

Appendix 1

The Isle of Wight Council consulted on the following draft Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) under regulations 11 to 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012:

- Draft Bay Area Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document
- Draft Bembridge, Brading & St Helens Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document
- Draft Cowes, Northwood & Gurnard Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document
- Draft East Cowes & Whippingham Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document

The consultation commenced on Friday 29 November 2024 and closed at 5pm on Friday 17 January 2025.

This document provides a summary of the responses made and how those issues have been addressed in the final SPD documents.

Overall, a total of 116 representations were received.

- Draft Bay Area Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document - **12 representations**
- Draft Bembridge, Brading & St Helens Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document - **5 representations**
- Draft Cowes, Northwood & Gurnard Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document - **68 representations**
- Draft East Cowes & Whippingham Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document - **5 representations**

There were also 26 general comments received. A total of 36 representations were in support of the LCWIP SPDs.

The tables below show summaries of the comments made, including those from statutory consultees with the final column being a council response to each comment made.

General comments				
Number of representations	26			
Ref number	Name of respondent	Paragraph or policy	Issue Raised	Council Response
LCWIP 01	Geoff & Caroline Read	General	<p>In favour of the proposals to extend the network of pathways on the island.</p> <p>In favour of dual use of the pathways but there needs to be more restrictions on speed and use of them by cyclists.</p> <p>More signage reminding cyclists that they do not have priority would be helpful. More breaks in pathways which force cyclists to dismount to negotiate through staggered barriers is helpful.</p>	Support and comment noted.
LCWIP 04	Angela Hewitt	General	<p>My safe route from Newport to Whippingham.</p> <p>I Live in Whippingham and cycle from Whippingham (43 years) to Blackwater from time to time.</p> <p>This is my safe route. Alverstone rd slope is slightly easier than the main road and much safer. I never cycle along the main road in consideration to my own safety and to the traffic.</p> <p>During the Summer when it is dry I cycle along the River medina from the Folly Inn.</p>	Comment noted
LCWIP 26	Justin Steele	General	<p>Amazed the IW Council are considering the outlined proposals given that the Sandown to Newport track has been unusable for more than 5 years after every time we have heavy rainfall.</p>	Comment noted.

			Sort out and properly maintain the infrastructure that we already have rather than wasting money consulting and creating more rights of way which will also fall foul of being properly maintained.	
LCWIP 38	Nigel Talbot	General	<p>I am writing in support of the LCWIPs becoming Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>It is sad to see the decline of cycling on the Island, and for perfectly understandable reasons. There is a perception that cycling is dangerous on our roads, and therefore fewer people cycle, which inevitably increases car use. Parents will not let their children cycle on the roads, either to school or socially as there are too few 'safe routes', numbers owning a bicycle therefore also decline. We need to reverse this downward spiral and invest in creating more cycle routes – proper cycle paths, off the main roads, not just lines on an existing road, with a good surface so ordinary bikes can use them. The side benefits to health, well being, and the environment are well documented, but for us on the Island the additional benefits are for tourism, also sadly in decline.</p> <p>Please put cycling (and walking) high on your priorities..</p>	Support noted.
LCWIP 39	Ryan Lownds on behalf of Southern Water	General	<p>Thank you for consulting Southern Water on the following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) within the Island Plan Local Development Framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bay Area Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document. 	Noted. No comments to make on the documents.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bembridge, Brading and St Helens Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document. • Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document. • East Cowes and Whippingham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Supplementary Planning Document. <p>As this relates to Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure and not Utility Infrastructure, we have no comment to make on the documents..</p>	
LCWIP 41	Anon		I am in full agreement with this and much needed.	Support noted.
LCWIP 43	Neil Oliver	General	<p>I am in favour of the LCWIPS being accepted as SPDs.</p> <p>They represent sensible, robust plans to ease the travel of non-vehicular residents, those walking, scooting, using bicycles, tricycles, e-bikes, mobility scooters, wheelchairs, large double/triple buggies etc.</p> <p>They are sensible plans to link homes with schools, businesses (to work in) and businesses to visit including shops, POs and cafes.</p> <p>Evidence from around the world demonstrates that mixed use paths but not vehicles increase trade in shopping areas (such as the proposed route through Cowes). This particular route will continue to be used by commuters bicycling from E Cowes and the N'port - Cowes cyclepath to Redjet, so it seems sensible to accept this as part of progress and plan the changes accordingly.</p>	Support and comment noted.

			<p>In the consultation for the Place Plan for Cowes & Northwood there were many comments re. the difficulty of navigating across Cowes. The Randonnee attracting upwards of 3,000 participants demonstrates the possible income from bicycling holidaymakers and clear, obvious, signposted routes will simplify the use of such routes as 'Round the Island'.</p> <p>We as a population need to look forward to the future, improve things for our children and grandchildren and stop looking back to 'the good old days of the 50s and 60s.</p>	
LCWIP 51	Jill & Don Roe		<p>We are writing in support of the adoption of the above plans.</p> <p>It is very important to encourage everyone to walk & cycle more, and use their cars less, especially as a way of making everyday journeys. It helps people to save money, it's good for their health, for the local environment, and of course to help reduce climate change.</p> <p>What's not to like?</p>	Support noted.
LCWIP 54	Nora Clinton	General	<p>My full support for the 4 LCWIPs currently under consultation on the island. They are really important documents and actions for us to advance our transition to a net zero island.</p>	Support noted.
LCWIP 55	Matthew Whittaker	General	<p>Support of adopting the LCWIP documents as supplementary planning documents.</p> <p>They appear comprehensive, carefully considered and each with detailed community consultation and feedback that has resulted in good quality</p>	Support noted.

			documentation relevant to use for informing the islands approach to planning for the future, and inform the design of new developments.	
LCWIP 58	Jo Randall	General	With green transportation increasingly more urgent, and obesity levels at an all-time high, the creation of decent walking/cycling/running routes linking our towns would be a tremendous help, and would surely encourage more people to travel under their own steam more, whether to commute or for exercise and pleasure. Improvement and extension of existing routes is also long overdue. I support the IWC adopting LCWIPS and very much hope they will go ahead!	Support noted.
LCWIP 61	Nora Aridi	General	Full support for the 4 LCWIPs currently under consultation on the island. They are really important documents and actions for us to advance our transition to a net zero island.	Support noted.
LCWIP 67	Gareth Jones	General	We welcome these new schemes. Lately however we have found increasing lack of access to footpaths by the use of kissing gates mainly put up by the group Miles Without Styles. This has made impossible to access area of Newtown. They have completely missed the point of accessibility. In areas where kissing gates have to be used a metal gate next to it could be used fitted with a radar key which opens it up . Also the use of a finer more compacted aggregate would be good so making it easier for people with walkers ,wheelchairs etc.	Comment noted.

LCWIP 71	Tim Thorne on behalf of Cycle Wight	General	<p>CycleWight supports the adoption of the 4 LCWIPs to become supplementary planning documents within the Island Plan Local Development Framework : a) Cowes, Northwood, Gurnard b) East Cowes and Whippingham, c) St Helens, Brading and Bembridge d) Sandown, Shanklin and Lake.</p> <p>The creation of high quality walking and cycling routes will help the Council in its attempts to meet its aim to reach zero carbon emissions. It will have positive benefits on the Council's policy on health and well being by making it easier for people to exercise as well as carry out such tasks as shopping and accessing employment. Any provision that encourages less reliability on the motor car will mean more space for people.</p> <p>CycleWight will be a supportive partner in Council's endeavours to support these plans.</p>	Support noted.
LCWIP 80	Michael Wilks	General	<p>I fully support all of the LCWIPs completed to date.</p> <p>Active travel has long been neglected, the implementation of local plans will be highly beneficial to communities:</p> <p>Promoting activity and better health.</p> <p>Encouraging independence for school age children.</p> <p>Cutting the need to drive and hence carbon.</p> <p>Improving local environment quality.</p> <p>Safety from careless and speeding drivers.</p>	Support Noted
LCWIP 94	Tim Thorne	General	Support the proposals to try make the LCWIPs of E.Cowes, Whippingham, Cowes, Gurnard,	Support noted.

			<p>Northwood, Bembridge, Brading, St Helens and The Bay Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>Easier for better quality walking and cycling infrastructure to become a reality. This is vital to improve the quality of life for residents and visitors.</p>	
LCWIP 96	Ken Gilpin	General	The more the better. It's safer for all.	Support noted
LCWIP 97	Peter Dyer	General	<p>I fully support the 4 LCWIPs being adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>It's important for future long term planning that all challenges facing IOW communities be considered</p> <p>Also it should be accepted that not all people will choose to own or drive a car in the future when there are so many viable cost effective alternatives available such as e-bikes, cargo bikes and mobility scooters.</p>	Support noted
LCWIP 99	Simon Richards	General	I wish to express my general support for the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plans. If implemented, these plans will significantly improve safety for cyclists and walkers, whilst increasing designated routes for these highway users.	Support noted
LCWIP 100	Martin Grant	General	I am very supportive of this work and consultation. I would support any pragmatic outcome-focused approach. I would support 'spot' improvements sooner, over whole route improvements later, as it is likely to increase use	Support and comments noted.

			<p>thereby causing a cultural shift towards active travel.</p> <p>Genuinely excited at the changes you propose to Cowes and wish you the best in implementing them. The proposed changes for Cowes are excellent. Your clarification and plans for Cowes High Street are very welcome indeed.</p> <p>East Cowes: A new river crossing would be wonderful, not just for cycling, but also access to the river on the east side where there is greater access to the Medina. I think there would be a real benefit for this reason, however, it's probably not realistic for various reasons, including cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The most significant change would be between the Folly Inn and around Island Harbour. As you've noted, Folly to Island harbour is a narrow footpath. It's also muddy and thin. The route east by passing the A3021 is the regular route I take as the A road is frankly dangerous to cycling (and almost impossible for pedestrians). For this reason alone, I would prioritise this route. Extending the Medina Greenway northwards on the eastern river bank – whilst this would be the best option in my opinion (by far), following the A3021 main road would be the most realistic and cost-effective. <p>The Folly Inn to St Mildred's is a challenging footpath I have taken on several regrettable occasions. It would be beneficial if this could at least be made walkable, something Green King owners of the Folly Inn may support financially now that the renovations are complete.</p>	<p>Support noted and any future options for delivery.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			The Bay area: I agree with any proposal for additional shore-side cycling. It's already a lovely ride, but some of it is prohibited to cycling (albeit further north).	
LCWIP 101	Mike Fisher	General	Express my support for the proposals in the 4SPDs which have been produced over a period of time after extensive public consultation and urge the council to adopt and implement the proposals as soon as possible.	Support noted.
LCWIP 102	Matthew & Gill de Belder	General	Fully support the adoption of the next four Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs), for East Cowes & Whippingham; Cowes, Gurnard & Northwood; Bembridge, Brading & St Helens; and The Bay, into Supplementary Planning Documents. We must encourage the Council to do whatever it takes to get these plans into action and produce the routes and improvements on the ground if the public are truly going to benefit.	Support noted.
LCWIP 110	Guy Robinson Historic England	General	We welcome acknowledgement of the connection to Bembridge windmill in EWW10 in the Bembridge, Brading and St Helens LCWIP, and encourage similar consideration of connections with other assets, such as: The Bay Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shanklin conservation area (BAC 2) • Sandown Barrack Battery Scheduled Monument (BAC 7); Bembridge, Brading and St Helens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brading conservation area (EWW1 – EWW4 and the Brading CWZ and EWC1) 	Comments noted. The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage further consultation would take place with consultees and the local community.

			<p>Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cowes conservation area (CW3 and Cowes CWZ and CC5) <p>We encourage the relationship between cultural heritage destinations to be explored, informed by liaison with the Council's heritage advisers as appropriate, and for links to be made between the LCWIPs and the island's Cultural Strategy.</p>	
LCWIP 111	John Stewart-Murray on behalf of IOW Ramblers	General	<p>The creation and enhancement of routes from and through residential areas to public transport links and increased "networks" of cycling and walking will be of significant benefit to our 450+ local residents and members in their role as Ramblers and as IOW residents potentially using the proposed LCWIP improvements.</p> <p>We particularly applaud the LCWIPs intent to prioritise "joined-up" schemes and network creation, this aligns closely with the IOW Ramblers "Gaps and Links" project which identifies where often minor changes can result in significant benefits by connecting existing siloed routes or networks. We've found this is a very cost/effort-effective strategy when considering route additions or modifications.</p> <p>High proportion of Ramblers are also cyclists so both aspects of the LCWIPs are of interest, especially as the preferred route deliverable is a shared use walking/cycling route. Ramblers generally support well-designed shared use routes, the more recent layout and signage</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with consultees and the local community.</p>

			<p>changes used on shared routes eg revised 'lane' markings, have removed most of the issues that could result in safety concerns or conflict.</p> <p>We are also aware that shared routes are cost and space efficient solutions so are happy to endorse this method.</p> <p><u>Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard LCWIP</u> This is a very well researched and professional survey and all of the proposed enhancements appear desirable but the following routes seem to be of particular value: CW1, CW2 & CW3: these seem to offer most 'bang for the buck' and are more closely in accord with typical Ramblers requirements.</p> <p>CC6 and CC7: These longer distance cycling routes would be very useful to Ramblers, particularly CC7 which will enhance the English Coastal Path, a particular interest for all walkers.</p> <p><u>East Cowes and Whippingham LCWIP</u> These areas have some significant challenges for walking and cycling and is also an area of significant issues with the ECP routing, particularly where the current (non-ratified) proposals route the ECP down A roads some miles from the sea and through country roads with no pavements or footpaths in the Whippingham parish. We are pleased to see that there has been focus on enhancing cycle routes and extending 'quiet lanes' in the East Cowes and Whippingham areas, eg Interventions 4, 8, 12 and 15 . These would</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			also have significant benefit to walkers so we would recommend prioritising those options.	
LCWIP 112	Nick Fever	General	Support the introduction of all the Island LCWIPs.	Support noted.
LCWIP 115	Alex Lawson	General	<p>I write to support adoption of the Supplementary Policy Documents for Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure.</p> <p>I would comment that the following items should be prioritised:</p> <p># The East Cowes and Whippingham document section 3.2 refers to the English Coastal Path. In particular Figure 4 shows part of CS24. The ECP has been discussed at the PROW Local Access Forum.</p> <p>It is recognised that there is an opportunity to provide sustainable commuting between Newport and East Cowes, which are employment and dormitory centres.</p> <p># The East Cowes and Whippingham document section 4.3 Summary of options linking Whippingham to Newport, and shows Figure 25: The grass verge on the west side of North Fairlee Road could be made into a cycle path. This would improve the cycle and walking network connecting Cowes, Newport and Wootton by making it much safer.</p> <p># The Cowes Northwood and Gurnard document suggests enhancements to the Core Walking Zone in Cowes High Street.</p>	<p>Comments and support noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with consultees and the local community.</p>

			<p>Passengers arriving in Red Funnel Yard may be elderly and with luggage.</p> <p>They face an obstacle course to reach the Southern Vectis buses which now terminates at M&S. Priority should be given to improving the route.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Representation on the draft Bay Area LCWIP SPD				
Number of representations	12			
Ref number	Name of respondent	Paragraph or policy	Issue Raised	Council Response
LCWIP 03	Adam Collings	General	<p>Support the plan.</p> <p>Note LCWIP missed off the southern end of Shanklin (Westhill, Shanklin Manor and Luccombe). What happens to any applications within this areas?</p> <p>Suggest SPDs should be adopted by Island Roads so that they are considered when works are planned for areas.</p>	<p>Comments and support noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with consultees and the local community.</p>
LCWIP 07	Cazz Rawden	General	<p>Photos showing Shanklin to Wroxall cycle track as it is now drainage needs to be installed along side the edges of the track to prevent this happening every winter.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
LCWIP 08	Cllr Jenny Hicks - Sandown Town Council	General	<p>I am at a loss over planning for the huge advertisement display opposite Jewsons side</p>	<p>Comment noted. Outside the remit of the LCWIPs.</p>

			<p>building in Sandown two years ago because of height and right in front of residential buildings!</p> <p>It should have been sited in business area not residential.</p>	
LCWIP 27	J. Page	General	<p>I have a number of concerns with the first being the highlighting of some areas to change to 20mph, whilst I can understand this in side streets and maybe the Esplanade area, I feel it is not appropriate for main roads like Avenue Road and Broadway etc.</p> <p>Additionally, with the creation of walking and cycling lanes/areas I can only guess that many parking spaces will go to incorporate these schemes? In Sandown we already have many issues with the lack of free parking and recent projects have removed more residential spaces which is making it difficult especially for the elderly and/or disabled who often have to walk long distances from their homes to their cars this seems to be getting worse every year.</p> <p>If parking spaces are to be removed, I believe this could massively affect tourism as if families cannot find anywhere to park they will not come to Sandown and more businesses will suffer and probably close. You could say walking and cycling areas may attract tourism but I would say for every walker or cyclist attracted you could lose a car full of people and this impact should be considered.</p>	<p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, groups and parish and town councils and include a design brief to establish if the project was feasible.</p>
LCWIP 28	John Cliff	General	<p>Already have issues with insufficient parking in Sandown. Not all locals wanting to get from a to b, tourists who need to arrive and have decent</p>	

			<p>spaces to park with good access routes to the beaches and attractions (dinosaur isle etc).</p> <p>Don't waste money on the landward side, improve the access across to the beach side. You managed to not define a single walking path that is beach access or beach to beach access (the esplanade).</p> <p>Surely parking to beach access is one of the prime reasons for walking in Sandown. Parking should be an entire category of trip attractor if you're dealing with a tourist location where a large number of the people walking are arriving by vehicle. The document seems to completely ignore the volume of non-resident pedestrians we have.</p>	
LCWIP 36	Richard Morris	BAC2 Cycle Route	<p>My first is to ask will you be closing the esplanade in 2025 to do surface improvements and what areas will this cover?</p> <p>Secondly the suggested change in parking orientation along the seafront east of the pier is going to drastically reduce parking in the beach area. This impacts visitors, access for disabled persons and local residents. On street parking for residents in Sandown is extremely limited, especially around the Fitzroy Street area and this is exacerbated during summer months. By reducing the parking along the seafront what consideration is being taken for local residents who already struggle to find on street parking?</p> <p>My opinion is that you will not achieve reducing congestion in Sandown by introducing cycling and walking routes as the majority of the island's visitors is families with young children and lots of</p>	

			<p>"luggage" and the elderly. A very low number in comparison will be visiting on push bikes. All it will achieve is force people to use the already limited on street parking higher up in the town. The suggested improvements don't support the fact we are a small seaside town without the space unlike the bigger beaches of Bournemouth or Portsmouth where similar initiatives have been successful. I currently think the layout of the esplanade provides ample space for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, when is the work due to start and be completed by along this route? There are plenty of businesses along the seafront who would suffer from extensive works in the summer months detracting visitors due to noise and limited access.</p>	
LCWIP 42	Helen Jones	General	<p>I am generally in favour of the approach of the LCWIPs to improve the safety and coherence of the cycling and walking routes and networks. Enabling a higher proportion of short journeys to be made by walking and wheeling (cycling and by use of wheelchairs and other mobility aids) will have benefits to the individuals and their communities as well as the island, country and world. We support the introduction of more continuous footways, raised tables, dropped kerbs, controlled crossings, the widening of footways, and clearing of road furniture cluttering the footways, traffic calming including default 20mph zones in built-up areas, and on quiet roads, and some modal filters to prevent through traffic.</p>	<p>Support and comment noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with the local community.</p>

			<p>The walking and cycling improvements proposed in the Bay Area LCWIP are focused on short utility journeys taking up to perhaps half an hour. I am a walker, being a Ramblers Walk Leader, and also a cyclist, volunteering for delivering by e-cargobike among other cycling activities.</p> <p>I approve in particular of the following improvements:</p> <p>BAW7 improving the railway crossing to render it accessible for wheeling</p> <p>BAW12 improving the public realm around the station and the crossing under the railway</p> <p>BAC1B introduce improved shared use offroad trail, even if the improvements along Landguard Road (BAC1) can be carried out</p> <p>BAC4 improvements to the existing surface, improving drainage and improving links to Blythe Way, Carter Avenue and Upper Hyde Lane</p> <p>BAC6 clearance to increase usage</p> <p>BAC8 if the shared use path in the park can be made safe, especially the improved railway crossing</p> <p>There was a mention of upgrading the footpath from Yaverland to Culver Down to allow cycling. This would be a popular cycling route, as the road route to Bembridge is unpleasant to cycle. This would need to be done with input of Natural England (?) and National Trust. As it is a steep hill, safety of the more vulnerable users, including pedestrians would be paramount.</p> <p>NCR23 Sandown-Newport Cycle route - as pointed out this has flooding issues, including on the section covered by this LCWIP, often rendering it impassable on foot as well as by</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			bike. There is a desperate need for this route to be upgraded, to increase its utilisation.	
LCWIP 44	David Kast on behalf of Shanklin Theatre Ltd.		<p>On behalf of the Theatre, I am writing to express some initial concerns that we have regarding the current proposals for narrowing the Junction between the High Street and Steephill Road, widening the footways and creating a new public space outside our Theatre. This is shown in the current Draft Plan under Shanklin CWZ South. Throughout the year, Shanklin Theatre provides a significant entertainment service to the Island community, its tourism and visitors. Notably during the summer months, we have a regular weekly musical programme, currently entitled 'Beyond the West End', where each show can attract up to 9 coachloads of Island visitors. This puts pressure on the existing road system and as a result, coaches are called in by our front of house team in a coordinated way to avoid any significant traffic disruption. The road entrance to the Theatre via the junction of the High Street into Steephill Road, is a one-way system, already with limited space due to the parking allowed either side of the road. This results in a tight manoeuvre for coaches (and any cars), driving up to the Theatre to drop off passengers. Widening the footways and narrowing the junction - even if parking is subsequently removed, would certainly hinder such access. If coaches were prevented from accessing the Theatre as a result of the current plan, this would be detrimental financially</p>	<p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, groups and parish and town councils and include a design brief to establish if the project was feasible.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>

			<p>to both the Theatre and production company involved.</p> <p>Alongside the impact of increasing the footway widths, we have an additional concern regarding the proposal that such widening could create new public space outside the Theatre. This we feel may have an impact on the safety of those attending our shows. Given the fact that Steephill Road will continue to be open to traffic, there will be vehicles turning left outside our Theatre into Prospect Road, or right to continue up Steephill Road. With many shows throughout the year attracting over 600 people at a time, this can create congestion immediately outside our Theatre, whilst cars, etc, are still seeking to pass through the routes mentioned. We do our best to move people quickly into our Theatre wherever possible, but our view is that any steps taken by the new plan to encourage loitering in a new public space created outside the Theatre, could increase the risk of accidents for those attending shows.</p>	
LCWIP 57	Bruce Webb	Section at base of Ferncliff Path, Sandown.	<p>I am really pleased to see the future plans for Sandown in your recent document. However there appears to be a small area missed out on your maps which is an accident blackspot where road, footpaths and slipway, revetment all meet. This is at the base of Ferncliff Path (which is part of the coastal path) where it meets with near the Beach Shack cafe and Sandown Beach hire and Devonia Slipway.</p>	<p>Thank you for raising these points.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with the local community.</p>

			<p>The area is a turning area for cars and it is very often jammed up with traffic which then can jam up further back to the pier. This is made further worse by the Lifeboat emergency parking which is constantly abused by people parking in the space. In the summer months this area is extremely dangerous for walkers, disabled in wheel chairs, the elderly, mobility scooters and small children.</p> <p>As this area of road has a two footpaths, the revetment, the beach via a slipway and a 30mph road all converging in one place would it be possible to introduce traffic calming/raised walkways, or simply a restriction in parking and traffic to the south side of the pier so only residents of Napoleons landing, Deliveries and lifeboats can come down the seafront south of the pier ?</p>	
LCWIP 76	Bob Sharples on behalf of Sport England	General	<p>It is disappointing that we are making the same comments as we did 2 years ago:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SPD does not address the needs of disabled cyclists; 2. Nor does it address the charging for electric bicycles. <p>Two other issues which have come to the fore, since we responded to the Newport and Ryde LCWIP are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The need for more secure cycle parking – which should be covered CCTV. If the cycle parking is covered PVs can be put 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, consultees and parish and town councils and include a design brief</p>

			<p>on the roof as part of a sustainable energy programme; and</p> <p>b. Bike rental hubs.</p>	to establish if the project was feasible and inclusive.
LCWIP 83	Helen Jones on behalf of IOW Ramblers	General	<p>On behalf of IOW Ramblers- We support the introduction of more continuous footways, raised tables, dropped kerbs, controlled crossings, the widening of footways, and clearing of road furniture cluttering the footways, traffic calming including default 20mph zones in built-up areas, and on quiet roads, and some modal filters to prevent through traffic.</p> <p>The walking and cycling improvements proposed in the Bay Area LCWIP are focused on short utility journeys taking up to perhaps half an hour. Ramblers walks are of various types, short health and wellbeing types walks including GP-prescribed walks in groups, and longer rambles mainly for leisure/fitness, usually longer than the utility walks on which the LCWIPs are focused. Nevertheless, the improvements proposed will certainly benefit our members, for instance by improving links to routes beyond the central zones of the towns, into the countryside. We approve in particular of the following improvements:</p> <p>BAW7 improving the railway crossing to render it accessible</p> <p>BAW12 improving the public realm around the station and the crossing under the railway</p> <p>BAC1B introduce improved shared use offroad trail, even if the improvements along Landguard Road (BAC1) can be carried out</p>	Support noted.

			<p>BAC4 improvements to the existing surface, improving drainage and improving links to Blythe Way, Carter Avenue and Upper Hyde Lane</p> <p>BAC6 clearance to increase usage</p> <p>BAC8 if the shared use path in the park can be made safe, especially the improved railway crossing</p> <p>There was a mention of upgrading the footpath from Yaverland to Culver Down to allow cycling. This would be a popular cycling route, as the road route to Bembridge is unpleasant. This would need to be done with input of Natural England (?) and National Trust. As it is a steep hill, safety of the more vulnerable users, including pedestrians would be paramount.</p> <p>NCR23 Sandown-Newport Cycle route - as pointed out this has flooding issues, including on the section covered by this LCWIP, often rendering it impassable on foot as well as by bike.</p>	
LCWIP 109	Cllr Ian Ward	<p>Page 36</p> <p>Page 37</p> <p>Page 67</p>	<p>A. Page 36. The suggestion is to widen the pavement; however the road is narrow, lined with parked cars on one side. The road is a Bus, Coach and heavy vehicle route so widening the pavement will risk collisions with the parked vehicles.</p> <p>B. Page 37. Yes, widen the pathway if possible</p> <p>C. Page 67. Widening of the pavement to 3m is unnecessary as it is little used by cyclists and would narrow traffic flow along that stretch of road.</p>	<p>Comments note.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with the local community.</p>

Representation on the draft Bembridge, Brading and St Helens LCWIP SPD				
Number of representations	5			
Ref number	Name of respondent	Paragraph or policy	Issue Raised	Council Response
LCWIP 02	Stella Peterson	General	Supportive of the document Hope there is the money available to implement schemes to encourage people to use more active forms of transport and reduce their reliance on motorised vehicles.	Support noted.
LCWIP 77	Bob Sharples	General	<p>It is disappointing that we are making the same comments as we did 2 years ago:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SPD does not address the needs of disabled cyclists; 2. Nor does it address the charging for electric bicycles. <p>Two other issues which have come to the fore, since we responded to the Newport and Ryde LCWIP are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The need for more secure cycle parking – which should be covered CCTV. If the cycle parking is covered PVs can be put on the roof as part of a sustainable energy programme; and <p>Bike rental hubs.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, consultees and parish and town councils and include a design brief to establish if the project was feasible and inclusive.</p>
LCWIP 79	Mike Slater on behalf of IOW Ramblers	General	The Ramblers fully support this proposal; in particular we value the following improvement opportunities:	Support noted

			<p>EW5 Provision of a footway alongside Carpenters Road St Helens.</p> <p>EW6 Provision of a footway alongside Eddington Road St Helens.</p> <p>EW6 Improved arrangements for pedestrians along Duver Road St Helens.</p> <p>EW1 Multiuser track arrangements alongside the A 3055 between Brading and Sandown.</p> <p>EW2 The opportunity identified for a new multiuser route between Brading Rail Station and Westridge Ryde.</p> <p>EW3 Multiuser track arrangements from Brading to St Helens across the marshes and along the disused railway line.</p> <p>EW7 Multiuser track arrangements from Brading to the southern suburbs of Bembridge.</p>	
LCWIP 114	<p>Claire Brickell</p> <p>Andrew Scally</p> <p>Clare Owens</p> <p>Jacky Matthews</p> <p>Ian Matthews</p>	General	<p><u>TRAFFIC CALMING</u></p> <p>In principle we support the proposals for traffic calming and a 20mph speed limit. However we strongly feel that the calming measures should not be in the proposed area - they should be further along Eddington Road, on the straight part of the road in order that road users & pedestrians have greater visibility of the oncoming traffic from the Village and from Nettlestone directions.</p> <p>(*between Eddington Cottage driveway and Nodes point taking into consideration the entrance from Fakenham Farm)</p> <p>With the proposed calming being situated on a bend the traffic from both directions will not see each other until last minute therefore increasing traffic manoeuvres.</p>	<p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, groups and parish and town councils and include a design brief to establish if the project was feasible.</p>

			<p>The proposed siting of the calming measures will have significant impact on the accesses to the driveways of Miramar & Seaways, creating issues when reversing out of the drives and potentially turning into the drives from both directions. Other calming concerns are as follows -</p> <p>Noise pollution from cars stopping and starting</p> <p>Electric cars - unable to hear them when stationery</p> <p>Size of throttled carriageways - would they be wide enough for buses, fire engines, the transport of mobile homes</p> <p>We think that a 20mph sign - 'you are now in a 20mph zone' should be placed between the traffic calming area and the corner - Duver Rd/Upper Green Road.</p> <p><u>FOOTWAY</u></p> <p>If the owners of the field are content with selling the verge to create a pavement what will happen with regard to -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the gravel driveway that would have to be to be crossed, b. two old established oak trees, telegraph pole and the St Helens Village Sign and planter? <p>These items would be hazards on the pavement and would not allow the pavement to be made to the designated dimensions.</p> <p><u>LAND OWNERSHIP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens if the owners of Eddington Cottage & the field do not wish to sell their land? 	<p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

LCWIP 116	Tom and Jo Rees	General	<p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe the creation of a footway between Duver road and Nodes point, along Eddington Road would be a real improvement and to not only safety but enable Nodes Point visitors to walk to engage in the village. • We believe the creation of a footway down Duver Road to access the beach would increase safety and encourage walking in turn easing congestion of parking along the road way. • Traffic calming / pinch point on Eddington Road would reduce the speed at which people drove out of the village. <p>Room for further thought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a pinch point on Eddington Road would need to be considered carefully as to its positioning. • Litter patrols and bin provision on the Eddington Road footway. • Safety review of access and egress to existing driveways with increased footfall / cycle traffic. <p>This proposal seems like a real positive step towards increasing the use of walking / cycling and would reduce the reliance on motor vehicles.</p>	<p>Support and comments noted. The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with the local community.</p>
-----------	-----------------	---------	--	---

Representation on the draft Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard LCWIP SPD				
Number of representations	68			
Number of representations on Cowes High Street (full or part)	60			
Ref number	Name of respondent	Paragraph or policy	Issue Raised	Council Response
LCWIP 05	Jo Mort	General/ Cowes High Street	<p>As a parent of a disabled person, one of their disabilities is that they are blind, I have concerns about the shared paths and the speed that cyclists go. Often using bells to tell you to get out of the way without reducing their speed. This is dangerous to a disabled person.</p> <p>The pavement from Cowes to Gurnard along the seafront is not flat on some areas. Due to my child's cerebral palsy they have to walk on the flat part next to the road. I note this will be now for cyclists so will the slope on the paths be flattened?</p> <p>Shared area along the high street is difficult to navigate now and no indication where the precinct ends and the road starts near Hursts. Walking by Hursts doorway On the pavement is impossible with shoppers. Delivery vans parked across the pavement bobbles across the road from Hursts to the opticians on the opposite side of the road</p> <p>Have you contacted/worked with disabled people when implementing some of the changes?</p>	<p>The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).</p> <p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p>

				<p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
LCWIP 06	Daryl Harrison	General	<p>Support this long overdue cycling infrastructure proposal for our community. Improved cycling infrastructure is essential for sustainable living and healthier choices.</p> <p>A bridge at East Cowes marina is my most favoured option as from personal experience Island harbour route has several flaws.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with the local community.</p>

			Good to hear a greater emphasis for greener and sustainable travel. Please consider this a positive in favour endorsement of any improvements going forward.	
LCWIP 09	Mark Ayres	Shooters Hill, Cowes High Street	<p>I strongly object to the proposed cycle route through shooters hill, high street, Cowes. This is a narrow pedestrian area with shops both sides people meander from one side to the other, enjoying shopping in a safe manner, speeding cyclists will cause the elderly, disabled, vulnerable people, nervous disposition etc to have to rapidly move out of the way.</p> <p>During busier times, increased visitors and sailing events inc. cowes week this will be a serious breach of health and safety.</p>	<p>The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).</p> <p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p>
LCWIP 10	Jon Roberts	General/ Cowes High Street	<p>Following issues with this proposal. Cyclists and scooterists are governed by the Road Traffic Act. Proceeding on pavements and through pedestrian precincts is illegal as is travelling contrary to the flow of traffic. The proposed plan is flawed and will inevitably lead to more confrontation and accidents than already occur. Energy and resources would be better utilised in ensuring that the authorities enforce our existing laws rather than enabling dangerous situations to occur.</p>	<p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p>
LCWIP 11	Debbie Wilson	Cowes High Street	Concerned to hear cycle lanes planned to direct cyclists through Cowes High Street. Significant safety risk. I ask you to reconsider the route.	Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in

LCWIP 12	David Higgins	Cowes High Street	<p>I bet nobody has even bothered to visit the high street to ask the visitors, shoppers or businesses on the high street.</p> <p>It is already dangerous enough with the few cyclists that chose to ignore the cycling ban. There are several 1 way roads along the route as well as the High Street that cyclists already ignore ie Birmingham rd.</p> <p>You can't even police the current traffic laws on the high street now with delivery lorries and vans driving on it all hours</p>	<p>engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p>
LCWIP 13	Lisa Covington	Cowes High Street	<p>Oppose cyclists being allowed to cycle through Cowes Town Centre.</p> <p>To allow cyclists to cycle through with no speed limit is utter madness.</p> <p>Additionally, they will be cycling from Birmingham Road into Cowes in the opposite direction to the one way traffic which will also impede motorists wanting to turn into Birmingham Road from Beckford Road. There are parking bays on Birmingham Road obscuring oncoming cyclists which will only lead to collisions.</p> <p>This has not been thought through at all given the heavy burden of pedestrians in Cowes, many with children and dogs.</p>	<p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
LCWIP 14	Alison Langridge	Cowes High Street	<p>Lack of awareness of the significant dangers of cycling through Cowes High Street.</p> <p>I wonder if any of the planning officers involved in proposing this scheme have actually visited Cowes High St?</p>	

			<p>Number of pedestrians who pass from one side to the other while shopping; the number of people walking with dogs and/or small children; the number of pushchairs; the number of elderly or disabled people; people congregating and enjoying themselves outside the restaurants and pubs. All this happens at all times of the year with residents going about their daily activities: consider then the added impact on that number during the summer period - not forgetting of course, Cowes Week and the influx of people then.</p> <p>This part of the scheme absolutely cannot be allowed to go ahead. There must surely be an alternative route which would provide adequate walking/cycling routes for those who want to access them while preserving the character - and importantly the safety - of Cowes High St.</p>	
LCWIP 15	Clive Blount	Cowes High Street	<p>Concern about the removal of pedestrian status for Cowes High St and its re designation as mixed Cycle/Pedestrian.</p> <p>The issue is not one of “mums, dads and kids” using bikes for transport, but rather one of groups of competitive Lycra clad sports cyclists who need to maintain a high speed. This is an increasing problem, particularly in the vicinity of the bottom of shooters Hill/Sainsburys area where bikes are at high speed and visibility is reduced.</p> <p>I would argue that mixed use would also preclude outdoor seating for cafes...</p> <p>Far better to develop our road network to include cyclists safely instead. Currently, most cyclists are</p>	

			happy to dismount for the pedestrian section; it is a small number of aggressive types who are the problem.
LCWIP 16	Tom Hicks	CC7 (Cowes High Street)	<p>Comments, specifically on the proposals for route CC7 (Cowes High Street).</p> <p>Safety 1: The recommendation is to create a mixed use pedestrian and cycling zone (absent the space for a segregated cycle lane). This means cyclists sharing space with the elderly, children, prams, the disabled, mobility scooters and wheelchair users. Cycling is currently banned during the day through the High Street, and yet, it is still frequently used by cyclists who ignore the rules. I can think of at least three occasions when I have seen cyclists hit pedestrians in the High Street in the last two years - including my elderly Mother.</p> <p>Safety 2: I know from extensive firsthand experience that cyclists cannot be relied up to follow the rules. I note the proposal suggests "signage to encourage appropriate use" - this is frankly laughable and absent serious (and expensive) enforcement of the speed limit, there will be extensive risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>Safety 3: The layout of the High Street. Again, absent a segregated cycle lane, individuals and families coming out of shops are at risk of being hit. These risks are potentially exacerbated by multiple choke points on the High Street, particularly just south of the Red Jet terminal (by Shorelines and the jewellers) and at the southern end of Shooters Hill.</p>

			<p>Safety 4: Cycling traffic at certain times of year. The Island is a popular destination for competitive cyclists who often visit in large/organised Cycling Club groups. How does your consulting partner, People Power, propose handling 30 cyclists on racing bikes trying to weave their way down the High Street on a busy Saturday or Sunday (at speed)?</p>	
LCWIP 17	Mark Ayres	Cowes High Street	<p>Please can I ask if the disabled, partially sighted, people with anxiety, and vulnerable elderly have been given the option to comment on the proposals for cycle lane in cowes?</p>	
LWCIP 18	Phillip Downes	Cowes High Street	<p>It is a pedestrianised High Street for a reason. There are far more pedestrians using the High Street than there are cyclists, especially during the summer period but also throughout the year.</p> <p>A cycle track will take up the complete width of the High Street.</p>	
LCWIP 19	Niki Richardson	Cowes High Street	<p>Please don't consider putting a cycle lane through Cowes High Street, it would be hazardous and dangerous for shoppers elderly and visually impaired and deaf people, and for young children! The street is pedestrianised for a reason! There would be far too many accidents if there was a cycle route through it. It would kill the High Street and make shopping here not appealing which would kill our businesses!</p>	
LCWIP 20	J Morton	General/ Cowes High Street	<p>Please can you email me/publish the safety measures for blind/visually impaired pedestrians that have been identified and the measures that will be implemented for this scheme.</p>	

			<p>My adult daughter walks daily from home through Cowes. She is blind and uses a cane. She also has low muscle tone cerebral palsy but loves to walk independently.</p> <p>Often encounter amongst other things, speeding bikes and scooters, delivery wagons, extended dog leads and pavement furniture.</p> <p>Would like to know what measures are being implemented to let people with disabilities, especially visual disabilities where the cycle lanes are?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will there be raised bobbles all the along the edges from the floating bridge to Gurnard? 2. Have disabled people, sight for Wight, Guide Dogs for the blind been contacted and what was their advice, feeding into this plan. 3. Will the pavements between the parade and Gurnard be levelled. 4. Will dogs have to be kept on short leads to avoid tripping over the extendable leads 5. Will pedestrians be prevented from stopping to chat so that the pedestrian walk way is kept clear. 6. Pavements kept clear of tables, chairs, signs etc 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>7. How will a disabled, blind/visually impaired person safely cross the road.</p> <p>8. Who will police the speeds of the cyclists?</p>	
LCWIP 21	David Millar	Cycle Route CC7- Cowes High Street	<p>Whilst broadly in favour of much of the plan, and a supporter of moving traffic from cars to walking and cycling, I am concerned specifically by what I have read on cycling route CC7, particularly the section from the Esplanade to the junction of Birmingham Road and Medina Road.</p> <p>The proposed Queens Road to Medina Road section of the CC7 cycle route dangerous, inconvenient and frustrating for all users, and at times impossible, and requires too many restrictions on street furniture, cars, parking, and deliveries as well as impacting commercial revenues. The ban on cycling in those areas where current should remain and should be reinforced with extra signage to discourage illegal cycling.</p> <p>Proposed alternative: separate cyclists into two groups. sports and touring cyclist, often in large groups and regular commuters.</p> <p>The other group would include shoppers on cycles, parents with small children, and school children. The second group would continue to use their cycles on the rest of the area's routes but would dismount and walk their cycles on the pedestrian-only lengths of CC7 referred to above.</p>	
LCWIP 22	Louise Newlands	Cowes High Street	<p>Objection to this plan as it will put pedestrians and shoppers at a high risk of collision and</p>	

			<p>subsequent injury. In the high season, the High Street is extremely busy with pedestrians, shoppers, tourists, families, young children and dogs. The High Street should be pedestrianised for the safety of all who use it.</p> <p>The proposed cycle lane can be diverted away from this High Street, it is not necessary to bring it directly into the High Street.</p>	
LCWIP 23	Jack Thompson	Cowes High Street	<p>Concerned about this plan to build a cycling lane cutting through Cowes High Street and strongly oppose it.</p> <p>The High Street is way too narrow to accommodate this.</p> <p>We also believe reducing pedestrian space will be very detrimental to business and off-putting to customers due to this added traffic, and very dangerous as we are already witnessing near misses daily between people and bicycles due to reckless behaviour from riders speeding down the High Street when they should dismount.</p> <p>We are not mentioning the sheer ugliness of a red cycling lane spoiling the prettiness of the high street like a deep-cut scar.</p> <p>The cycling lane should definitely be diverted via Victoria Road - Ward Avenue - Baring Road - Castle road to sea front.</p>	
LCWIP 24	David Millward	General/ Cowes High Street	<p>Support the Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard LCWIP. In support of this I would make the following comments: -</p> <p>1. There are clearly some local concerns regarding cycling in the Cowes High Street pedestrian area. This is evidenced by a number of "No Cycling" notices displayed in some of the shops.</p>	

			<p>While there is obviously the potential for cyclist / pedestrian conflict in an area which is busy at times, the current alternative is on narrow roads, with a much, much higher risk of cyclist / vehicle conflict. The current lack of a traffic free route into, and through, the town will put off potential cyclists.</p> <p>2.The Island, and Cowes, is a tourist destination, and in an era where there is concern about falling visitor numbers, we should be doing all we can to encourage cycling visitors. It is worth noting that cycling tourists very rarely carry much in the way of food or supplies (unlike tourists travelling by car, for example); cycling visitors are therefore high users of local shops, cafes, accommodation etc. A 2020 study by Cycling UK, based on the King Alfreds Way, (in the South Downs, Ridgeway area) found that touring cyclists spent an average of £83.60 per person, per day. We should therefore be encouraging cyclists into Cowes, not around it.</p> <p>3.The existing Red Squirrel Trail is a fantastic asset for all forms of active travel; commuters, dog walkers, leisure walkers, wheelers and cyclists all use it, and appear to do so without conflict. This serves as an example of what can be achieved, but it mustn't be "forgotten" by the LCWIP's. Many sections are in a poor state of repair, these should be brought up to standard at the same time as the other excellent proposals in the LCWIP's.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			In summary, I hope to see the implementation of these plans as soon as possible and with the right level of engagement with all stakeholders, believe they can greatly improve the provision for active travel across the Island.	
LCWIP 25	Phil Hampson	General	<p>1. Generally I think this is an excellent plan as cycling in the area often feels threatening and this must people off using bikes for transport.</p> <p>2. I'd like to see some prioritisation of the various changes. From my perspective the very high priority changes are:-</p> <p>A) The uphill routes from Cowes town centre as all current routes involve at least some heavy traffic areas. Specifically the combination of parked cars and hills is problematic both on Park Road and the lower reaches of Baring Road. In both cases there's not really room to allow 1.5 meter overtaking space for cyclists. This means either motor vehicles are held up or they perform dubious overtaking manoeuvres. For this reason I think the Sun Hill, Northwood Park stretch to Crossfield Avenue of CC8 and or the Birmingham Road, Moorgreen Road stretch of CC5 should be prioritised.</p> <p>B) The section of Place Road between Three Gates Road and Pallance Road is pretty dangerous. The traffic is heavy and fast. Turning right onto Pallance Road is nasty as some traffic heading towards the Round House cuts the corner. This part of CC2 is urgently needed. Ideally some sort of walking / cycling crossing near Pallance Road should be included.</p> <p>C) Where there are shared paths in parks dog owners should be encouraged to use short leads</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. At this stage, further consultation would take place with the local community.</p>

			<p>on the shared paths and there needs to be some physical segregation between any Cycle track and areas where dogs are off the lead.</p> <p>Finally, from what I can see the High Street sections of CC7 will cause some controversy. A low traffic route from the Floating Bridge to the Esplanade is essential to any cycle plan for Cowes.</p>	
LCWIP 29	Gillian Corby	Cowes High Street	<p>I have been a resident of Cowes for 35 years. I am a keen cyclist and regularly use the route from Cowes to Gurnard. I currently can cycle through Cowes High Street before 10am. After that, I get off my bike and walk through - it takes about 5 minutes.</p> <p>Why do you want to spend money changing something that works perfectly well?</p> <p>I am concerned that in the Summer the High Street is busy with children, push chairs, wheel chairs, elderly people, as well as the local shoppers and tourists. Cyclists will create a real risk to the safety of those pedestrians.</p>	<p>The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).</p> <p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p>
LCWIP 30	Lin Hayward on behalf of Cowes Heritage and Community Group	Cowes High Street	<p>We are a community centre in Cowes and our members have asked us to express their concerns about the proposed cycle routes through the town centre.</p> <p>Managers and staff of shops in Cowes High Street (including some of our members) have had near and actual collisions with cyclists, when stepping out of a shop doorway or as pedestrians innocently strolling along the so-called 'pedestrian zone'.</p>	

			<p>Residents are frustrated at the lack of enforcement by the Police.</p> <p>Sport enthusiasts, young families and senior residents frequently cycle in both directions between Mill Hill Road and The Parade. This increases during the warmer months when large groups of 'Round the Island' route cyclists zip through the town centre.</p> <p>Many of these travel against the one-way system. The alternative routes avoiding the town centre have short inclines but nothing too taxing for a regular cyclist. Or they could dismount for a few minutes.</p> <p>It takes around 10 minutes for a generally fit person to walk the full length of the town or 5-6 minutes to access the Red Jet terminal from either end. Why shouldn't cyclists be made to dismount?</p> <p>Many disregard the road signs at every junction. Of course, we realise Police / PCSO numbers are much lower than in previous years and that is part of the problem.</p> <p>Could Island Roads paint large signs on the road surface? Of course there will still be those who ignore them but they would be more visible than A4 posters in shop windows.</p> <p>But proposing cyclists and electric scooters could travel in both directions along this route would just support those who have disregarded the highway code for many years and increase the hazards for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
LCWIP 32	Steve Richardson	Route CC7 – Cowes High Street	I would like to object to the creation of a cycle route through Cowes High Street as per route number CC7.	

			<p>Cowes High Street is vibrant. It has a flourishing variety of independent shops and restaurants. At present it is a relaxing and safe environment to wander through, peruse and purchase. This is particularly the case as there are significant numbers of both the elderly and young, including toddlers and prams. If visitors on bikes which to come through the centre of Cowes and shop , they can dismount and walk. There are plenty of excellent alternative routes if people wish to cycle and enjoy our lovely Island and derive the benefits from exercise which your papers rightly set out. This is particularly the case as there are significant numbers of both the elderly and young, including toddlers and prams.</p>	
LCWIP 33	Deborah Bray	Cowes High Street	<p>Strong objection to the proposed cycle route down Cowes High Street .</p> <p>This would have a very bad effect on trade for the shops in the town in addition to spoiling the atmosphere in the street which is calm and safe especially for young children and the elderly .</p>	
LCWIP 34	Marian Flannery	Route CC7 – Cowes High Street	<p>I prefer Cowes high street to be cycle free giving priority to walkers.</p>	
LCWIP 35	Cheryl Plummer	Route CC7 – Cowes High street	<p>I have reviewed your proposal for a cycle lane connecting Cowes Floating Bridge to Gurnard via the High Street.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with this proposal as we already have issues with cyclists riding through the town (against regulations) and posing a danger to pedestrians. Cyclists often ride in</p>	

			<p>groups, taking up much of the pavement, they often cycle at speed without due care for pedestrians. This is a pedestrianised area with elderly and young visitors and residents. They should not have to worry about colliding with bikes.</p> <p>In addition, Birmingham Road is a one way road and cyclists from the Floating Bridge will be going against the traffic flow.</p> <p>This plan will just embolden large groups of racing cyclists to speed through a pedestrian area.</p>	
LCWIP 37	Catherine Flury	Cowes High Street	<p>I must object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to integrate a cycle way down Cowes High Street.</p> <p>The High Street is already used by cyclists. At the moment cyclists have no consideration for pedestrians, so why would this change? Cyclists riding past the Castle and along the Green have precious little regard for pedestrians as it is and there is at least an 'escape' area for pedestrians.</p> <p>I have to ask what precautions would be taken during the Round the Island Randonnee?</p> <p>In these days of severe Health and Safety Regulations I have to ask what on earth lead the Council to believe that this would be a safe option?</p>	
LCWIP 40	Rog Reynolds	Cowes High Street	<p>The proposal to allow cycling in Cowes High St is dangerous for all pedestrians. This must not happen. Shooters Hill enables cyclists to achieve 20 or more mph. In addition you should note</p>	

			that recreational cyclists are interested in two things. 1. Their average speed- they won't slow down and policing speed is impossible and 2. The elevation achieved on their ride, just send them to Victoria Road, from there access to RedJet, restaurants and shops. Or of course they can walk.
LCWIP 46	Martin Winter	Cowes High Street	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed cycle path on Birmingham Road, Shooters Hill and Cowes High Street.</p> <p>Birmingham Road The parking on Birmingham Road makes it very difficult to see traffic when pulling out into Birmingham Road, only having to look one way. Having cyclists approach in the opposite direction is a very serious accident waiting to happen as the parked cars will obscure vision.</p> <p>Shooters Hill This is very steep and will result in cyclists moving far too fast in a very busy area for pedestrians, Cowes High Street</p> <p>This is a very busy, narrow thoroughfare and should be for pedestrians only. There is a route via the roads for cyclists to bypass the high street. A cycle lane would hinder access to the shops. Cyclists would be a menace to anyone unstable on their feet as pedestrians would inevitably have to cross the cycle path. There is just not the space. There would be many serious accidents if a cycle path was added to the high street.</p>
LCWIP 48	Bev White	Cowes High Street	Cowes high street is very narrow in many places and cyclists coming through such a narrow space. They are often doing so at speed. Amongst

			<p>pedestrians will be dangerous. This will be bad for the high street shops too.</p> <p>There are many places for cyclists to exercise on the island so adding this route simply adds risk. Would cyclists be required to keep to a 10mph speed or less and how would you police this? The high street is often full of people of all ages from young children to elderly people.</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposed route.</p>	
LCWIP 49	Becky Gardner	Cowes High Street	<p>While I understand the importance of encouraging healthier travel options, I believe the introduction of this cycle lane could have unintended negative consequences for the community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased Risk to Pedestrians: Cowes is a pedestrian-heavy area, frequently used by families with young children, people walking dogs, and, at times, intoxicated pedestrians. A cycle lane, particularly one that allows cyclists to travel at speed, could significantly increase the risk of accidents and conflicts in these shared spaces. 2. Space Limitations: The streets and pathways in Cowes, especially along Birmingham Road, the High Street, and the seafront, are already quite narrow and congested. Adding a cycle lane may reduce the available space for pedestrians, pushchairs, or individuals with mobility aids, creating potential hazards and inconvenience. 3. Impact on Local Businesses: Cowes relies heavily on tourism and local shopping. The presence of a cycle lane could deter some 	

			<p>visitors, particularly those concerned about speeding cyclists, which might result in a reduction in foot traffic to local businesses.</p> <p>4. Challenges with Regulation and Enforcement: Without proper enforcement, issues such as reckless or speeding cyclists could persist, further increasing the risk to pedestrians. This could require additional resources for monitoring and maintenance, adding further costs to the project. While I appreciate the effort to promote sustainable transport, I urge you to reconsider the current plan and conduct further consultation to ensure that it benefits all members of the community without compromising safety or accessibility.</p>	
LCWIP 50	Lauren Harris	Cowes High Street	<p>I strongly believe that Cowes High Street is not a suitable location for such infrastructure. The street is far too narrow and far too busy to safely accommodate a cycle lane.</p> <p>This proposal will deter shoppers, negatively affecting already struggling small local businesses that rely on foot traffic, which will be a huge shame.</p> <p>Families with young children, people with dogs, and the elderly or disabled will be especially excluded from using the high street, damaging the area's welcoming sense of community. Again a huge shame, because a sense of community on highstreets is a dying thing and something that Cowes does so well, it is always commented on when we have visitors how lively and bustling the high street is compared to their home towns.</p>	

			While I understand the importance of promoting cycling, it is essential that cycle lanes are carefully placed where they enhance safety and accessibility for all. I urge you to reconsider this proposal in favour of more suitable alternatives.
LCWIP 52	E Floyd	Cowes High Street	I most strongly object to the proposed cycle way through Cowes High Street. Cyclist e-scooterists do not obey current regulations , I note that on the proposed map that Birmingham Road is not included in the scheme , at present a lot of cyclists flout the One Way restriction on this road ,to access the high street.
LCWIP 53	Mike Elsom	General and Cowes High Street	<p>In my experience, it really doesn't matter if curbs are dropped or signs are erected. This simply will not be enough to encourage people to change their habits and choose walking or cycling over taking a car or other mechanised transport. And those who already choose to walk or cycle will continue to do so using their tried and trusted routes – they will not divert to an “organised” pedestrian or cycle route, that makes absolutely no sense.</p> <p>Effort and investment should – in my view – be directed to changing people's habits in two ways: First, to encourage people to use their cars less (through education on health and the environment, for example) and second, by encouraging and educating all road users to operate together safely and respectfully.</p> <p>I use the green marked cycle lane by Coppins Bridge in Newport. This is an excellent initiative</p>

			<p>to avoid the busy roundabout but as it also includes an adjacent pedestrian walkway, pedestrians often stray into the cycle lane without knowing – this makes both cycling and walking dangerous.</p> <p>The narrowness of parts of the high-street make walking and cycling dangerous to both parties and that’s why cycling is currently prohibited. Installing a cycleway will encourage cyclists to ride through the town thinking they have right of way – accidents with pedestrians who unwittingly stray into the cycleway will be inevitable.</p> <p>There is no need for cyclists to continue to ride along this short stretch of road – there are other routes cyclists can take (eg, part of the round the island cycle route) if they don’t want to dismount. Allowing cyclists to ride through the town encourages them to “keep on going”. If they have to walk through, they are more likely to stop and make use of the local business and shops. Additionally, Cowes is successfully encouraging a “café culture” with tables outside cafes and restaurants. Installing a cycleway would destroy this excellent initiative.</p> <p>I am fully in favour of encouraging walking and cycling and relying less on mechanised transport. However, this requires a programme of education to change habits.</p>	
LCWIP 56	Catherine Flury	Cowes High Street	How do you propose to segregate cyclists and pedestrians? At the moment there is no segregation in the high street and it is extremely	

			<p>dangerous. Even though it is a pedestrian zones hardly any cyclist takes any notice.</p> <p>What thought has been given to E bikes - how do you propose 'policing' Cowes High Street and differentiating between pedal and E bikes? Is the proposed cycle lane two way?</p> <p>Your proposal removes the 3 parking places outside the optician and butcher - given any thought to people who have difficulties walking and use one of those parking spaces to shop or use the optician??</p>	
LCWIP 59	R A Sheldon	Cowes High Street	<p>Cowes High Street is too narrow to host an exclusive cycle lane. Space will be needed for:</p> <p>Residents vehicles Waste collection lorries (already almost as wide as the street) Delivery vehicles of varying sizes Building work vehicles. Ambulances</p> <p>In addition, large numbers of pedestrians use the High Street (and are often in conflict with cyclists illegally using the same space) Whilst other roads may have the width to accommodate a dedicated cycle route, the High Street does not.</p> <p>The intention behind the idea may be commendable but, in this case, it's clearly impractical.</p>	
LCWIP 60	Chris Preston	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overall objectives of the proposals are excellent and will contribute to both well-being and safety of Cowes residents. 2. As a regular cyclist around the area, at least 3 times per week, I already feel that Cowes is a privileged place to cycle with good road safety 	<p>Support and comment note.</p> <p>The proposals are a 'wish list'. However, yes if the plan can be used to attract future funding any future proposals will be subject to</p>

			<p>and connectivity. I strongly believe that the emphasis and investment should be on encouraging more people, and particularly both schoolchildren and the elderly to do more <u>walking</u>, for which improved safety will help.</p> <p>3. A particular example of where the emphasis may be misguided is the Cowes High Street, where it is only a minor inconvenience to dismount, costing a few minutes in time, but where cyclists are a real inconvenience if the street is crowded.</p> <p>4. I have not seen any cost-benefit analysis, which would support scarce local funds being used for the proposals which appear to total in excess of £14 million, although I appreciate that some of the proposals are very much a "wish list". However if the plan can be used to attract supplementary central funding, which is used to improve the quality of life and well-being on the Island this may not be relevant.</p>	<p>further rigorous consultation with the local and wider community.</p>
LCWIP 62	Stephen and Dorothy Brooks	<p>Route CC7 Birmingham and Medina Roads Cowes High Street Bath Road to Queens Road Queens Road to Gurnard Green</p>	<p>The proposals to promote more walking are welcome and should be prioritised. We are surprised that the plans do not offer an integrated approach to cycling and walking. At every stage cycling seems to be given precedence over walking and the proposals do not recognise the impact on, and the needs of, walkers or other vulnerable road users. We feel there are a number of instances where improvement to benefit cycling will almost certainly discourage walking. Of particular concern is the proposed cycle route CC7. These concerns are detailed below.</p>	<p>The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).</p> <p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p>

			<p>We are concerned that the report does not estimate the impact of its proposals on cycling and walking. There is therefore no way to assess the cost/benefit of the proposals and whether they represent value for money.</p> <p>Objections to cycle route CC7 – Floating Bridge to Gurnard Green We are concerned that the proposed cycle route CC7 from the Floating Bridge to Gurnard Green, at every stage prioritises cycling over walking leading to a loss of safety, comfort and convenience of walkers. The estimated cost of £1.724m, makes it the most expensive section of the proposals and its impact on walkers makes it the least desirable.</p> <p>Birmingham and Medina Roads. – the new quiet way is unnecessary and detrimental to walking. Medina Road has pavements on each side and traffic flow, constrained by the capacity of the chain, ferry is light. There is no need to make changes to this road. It is already in shared use by cyclists and motor traffic. Further constraints on motor traffic will encourage more people to make the journey via an already congested Newport. Similarly, Birmingham Road is short and has pavements on each side. Motor traffic is light and travels slowly because the road is not on the route to anywhere for motor traffic. Opening it up for two-way shared use with cyclists will increase the risk to pedestrians, wheelchair users and parents with small children, reduce their comfort with little or no gain for cyclists.</p>	<p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p> <p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Cowes High Street – unnecessary and detrimental to walking.</p> <p>The High Street is a narrow pedestrian zone. The proposal to make parts of it a shared cycling and pedestrian zone with cyclists permitted to travel in both directions. The proposal takes no account of the inevitable loss of safety and comfort for pedestrians, wheelchair users and parents with small children. Nor does it consider the impact on the numerous local retail and hospitality businesses based on the high street.</p> <p>Currently the High Street is a pedestrian zone for most of the day and those cyclists who choose to cycle along the street generally do so slowly and cautiously aware that they are who breaking the law. If cyclists are given the right to cycle along the street, including e-scooters and e-bikes, many of which can reach speeds of 25 mph, they will inevitably ride at much higher speeds, aware that speed restriction cannot be enforced on cyclists. This will endanger both cyclists and walkers.</p> <p>It is hard to see how the report can justify its claim that it will improve the safety of cyclists. Currently they are not permitted to cycle on this street and so face no safety risks. Permitting them to do so in a contraflow arrangement shared with pedestrians will surely increase the risks that they might collide with other cyclists, pedestrians and anything else on the street.</p> <p>Bath Road to Queens Road – increases in cycling will drive walkers away.</p> <p>The current shared use pathway generally works well with cyclists and pedestrians acting considerately. However, if the scheme is</p>	<p>enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>successful in radically increasing the number of cyclists, then this delicate balance will be destroyed. A higher volume of cyclists will inevitably drive pedestrians and vulnerable users away from this popular walking route. Cyclists however could easily use Queens Road, which has a low volume of motor traffic.</p> <p>Queens Road to Gurnard Green – Hugely expensive, unnecessary and likely to discourage walking.</p> <p>This part of the proposals is estimated to cost £700,000. It is not needed because the road is not busy and traffic is generally slow.</p> <p>The provision of a segregated contraflow cycle lane is not only a massive overkill but is likely to prove counterproductive to the aim of increasing walking. Installing the cycle lane will mean the removal of 1km of seafront parking that is used predominantly by people seeking to walk along the coast, dog walkers, water sports enthusiasts, fishermen etc. Many of these people are elderly, with disabilities, small children or bulky/heavy equipment and so are not able to cycle. There are no plans to provide replacement parking places that would allow these people to continue to walk along the coast.</p>	
LCWIP 63	Nigel Spooner	Route CC7 Birmingham and Medina Roads Cowes High Street Bath Road to Queens Road	I agree with Stephen and Dorothy Brooks response. The response covers my objections.	

		Queens Road to Gurnard Green		
LCWIP 64	Martin Gibson	General and Cowes High Street	<p>Writing to support the adoption of the four LCWIPs as Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>I strongly support the proposals included in the Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard LCWIP in particular. Change is needed if we are to meet our net zero goals, and to provide a safe, healthy environment for local people. Delivering the measures in the LCWIP would be a huge win for the local area and we should use all endeavours to ensure we increase the priority given to delivering against the plan.</p> <p>Route through Cowes High Street - this approach would allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the LCWIPs have already been approved by the council, and therefore form part of the council's overall set of transport plans. As such, their adoption as SPDs makes complete sense. The Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard LCWIP has also been adopted by all three local councils.</p>	Support noted.
LCWIP 66	Chris Whiley	Route numbers: CW1 CW2 CW3 CW4 CW5 CW8 CC1 CC2	CW1 A path from Worsley road to Baring Road can be established across the Jordan Valley flood plain. This direct link would better connect the village to schools etc. This link could direct pedestrians down Crossfield Avenue which is a safer route to town than Park Road. I support the zebra crossing on Baring Road.	The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).

	<p>CC3 CC4 CC5 CC7</p>		<p>A raised table crossing across Church road is unnecessary as the route to Gurnard Pines would be by the new path proposed.</p> <p>A raised table crossing at Solent View Road is a waste of money as the junction is well served by paths and the traffic is low</p> <p>I support tighter corner at the Woodvale Road Baring Road junction.</p> <p>CW2</p> <p>I object to the proposal to tighten the corner radii on the junction of Crossfield Avenue and Baring Road. The council has created an issue at this junction by stopping school drop off traffic outside Gurnard Primary school which has moved the traffic and parked cars from around one school to around this junction which serves two schools, also compromising the bike lane on Baring Road. The wide corner gives space and visibility for the safety of children, walkers and cars. Cars at school pick up time are forced to park in Crossfield Avenue/Baring Road so tightening the junction would give less space to avoid a collision with another vehicle. School buses use this route. What is needed is better thought to remove cars from this area at school times by opening a circular school drop off zone inside the school site. Baring Road and Crossfield Avenue are quiet for pedestrians and cars outside of the twice daily 30 minute school runs so the wrong issue is being addressed here.</p> <p>The tightening of the junction at the other end of Crossfield Avenue would be dangerous as currently pedestrians have no issues in crossing</p>	<p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p> <p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that</p>
--	------------------------------------	--	--	---

			<p>here due to being able to cross a single lane to a central waiting area. This then places more people in line with traffic. A raised table in a 20 mile hour limit also seem excessive.</p> <p>Continuous footways seem like a vanity project and have been ticked from a list– example, across Guppy close where there are 8 houses. There would be an awful lot of wasted money on this route when footways are clear, wide and quiet.</p> <p>CW3 Continuous footways across the inner Park Road Closes are unnecessary as the footpath to town ceases on that side of the path just afterwards. Pathway across the football club has no dropped kerb currently making wheelchair use impossible. The route has been designed to service a school that is closing.</p> <p>CW4 I think more can be made of this route with better connectivity across the parks to take walkers away from Park Road.</p> <p>CW5 Zebra crossings should be replaced with traffic lights to control three way traffic. Zebra crossings would be chaotic during school drop off times and endanger children.</p> <p>CW8 I fully support. Consideration should also be made to taking the path along the river north to link to Woodvale road in Gurnard and to have a</p>	<p>would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>path from Baring Road near Crossfield Avenue to Gurnard Village.</p> <p>CC1 I fully support.</p> <p>CC2 I object to segregated roadside for bikes for very short periods. This is pointless and a waste of funds. Taking the speed limit to 30 removes any issue.</p> <p>CC4 The segregated roadside down Newport road is not necessary when bikers won't use this road and use the Newport Cowes Cycleway from Shamblers Copse. To access Northwood from Crossfield Ave to Northwood cycling down Place Road and Nodes Road is flatter. This is not a viable route.</p> <p>CC5 I support the use of these roads to avoid Place Road.</p> <p>CC7 Cowes High Street would be dangerous as a shared use bike and pedestrian area. The pedestrian area is not wide enough to safely allow this. Cafes operate with tables outside on steep inclines and cyclists could create a real hazard to public safety. Cowes frequently has events that sees this area crowded and every time the boat offloads walkers are everywhere.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>I have been a cyclist commuter in this area and would quite happily get off my bike and walk. I witness so many cyclists rushing for the boat and illegally cycling in this area causing hazards. The town centre shop operators and the public has a campaign to stop cycling in the high street so it seems like the authors ignored the public views. Bikes travelling along the High Street from the Floating Bridge toward the red jet also burst into incoming traffic.</p> <p>The segregated pathway along the route to Gurnard is a waste of money. Yes it is scenic but a shared road use would suit.</p>	
LCWIP 68	Barbara Milton	Cowes High Street	<p>I am in support of improving and extending cycle routes on the Island but have a very strong objection to the proposals for Cowes High Street. The High Street is far too crowded with pedestrians, including children and elderly who may not be entirely 'cycle aware' or lack mobility to move quickly.</p> <p>It's one thing for pedestrians and cyclists to share a path like the cycle tracks but to allow bikes down a long standing narrow pedestrian road lined with shops is dangerous.</p> <p>I feel the current arrangement to allow vehicles between 7 and 10 is a good compromise.</p>	
LCWIP 69	Jules Mantle	Cowes High Street	<p>I wish to register my concern about the proposal to put a cycle route through Cowes High Street. Whilst I am broadly in support of more cycling and walking routes, the proposal to have cycling through the High Street is not feasible.</p> <p>My reasons for concern are:-</p> <p>Cyclists will not obey speed limits – many cyclists will be doing timed rides (using Strava and other</p>	

			<p>apps) which will mean they ignore all speed limits whilst trying to achieve personal best times or beat their friends.</p> <p>Older people, children and dogs will be involved in accidents due to cyclists ignoring speed limits and neither party paying attention.</p> <p>I suggest:-</p> <p>Routing the cycle route down Consort Road, left into Beckford Road, right into Gordon Road, across into Denmark Road, left up Granville Road Bridge, right on to Granville Road, over to Union Road, left into Church Road, left into Castle Road, right down Castle Hill and left into Queens Road.</p> <p>If we want cyclists who are not racing the clock to increase their dwell time in the High Street and benefit local shops and food outlets, then more bike racks around town might help.</p>	
LCWIP 70	Susan Salmon	Cowes High Street	<p>I wish to make known my reasons for opposing the idea of a cycle path through Cowes High Street.</p> <p>It is an ill conceived idea with no thought for the Residents of Cowes or the vast number of tourist who visit us each year.</p> <p>It is my opinion that it would be dangerous as the High Street is a busy social setting and being pedestrianised allows a freedom seldom enjoyed in commercial areas.</p> <p>I believe that allowing cycling thru the High Street would have a detrimental effect on the traders as fewer people would 'saunter' and 'browse' and 'meet up' to sit and watch the world pass from a coffee shop</p>	
LCWIP 72	Peter and Avril Digby	Cowes High Street	<p>1. Although there is a path along the seafront in Cowes for use by pedestrians and cyclists which,</p>	

			<p>apart from some isolated incidents, seems to work, a similar arrangement through Cowes High Street couldn't possibly work because the width of the space available, currently supposed to be pedestrianised with exceptions for delivery vehicles, is way too narrow! Definitely not the place to introduce a cycle path. The sea front path is much wider and has less footfall.</p> <p>2. The central part of the High Street is already crowded with pedestrians out shopping, pushing babies and toddlers in prams and pushchairs, walking dogs, chatting and so on. In addition, there are elderly/infirm people who cannot move quickly enough to get out of the way of errant cyclists.</p> <p>3. The introduction of a cycle path, exclusively devoted to cyclists or shared with pedestrians, would lead to intolerable congestion/inevitable accidents and spoil the enjoyment for the general public.</p> <p>Leave what is a great High Street alone and let cyclists walk through it, pushing their bikes, or use the road round Cowes. The time they would save by having a cycle path is negligible.</p>	
LCWIP 73	Sue Day	Cowes High Street	<p>Disagree with bike riding through Cowes town shopping streets. It will be dangerous for locals & visitors & detrimental to national & independent shops.</p> <p>I can visualise older people, people with limited vision & limited hearing together with young</p>	

			<p>children who wouldn't understand the system being dangerously compromised.</p> <p>This plan would also allow the very heavy electric rental bikes to be driven through the pedestrian area.</p> <p>The current signage allows vehicles along the pedestrian areas but only after 6pm & during night time, I would guess because moving vehicles are a danger to people walking & using the shops.</p> <p>Money should be spent to provide secure parking for bikes to enable shop visiting by locals & visitors. I really hope this scheme is cancelled.</p>	
LCWIP 74	Bob Sharples on behalf of Sport England	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SPD does not address the needs of disabled cyclists; 2. Nor does it address the charging for electric bicycles. <p>Two other issues which have come to the fore, since we responded to the Newport and Ryde LCWIP are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The need for more secure cycle parking – which should be covered CCTV. If the cycle parking is covered PVs can be put on the roof as part of a sustainable energy programme; and b) Bike rental hubs. 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, consultees and parish and town councils and include a design brief to establish if the project was feasible and inclusive.</p>
LCWIP 78	John Rosenthal	Route number: CC7 CW1	<p>Ref CC7</p> <p>Birmingham Road, Cowes should remain one way.</p> <p>Shooters Hill and the adjoining High Street should</p>	<p>The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current</p>

		<p>CW2 CW3 CW4 CW5 CW6 CW7 CW8 CW9 CW10 CC1 CC2 CC3 CC4 CC5 CC6 CC7 CC8 CC9</p>	<p>remain for pedestrian use only after 10-00am each day, The next bit of the High Street from Fountain Yard to the junction with Market Hill should also remain the same for pedestrians only, then from the Market Hill Junction onto and including Bath Road should remain One Way traffic for all towards the Parade. Also needs a sign at the Egypt point end of the shared path along Princes Esplanade.</p> <p>CW1 There is no need for raised table or tighter Radii re junctions of Baring Road and Crossfield Ave and the same for the Junction with Woodvale Road. Re-alignment of the steps opposite the end of Woodvale Road, could possibly do with a small area to stand on at the top to view the traffic before crossing the road. As for widening the footway in Woodvale Road this will possibly cut down the overall carriageway width,</p> <p>CW2 Do not need a raised table or tighter corner, have already covered this in CW1 No need to remove the traffic Island at the junction of Ward Ave and Crossfield Ave and why lighting etc. and widening of the path through the Park?</p> <p>CW3 The Roundabout at the junction of Park Road, Place Road and Tuttons Hill is fine, major problem is motorist that are unsure how to use it.</p>	<p>pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).</p> <p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p> <p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Re the access to Northwood Recreation Ground, visibility is restricted due to parked vehicles in Park Road more than anything else.</p> <p>No need to widen footways etc in Park Road or the tightening of Radii at various junctions.</p> <p>CW4 There is already a footway build in Victoria Road near the junction with St Marys Road, St Marys Road is narrow enough as it is without trying to widen the footway.</p> <p>CW5 The junction of Mill Hill Road and Newport Road is tight enough as it is, any commercial vehicle quite often has to wait for a gap in the southbound traffic in Mill Hill Road to negotiate this bend as it is.</p> <p>More should be done ref those that park on the Pavement when there is a lage parking area already supplied to the side and rear of the premises.</p> <p>No need for any widening of Footways or tightening of Radii at junctions.</p> <p>CW6 Zebra crossing in Newport Road would be handy just North of the junction with Smithards Lane.</p> <p>CW7 Presume the gated access would have to be maintained as there used to be access to the rear of the undertakers so is it really necessary to make a Footway across this.</p> <p>CW8 Hilton Road is still a road as such so not really viable to construct a footway across it, would involve dropped kerbs etc.</p>	<p>prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Visibility when exiting from the Gurnard Pines onto Cockleton Lane could do with improvement but feel this would involve the purchase of some land from the house on the corner.</p> <p>CW9 Zebra Crossing in Wyatts lane quite a good idea but why a raised table? Re Oxford Street, No need to widen the footway, quite adequate as it is, if needed there is available land in front of the bungalows on the South side</p> <p>CW10 No need to go to the expense of reducing the short bit of 40MPH limit from Nodes Road to Place Road junction with Three Gates Road, normally the traffic does that on its own. No need for tightening of Radii at the road junctions, in fact all this will do is increase damage to kerbs etc from commercial vehicle unable to negotiate the bends.</p> <p>CC1 Is the route that heavily used that it warrants the expense of two Tucan crossings, also the drawing shows the route going through the industrial area behind Northwood Garage?</p> <p>CC2 Re segregated roadside use in Nodes Road and Place Road, there is not enough width in the carriageway.</p> <p>CC3 Appreciate this is in the future but how can you prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over road traffic on one of the main roads into Cowes.</p> <p>CC4 Again concern over the width of the carriageway of Newport Road, the average width of a Bus or</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>HGV can be 2.9m which doesn't leave room for a segregated cycle lane.</p> <p>CC5 Rather than sending the cyclists through the gated access along Place Road which you are also wanting to place a footway across and then across the football pitches to get to the road by the Cricket Club why not either continue to the Roundhouse junction with Park Road or use Broadfields Avenue as an alternative route.</p> <p>CC6 No real problems.</p> <p>CC7 As this was the main objection it was the first issue covered.</p> <p>CC8 Baring Road shared used is OK but could be a bit tight towards the Roundhouse due to the width of the carriageway.</p> <p>CC9 All OK</p>	
LCWIP 81	Tobias Vogel	General	Seeing the LCWIP SPDs (especially for our neighbourhood, but also in general) is fantastic. I'm convinced this will be money well spent.	Support Noted
LCWIP 82	Val Lawson	Cowes High Street	<p>I am concerned about the safety of cycling (especially electric bikes) in Cowes High Street.</p> <p>Proposed cycle route: East to West Route Medina Avenue - Mill Hill Rd-West Hill-Beckford Rd-Gordon Rd-Denmark Rd-Granville Rd-Union Rd-Market Hill-Bath Rd. West to East</p>	The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).

			<p>Castle Rd-Union Rd (very short cycle contra flow needed) Granville Rd-Beckford Rd-Birmingham Rd-Medina Ave</p> <p>This route only needs signing and a very short section of cycle contra flow in Union Rd. It keeps cyclists out of the High St (but they can still access it at several points) and does not need a contra flow in Birmingham Rd. It enables cyclists to cross Cowes from the chain ferry and from the Cowes-Newport cycle route from Artic Rd.</p>	<p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p>
LCWIP 84	Henry Barton	Cowes High Street	<p>Proposal will destroy the unique, accessible, safe pedestrian environment of Cowes High Street. An imposed cycle lane will deny tables and chairs space outside cafes and other businesses that are enjoyed by customers at present.</p> <p>It is ridiculous not to expect cyclists to dismount and walk, as directed at present, through the High Street.</p> <p>Touring cyclists travelling en mass on a dedicated cycle lane through Cowes High Street will be an accident waiting to happen and a cycle lane will not increase foot fall to local businesses, quite possibly having the opposite effect.</p>	<p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p> <p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p>
LCWIP 85	Hugo Camacho	Cowes High Street	<p>My email is to oppose the cycle lane. I will destroy the sea front & Cowes high street. More accidents more traffic. The construction affected everything & everyone.</p> <p>If you change Cowes high street business won't survive some are hardly surviving.</p> <p>Please don't build that cycle lane.</p>	<p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p>

LCWIP 86	Jeremy Seale	Cowes High Street	<p>The proposed cycle track running through Cowes High St and surrounding roads is not workable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Most roads, especially High Street and Bath Road and Birmingham Road are not wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians. *Goes against most local businesses interests as many have licences to use pavements, further narrowing the gap. * Vastly increased chance of injury to pedestrians, *As a Cowes resident I fail to see the point or benefit of this proposal in a built up area. *Will potentially harm already struggling businesses as the scheme gains a negative impact on Central Cowes. *Additional cycle route signage on posts and at ground level will simply add to and further confuse the already crowded street scene with potentially ugly extra signage. *I cycle, but my experience is many cyclists ignore signage and cycle tracks anyway, * This proposal is potentially dangerous and detrimental in towns and fundamentally unworkable. *There are many more worthy areas of improvement where public finance should be spent. 	<p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
LCWIP 87	Celia Kappes	Cowes High Street	<p>I have looked at the LCWIP which suggests a route for cyclists, in both directions, through Cowes town centre.</p> <p>The High Street is very narrow in places - far too narrow to accommodate pedestrians, prams and mobility scooters as well as bicycles. Tourists</p>	

			<p>tend to walk in groups so can take up most of the road. People go in and out of shops and it can be hazardous if they suddenly emerge.</p> <p>I cannot see why anybody would think that a shared street could be a feasible option. It could be a disaster for the town and have a deleterious effect on businesses. People are not going to come to Cowes for an afternoon stroll round the shops if they have to be constantly on the look out for bikes in what for years has been a pedestrian area.</p> <p>In Cowes we find some cyclists are considerate some still dismount and wheel their cycles, but others can be abusive, riding too fast and shouting at pedestrians.</p>	
LCWIP 88	Sam Sturdy	Cowes High Street	<p>I wish to object to the lifting and the encouragement of cyclists using the pedestrian area of Cowes High Street.</p> <p>Many old people, disabled people and parents pushing prams use this thin roadway as well as the main thoroughfare for young people walking to School. Encouraging cyclists to use this as well is highly dangerous and should not be encouraged. They should use an actual road alternative or get off and push the bike along until clear of the pedestrian area. An extra 2 min. diversion using a road instead of a pedestrian area isn't much to ask and I think you should prioritise pedestrians instead of a Bike first policy.</p>	
LCWIP 89	Nichola Roe & Terence Young	Cowes High Street	<p>Express concern regarding the proposed cycle track running down the pedestrianised sections of Cowes High Street.</p>	

			<p>The idea of a fixed track through the High Street which is very often highly populated with older people, dog walkers with extended leads, young children and parents or careers with push chairs, not to mention mobility scooters, by designating an area for cyclists, unless we've mistaken the proposal, it would appear that they'd have right of way which we think would be seriously dangerous and vastly reduce the useable pavement/walking area for town users.</p>	
LCWIP 90	Andrea Pleant	Cowes High Street	<p>Strongly object to the proposal to allow cyclists free access to Cowes High Street. Why do the cyclists, the majority of which seem to want to get through Cowes as quickly as possible, need to access the pedestrianised High Street, would be far better for them to bypass it, if they cannot dismount their bikes and walk through the High Street.</p>	
LCWIP 91	Joy Leader	Cowes High Street	<p>I am emailing with strong objection and disbelief that the council are planning to put a cycle lane through Cowes High Street.</p> <p>This can only have a detrimental effect on tourism which is already struggling and has there been no consideration to shoppers, visitors, locals who just (often with small children) enjoy a relaxing amble down this gorgeous quaint street.</p>	
LCWIP 92	Stephen Tewkesbury	Cowes High Street	<p>Object, regarding safety of pedestrians in the Cowes' High Street if the proposed cycle path is implemented.</p> <p>Key issues and concerns:</p>	

			<p>Westward cycle traffic would contravene the one way limited hours Eastward service vehicle travel in what is a single lane width paved road.</p> <p>The Shooters Hill end of the high street is a steep decline with curves preventing clear sight lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any bicycle would need to apply brakes for the duration of travel to control speed. ○ Curve sight line loss could cause accidents with the street frequented by shoppers, mum`s with prams, unaccompanied children, the elderly and regular accessible scooter users. <p>Toward the other end of the High Street the narrow pavement forces pedestrians onto the short vehicle use area.</p> <p>The section of gazetted vehicle 24hr use area is a one way travel for vehicles toward the M&S exit from Cowes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bicycles in a westward direction would be opposite the single lane vehicular direction of travel. <p>The Redjet Ferry Terminal junction is regularly jammed with queuing pick up cars, taxis and many people on foot with luggage and other items. Throughout the summer season this can be twice hourly situation.</p> <p>Having bicycles travelling in the opposite direction of single lane approved service vehicles and private vehicles nearer the ferry terminal is a recipe for disaster</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>There are various loading zones that would directly block cyclist throughway on occasion.</p> <p>There are simply legal no entry limits already in place and established traffic directions opposite to proposed cycling direction.</p> <p>I would suggest in the interests of 'connecting' logical cycle paths to the east and west of the high street that DISMOUNTED bicycles may be a permitted consideration.</p>	
LCWIP 93	Susan Gibson	General	Specifically would like to support the adoption of the Cowes LCWIP. I particularly welcome routes which link the seafront and the floating bridge directly.	Support Noted
LCWIP 95	Mary Phillips	Cowes High Street	<p>Objection to the proposals for a cycle Lane running through Cowes High Street and Shooters Hill.</p> <p>I do not believe these roads/pedestrianised areas are wide enough to be shared safely with cyclists. Cyclists riding through would destroy the pleasant relaxed atmosphere and discourage pedestrians/shoppers to the many local shops here.</p>	<p>The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues).</p> <p>The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.</p> <p>However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and further consultation and community engagement activity</p>
LCWIP 98	Jackie Laird	Cowes High Street	<p>Object for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paved area through Cowes is a very busy pedestrian area. Particularly during the summer months. 2. There are many cyclists who arrive to the island to cycle in groups of more than 4. With the location of Cowes and proximity to the floating bridge. They are often heading to the car ferry. 	

			<p>The pedestrian areas are simply not big enough for the volume of bikes v pedestrian. It's an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>3. I have experienced aggression on many occasions from cyclists towards me. Cycle lanes and pedestrian lanes get confused they don't work.</p> <p>4. The speed/weight of battery operated scooters and bikes. They are not properly regulated/insured or licensed.</p> <p>5. Kids learning to cycle without any road skills will be allowed to cycle through town. Their awareness of the dangers to pedestrians is far below that of an adult.</p> <p>6. Delivery vans need proper safe access to the many businesses in Cowes. How will pedestrians/bikes navigate that? Mornings particularly, when commuters are heading through town, or to the red-jet, cyclists are heading to work and the bin lorry is collecting. Then the red-jet arrives with the chaos that causes.</p> <p>If it's absolutely necessary to have a cycle lane connecting the floating bridge to Gurnard and the rest of the Cowes roads why can't that on the existing road network. Baring Road/Ward Ave/Victoria Road/Mill Hill and down to the Floating Bridge from there. This route would also improve safety outside two big schools (Gurnard Primary and Cowes Enterprise) and assist kids on a safe route home from school.</p>	<p>and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p> <p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
LCWIP 103	R Fippard	Cowes High Street	Aware that a shared pedestrian-cycle zone is being considered through Cowes pedestrianised	

			<p>high street. I wish to object to the proposed route.</p> <p>This would amount to hardly much of a difference on a bike and unlikely to end up with collisions with the elderly, hard of hearing, pushchairs, mobility scooters or families/tourists out shopping. And what about all the outdoor seating areas belonging to the cafes along the high street?</p> <p>There are more sensible routes nearby.</p> <p>I understand the applicant hosted a community engagement workshop and apparently engaged with the public via press releases, social media, posters, fliers, emails circulars, school newsletters, adverts on local buses, but I have to say I haven't been aware of / heard about or seen any of these. Nor have any of my neighbours or friends or the business owners on the high street that I have spoken to.</p>	
LCWIP 104	Mark McNeill	Cowes High Street	<p>Object very strongly at your proposals to turn the Cowes High Street, which is a PEDESTRIAN AREA, into a shared cycle and pedestrian street.</p> <p>The High Street is not sufficiently wide to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclist safely, along with the many venues that now have outside seating and shop displays, which all add to making the street a nice place to be.</p> <p>The Council needs to seriously rethink this plan and come up with an alternative route for cyclist who want to cycle through Cowes as an alternative to getting off their bikes and walk through pedestrian area and enjoying the town centre along with everyone else. Better signed for the pedestrian area would be a good idea.</p>	

LCWIP 105	Tony Butt	Cowes High Street	<p>Proposed introduction of a Cycle Lane/Lanes through Cowes High Street from Birmingham Road to the Esplanade.</p> <p>1. Location of the Lane/Lanes along Birmingham Road. At present it is one way with Parking on the Shop Side. Where will the Lane be, if close to the parking bays then it will be dangerous for cars/lorries pulling out even extremely slowly to avoid a collision. If the other side of the road against the pavement this reduces the width of the driving area with the risk of larger vehicles entering the cycle lane itself.</p> <p>2. Is there actually room for a Lane or Lanes on Shooters Hill through to the High Street as this is a Pedestrian Area with a number of areas for sitting outside various establishments. If street furniture is banned to accommodate the cyclists then local shops will lose custom and maybe even their business, thus having a detrimental effect of footfall in the town.</p> <p>3. The area between the two pedestrian precincts from outside Costa Coffee to the Pontoon is extremely narrow and there is actually nowhere for a cycle lane to be installed and would also be against the traffic coming down to the Pontoon and exiting from the Pontoon by the Fountain Hotel.</p> <p>4. Similarly the precinct from the Pontoon to Bath Road is also narrow and again against the traffic permitted at certain times.</p> <p>5. Bath Road itself is even narrower and also one way, again it is difficult to see where a Lane or Lanes could be installed safely.</p>	
-----------	-----------	-------------------	---	--

LCWIP 106	Diana Deacon	Cowes High Street	Object to the proposal to make Cowes High Street into a shared cycle and pedestrian street. I am very keen to promote safe cycling areas on the Island, but Cowes High Street is certainly not one of them and in my view this is an area where cyclists can and should dismount. During the summer months the High Street is particularly crowded and this is simply not a safe environment to have cyclists.	
LCWIP 107	G Hall	General & Cowes High Street	It will be an excellent addition to getting from say The Floating Bridge area to the Seafront. It has been a long term frustration to me that all cyclists including tourists are diverted / signposted around our town. The diversion is up many hills and alleviates businesses any chance of extra trade for one thing?	Support noted.
LCWIP 108	Laura Scott & Belinda Wright	Cowes High Street	Proposed cycling routes through Cowes High Street. Why are cyclists so important in a retail area, surely it's the shoppers and restaurant customers who need prioritising. The delight of Beckford Rd (on the North side) is that visiting youngsters are safe to walk along to the High Street without crossing the road or being shouted at by cyclists. Sometimes the cyclists are on the Island in large numbers in the summer - how will you control them then?	The LCWIP itself does suggest a route using the High Street, but through converting the current pedestrian zone to a pedestrian and cycle zone, not implementing a dedicated lane (which would most likely lead to more conflict issues). The approach could allow improved access to local shops, the red just terminal and the sea front.
LCWIP 113	Michael Rainey	Route numbers: Walking - CW1 Footpath CS4 Cycling -	In general, this appears to be largely a highway related draft and does not show links to the off-road walking network, which is disappointing as it misses some obvious opportunities.	However, any such route would only be delivered based on detailed feasibility studies and

		<p>CC7. Princes and Egypt Esplanades CC8.</p>	<p>Walking CW1: I am opposed to increasing the width of footways on Worsley Road and Woodvale Road. This is wholly unnecessary for walking, detrimental to the environment, tarmacking over green borders while Southern Water is trying to increase them as rain gardens to control run off and pollution. This will increase run off amounting to 100s of m2 of paving which would require planning permission and sustainable drainage. Apart from which it is £225k of completely unnecessary expenditure. Footpath CS4: between the Esplanade and Battery Road needs improvement to better deal with winter weather and make it an all year round route. A link between Worsley Lane and Woodvale Road across the fields would improve off road walking between the village and Gurnard PS as well as a further pedestrian link for general use off-road. A link between the bottom of Palance Road (Whitford Bridge) and Gurnard Pines along the east side of Gurnard Luck would complete the circuit from Sticelett and remove the need to walk along the narrow on-road Rew Street. Both the above proposals could be incorporated in any planning applications that come forward for the land or adjoining land.</p> <p>Cycling CC7. Princes and Egypt Esplanades: I note these are down for Segregated Roadside. The definitions refer to Segregated Cycle Track. I am not certain what either mean in the context of the Esplanades. I would be opposed to any of the</p>	<p>further consultation and community engagement activity and that the alignment shown in the LCWIP may not be the final alignment delivered.</p> <p>No route alignment is fixed by the LCWIP at the moment.</p> <p>Those concerns raised should, of course, be considered in engagement over any such route as and when resources are identified to deliver it and at that point detailed reasoning and evidence base on the feasibility of such routes will be carefully measured.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed prior to adopting the LCWIP as an SPD.</p> <p>In addition, projects may require the implementation of traffic regulation orders, a process that would require further consultation with the local community. Also further discussion would be required with the Police about the enforcement of any traffic regulation orders.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>pavement be used for cycling (other than supervised children under 10) as this is a popular walking and running route for many, both individually and in groups. Narrowing the width of the pavement in some way would be detrimental to the much wider waking use. Segregation in the road would reduce the availability of parking which would be detrimental to the enjoyment by residents and tourists. CC8: This needs to be coordinated with the highway proposals currently about to start by Southern Water who are carrying out works to change the carriageway, including footway crossings, in various places on Worsley Road, Woodvale Road, Solent View Road and others.</p> <p>Comment on the cycling proposals for Gurnard along the Esplanade and Baring Road in particular. They are ideal routes to practice riding in traffic, with parked cars and junctions to contend with. They have light traffic, are generally flat but have test climbs on Egypt Hill and Tuttons Hill.</p> <p>Children have to learn to ride and drive in the real world and these are good routes for doing so. I am opposed to the segregation proposed. It is unnecessary, detrimental to good road craft experience, expensive and in many cases will needlessly restrict parking which has wider value to the community and the Island tourist industry.</p> <p>I have strong doubts that this should be put into an SPG in its present form. It needs prioritizing into those aspects that really do get over some</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			road safety issues and those that are simply pipe dreams from a single perspective.	
--	--	--	---	--

Representation on the draft East Cowes and Whippingham LCWIP SPD				
Number of representations	5			
Ref number	Name of respondent	Paragraph or section	Issue Raised	Council Response
LCWIP 31	Estates BN Barry Nicholls	General	Brooks Copse Road should be a quiet Road with restrictions on HGV not going past Brock Copse bridge towards Whippingham. Also as no footpath on Alverstone road a 5m strip for footpath use on the west side to Whippingham should be taken to which would ease cycle use on the road and allow safe passage to the village. I understand the coastal path legislation could use powers to acquire this land and “kill two birds with one stone” hence providing a safe foot way for walkers to the village.	Comment noted. There are a number of recommendations in the report recommending key routes to become Quiet Road. These include Priority 8 and Priority 15.
LCWIP 45	Dawn Haig-Thomas	Priority 4 Priority 8 Priority 15	We are a family of cyclists, including three teenage cyclists and the key route of concern for us is travelling south to Wootton via Alverstone Road where there is the national speed limit and then into Brocks Copse Road where the sun at sunrise (travelling east) and sunset (travelling west) is blinding and very dangerous at national speed limit. We recommend these roads become Quiet Roads and were delighted to see this reflected in Priorities 8 and 15. 1. We support Priority 4: Whippingham to Newport - Connect the existing shared use paths in Beatrice Avenue and Saunders Way with a cycle route to	Support for these priorities noted.

			<p>Newport via one of three optional routes (A) to (C) because a safe cycle route to Newport along the Medina is lacking.</p> <p>2. We support Priority 8: Within Whippingham - Designate rural lanes as quiet lanes. Alverstone Road into Brocks Copse Road is currently a dangerous rat-run, not suitable for cyclists. Speed must be brought down through making it a Quiet Lane.</p> <p>3. We support Priority 15: Lower Alverstone Road and East Cowes Road - Designate lower Alverstone Road and East Cowes Road as quiet lanes. Again this road is dangerous for cyclists as used as a high speed rat-run.</p>	
LCWIP 47	Julie Gilmour	General	<p>We would like to see Brocks Copse Road be a quiet Road with restrictions on HGV not going past or from Brock Copse bridge towards Whippingham Also as there is no footpath on Alverston Road further up a 5m strip for footpath use on fields to the south/west side leading to Whippingham should be taken which would ease cycle use on the road Thus allow safe passage to the village which has no foot path this side of the village I understand the coastal path legislation could use powers to acquire this land and “kill two birds with one stone” hence providing a better foot way for walkers to the village and existing coast path.</p>	<p>Comment noted. There are a number of recommendations in the report recommending key routes to become Quiet Road. These include Priority 8 and Priority 15.</p>
LCWIP 65	Paul Sillett	<p>Priority 4 Priority 8 Priority 15</p>	<p>Particularly keen to see the following improvements implemented:</p> <p>a. Priority 4. Whippingham To Newport to provide a safe and continuous cycling route from Newport along the Medina.</p> <p>b. Priority8. Within Whippingham designate Alverstone Road and Brocks Copse Road as Quiet Lanes.</p> <p>This improvement has already been recommended by members of the IOW Council team.</p>	<p>Support for these priorities noted.</p>

			c. Priority 15. Designate both Lower Alverstone Road and East Cowes Road as Quiet Lanes.	
LCWIP 75	Bob Sharples on behalf of Sport England	General	<p>We were pleased to read that there was an acknowledgment of equestrian use at the start of the document, and of disabled cyclists and users of electric bikes and scooters.</p> <p>Perhaps the document could have gone further for the disabled cyclists by suggesting there is suitable cycle parking for tricycles or quad cycles? These should also have accessible toilets adjacent to them.</p> <p>The promotion of cycle hire for disabled users should also be considered, along with cycle hire hubs.</p> <p>It would have also been good to have addressed the need for charging points for electric bikes and scooters. Along with more secure bike parking, which would be covered by CCTV.</p> <p>Something else to consider, if the cycle parking is covered PVs can be put on the roof as part of a sustainable energy programme.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The LCWIPs include a speculative list of projects. There is no guarantee that any of these projects would be delivered. Projects could come forward if funding was found or through Section 106 contributions. Although, even if the money was made available, any proposal would have to go through a further public consultation process with the local community, consultees and parish and town councils and include a design brief to establish if the project was feasible and inclusive.</p>