

Annex 1: Suggestions and comments received through the Cycling Plan consultation

The responses – received through the online survey, emails and verbally at the exhibitions - have been divided into four categories:

Responses about the potential infrastructure shown on the consultation map	90 individual comments	Page 2 of this annex
Responses about existing infrastructure	58 individual comments	Page 8 of this annex
Suggestions for infrastructure not shown on the consultation map	71 individual comments	Page 12 of this annex
Comments about other aspects of the Cycling Plan, comments on strategy and priority and general comments	33 individual comments	Page 18 of this annex

Responses through the online survey were anonymous, so the exact number of people responding is not known, but in emails and at the exhibitions individuals often made more than one comment.

The potential infrastructure mapped for the consultation was itself based on prior discussion at the Transportation Task Group and stakeholder workshops.

An approximate area has been allocated to the comments received, although comments on routes often encompass several areas. As can be seen from the list below, there are a high number of comments for Guildford town centre but the western part of the Borough is perhaps under-represented:

Location	Number of comments
Guildford Town Centre	57
Shalford	20
Stoughton	16
Horsley	13
Stoke	13
Merrow	8
Parkway	8
Woodbridge Meadows	8
Burpham	7
Rydes Hill	6
University	6
Ockham	5
Peasmarsh	4
Slyfield	4
Clandon	3
Compton	3
Fairlands	3
Guildford Park	3
Jacobs Well	3
Manor Farm	3

ITEM 10

Artington	2
Bellfields	2
Burntcommon	2
Christmas Pie	2
Guildford Business Park	2
Park Barn	2
Puttenham	2
Woodbridge Hill	2
Effingham Junction	1
Gomshall	1
Normandy	1
Onslow Vilage	1
Ripley	1
Shalford	1
The Mount	1
Tongham	1
Whitmoor Common	1
Worplesdon	1

Responses about the potential infrastructure shown on the consultation map

Reference number used on consultation map, prefixed 'PR-Gui'

Map ref	Comment	Location
32	PRgui32 - Larch Avenue/Weyside Road. I understand that this is a Proposed Preferred Cycle route which means no modification will be made to the existing road layout. I cycle this road frequently and it is a poor road to cycle down. The 'cushion' force cyclists into the gutter which means vehicles feel they can over take. There is a sharp bend (opposite the secondary school) so when vehicles overtake in a poor manner (this frequently happens) the cyclist runs out of road). The 'pinch points' create dander for cyclists as cars then try to 'beat the cyclist' - maybe hatched road markings would be a visual aid to drivers that there is not enough room. The road is of poor quality for cyclists. There is no 'drop off' point for students attending the senior school so there is a lot of congestion at the start and finish of the school day. This is extremely dangerous for cyclists as visibility for road users is poor due to cars parked in the road/on the pavement. I see many cyclists riding on the pavement in Larch Avenue and I can see this happening more in the future. With regard to Weyside Road. This road is narrow and vehicles (including lorries) often show no consideration for cyclists. Often pedestrians walk in the road creating hazards (pavements are too narrow. I find this road dangerous to cycle down . Maybe if changes were made to parking in this road it would be better as more of the road would be available to road users and thus causing less conflict between cyclists and vehicles.	Bellfields
84	PRGui84 from A3 Burpham turn off down London Road to roundabout: who in their right mind would be cycling down the A3 southbound (unless a cycle path could be provided on this side of the A3, or a bridge linking to the existing path on the N side of the A3)?	Burpham
190	PRGui-190: Route on south side of A3 between Spectrum and Burpham School: Good idea.	Burpham
51 and 48	PR GU 51 and 48 very useful for linking into existing route from Burpham up Clay Lane (though that route needs attention.	Burpham
190	Low lying land new cycle path should be 3m min width tarmac built up above flood level. Steep hill?	Burpham
192	Remove gates and tarmac at 3m min width	Burpham
226	The proposal for Gui226 makes sense but is very short and disconnected? People need to be able to cycle to Binscombe as the closest amenities (school, doctors, shops) are here, but currently cyclists must use the main road part of which is via the 'Avenue' which is disintegrating and has a problem with water	Compton

	run off from Marks Tey.	
66	PR-Gui66 - I regularly use this route which is a good accessible journey to Effingham Junction. It would benefit from better signage to let drivers know that cyclists use the road, but it is fairly quiet.	Effingham Junction
34/41	PR-Gui34/PR-Gui41 - by proposing that PR-Gui34 should exit onto Envis Way this could cause accidents as this is very near Worplesdon Primary School. As Envis Way is crowded with very young children at the start and end of the school day. In addition Envis Way, Louis Fields and Sandpit Heath are filled with parked cars at these times, the parking problems will only increase owing to the increase in pupil numbers that will occur in September 2016.	Fairlands
34, 51, 74, 201	With regard to the cycling plan, safe, well maintained and lit cycle routes would be welcome as this would encourage more people to cycle and avoid conflict with motor cycles. We are concerned with some of the proposed routes namely PRGui34, 51,74 and 201. These cross green spaces (common land) which are unlit and in bad weather, are often impassable. In addition PRGui73 route would need to be off the Aldershot Road and be a combined pedestrian/cycle route, is there sufficient space on the verges of the Aldershot Road?	Fairlands
227	PR-Gui227 - For users heading from the station (or town) to the hospital or surrey research park, the routes as shown involve a significant diversion towards the university. Ideally this route (or another would pass under the A3 (where there's significant width) and join up with EX-Gui1	Guildford Park
233	Pr Gui 233 A useful route from the town centre to the hospital. I use it often as it is now. I'm not sure what changes are needed other than on the Westerly section.	Guildford Park
225	PR – GUI225 – could be cycle path not an advisory route	Guildford Park
204	PRGui-204: East Clandon to West Horsley: I presume this proposal is to convert the existing pavement beside A246 to a shared use cycle path: good idea. Could it be extended all the way to Fetcham? This is a very dangerous road for cyclists, but a very good route linking the various towns and schools, and providing access to country lanes across the North Downs around Polesden Lacey, and thence to Dorking.	Horsley
202,203,204	PR-Gui 202; 203 and 204 This would make cycling to Guildford from Horsley a lot safer. I do ride the route, but am wary of traffic and avoid busy times. I would cycle more often and use car less if this route was constructed.	Horsley
202, 203, 204	202, 203 & 204 - A246 path. I am a very keen cyclist and live off the A246. Myself and my cycle buddies would use this proposed path weekly My cycle club would use all of the proposed routes including 43,39, 40, 86 and 68	Horsley
202, 203, 204,86, 67, 87, 62	(Cannot find ref no). Support upgrade Footpath99 E Horsley to W Horsley and extend to E Clandon. This would be tremendous and encourage far more foot/cyclists to Horsley station where parking is so difficult. (Cannot find ref no.) Support creation of cycles lanes along Ockham Road North for E Horsley to A3, although cycle paths would be better. (Cannot find ref no.) Support greation of cycle path beside A246 from W Horsley to Merrow. (Cannot find ref no.) Support cycle path creation along R Wey to Jacobs Well.	Horsley
202, 203, 204,86, 67,87, 62	I generally support all the proposals, but particularly: - Upgrading footpath 99 to Bridle Path - Creation of cycle lanes along Ockham Road North from East Horsley to A3 - Creation of cycle path next to A246 from West Horsley to Merrow - Creation of cycle paths northeast of Guildford along the River Wey and on to Jacobs Well	Horsley
202, 204, 39, 40, 43, 86	PR Gui202, PR Gui204, PR Gui39, Pr Gui40, PR Gui43, PRGui86. I believe allowing a better cycling route into Guildford along the A246 would be of benefit in allowing safer riding for cyclists and perhaps give more incentive for people to use their bikes. I also believe the other routes listed are of benefit to allow better "off road" recreational cycling (particularly for families)	Horsley
204, 61, 58,62	As a previous regular cycle commuter between Guildford and West Horsley I would strongly support the proposals PR Gui 204 along a busy and narrow section of the A246 and PR Gui61, 58 & 62 which would avoid using the narrow section of Ockham Road North (B2039) between Ockham and roundabout with A3. Both current routes are regularly used cyclists at risk.	Horsley
62, 66, 204, 202, 203	I would like to strongly support the construction of following proposed routes : PR-GUI 62; PR-GUI 66, PR-GUI 204, PR-GUI 202, and PR - GUI 203.	Horsley

ITEM 10

202, 203,204	Support cycle path to West Horsley 3m wide minimum. Continue to East Horsley and Leatherhead.	Horsley
49, 45	PRGui49, PRGui45: Shows short route N along A320 from Clay Lane: good idea provided it can be made safe: this is a very nasty bit of road. Presumably, it is proposed to make the footway shared use. If so, why not extend that all the way along the A320 to Woking.	Jacobe Well
48	Pr Gui 48 (Jacobswell) Part of a good back route to Woking. But the road at present has fast traffic (>40mph). There is ample room for a separate cycle track.	Jacobs Well
51	Woods to be lit	Jacobs Well
35	PR GU35 appears to end on A3 - not very helpful or safe!	Manor Farm
35	PR GUI35 continue to Foot Bridge over A3 – Also back entrance to Surrey Sports Park?	Manor Farm
35	Bridge over A3 by Surrey Sports Park make cycleable.	Manor Farm
121/122/ 218/156/ 190/191/ 192/229/ 44/45/ 46/47/ 48/51	121/122/218/156/190/191/192/229/44/45/46/47/48/51 all look useful for getting about and/or worthwhile for recreation.	Merrow
10	Must be two way for cycles	North St
61	PR-Gui61 WPI support the delivery of this proposed route. This route can be facilitated directly through the development of Wisley New Settlement via dedicated routes segregated from motorised traffic. The route would serve residents travelling to destinations within and external to the development. It is noted that proposed route PR-Gui61 is currently designated as a footpath and would need to be converted to a cycle path.	Ockham
62	PR-Gui62 WPI support the delivery of this proposed route. It would provide a valuable link to the railway station and local centre at Horsley and thus be used by a variety of local residents including those commuters who wished to travel by train. WPI is currently working with Surrey County Council and GBC regarding this route and is willing to devote resources and funding towards the development and implementation of appropriate and deliverable improvements.	Ockham
66	PR-Gui66 WPI support the delivery of this proposed route. It would provide a valuable link to the railway station at Effingham Junction and thus be used by those commuters who wished to travel by train. WPI is currently working with Surrey County Council and GBC regarding this route and is willing to devote resources and funding towards the development and implementation of appropriate and deliverable improvements.	Ockham
PR-Gui58	PR-Gui58 WPI support the delivery of this proposed route. This route can be facilitated directly through the development of the proposed Wisley Airfield New Settlement via dedicated routes segregated from motorised traffic. The route would serve residents travelling to destinations within and external to the development.	Ockham
35	PRGui-35: Why not link this to the footbridge over the A3 to Onslow Village. Also, link direct from the footbridge to the University Sports Centre.	Onslow Village
27	There was a lot of references to completing the work started on the A25. It's not entirely clear to me what this means. I would emphasis my concerns that I made at the meeting that a lot of the work done to date on the A25 is not good enough to make people using these routes feel safe. I agree that the cycle lane from Merrow towards Guildford, for example, does make it a lot quicker for a cyclist to navigate but many potential cyclists are put off by the closeness of the traffic.	Parkway
14	Show existing connection along East bank of river coming out by railway on Woodbridge Rd and sign	Parkway
56	Tarmac path clean regularly, replace poor concrete block surface up to A25	Parkway
236	Support for route PR GUI 236 and extending it on footpath to 281. Path on Guildford side of boundary.	Peasmarsh
205	PRGui-205: (Puttenham) This point, where the NCN22 crosses the B3000, is very dangerous. Could an island refuge be provided?	Puttenham
72,81	Parked cars on verge?	Rydes Hill
73	Is this path two way?	Rydes Hill

12	PR-Gui12. The concept of joining the Downs Link with the existing route from Shalford to Guildford is excellent. The devil is in the detail. Have you considered crossing the A281 before Shalford Cricket Green and cutting across to the start of existing path by the A248 near the Parrot Inn. The existing proposal will be challenged to cross the A248.	Shalford
82	PRGUI82 - it is unclear how this route will help the continuity of cycling for travellers approaching from the south. The existing facilities in the area are littered with discontinuity and "cyclist dismount" signs. This effectively says to cyclists "give up your right of way and allow the cars past". The new London highway route out to stratford is an excellent example of encouraging cyclists by allowing them to keep moving despite obstructions rather than introducing new stop-start obstructions reduce the enjoyment of the journey (see comment below)	Shalford
12	Look into options to link Downs Link and Shalford. Not convinced. A281 is best option.	Shalford
192	PRGui-192 through Stoke Meadows (part of existing NCN223): scope for surface improvement esp the stretch close to the A3 (gets very muddy in winter)	Slyfield
190, 56, 191, 192	PR-Gui 190, 56, 191 and 192 These are leisure routes and our group of over 50 cyclists would really appreciate these routes being constructed. The canal and River Way are frequently used for pleasure and extension of routes away from traffic is to be encouraged.	Slyfield
6	6 This cross roads has been changed over the years. the existing lights for pedestrians and cyclists are adequate when used together with the footbridge	Stoke
8	8 This is designed to go through a congested area at school times - not a clever idea.	Stoke
13	PRGui-13: Wey towpath between Ladymead Bridge and A320 Stoke Mill Bridge: needs durable surface.	Stoke
195,196,212	Support - link and show all schools in area - traffic calm and 20mph limit	Stoke
211,212	Support - link and show all schools in area - traffic calm and 20mph limit	Stoke
218	Improve tow path but Low priority as prone to flooding,not suitable as a commuter route	Stoke
link PR207 (Worplesdon Road) with PR GU47 (Salt Box Road)	Suggest link PR207 (Worplesdon Road) with PR GU47 (Salt Box Road) by diverting up Barrack Road into Cardwell Keep onto Fairborne Way, through gate at end across footpaths to Little Street, cross to Railton Road at end of Tylehost, left into Macdowall Road right into Knox Road, Right at end into close then take footpath to Escombe Drive and left into Grange Road. Much quieter than going up main road and Cumberland.	Stoughton
51	Route along Salt Box Road – bang a hold through the side of the tunnel like at Famshall!	Stoughton
207,230	Cycle paths must be wide enough	Stoughton
32	Support Good connector from Wooden Bridge to Slyfield	Stoughton
47	Cycle paths must be wide enough	Stoughton
76	Stop cars parking on verge	Stoughton
78	Continue route from Keens Lane along Gravetts Lane to maintain outer cycle ring way	Stoughton
51	How is route 51 going to cross the railway as the road is constrained on Salt Box Road at the railway bridge?	Stoughton
73, 79	There also appears to be a gap between PRGui73 and 79. Whilst it appears that a cycle route is being proposed behind Sime Close to link in public right of way number 445 this is a route which is not available as there is no direct link through Findlay Drive other than via residents gardens!	Stoughton
73, 79	Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane, which is the correct route to link PRGui 73 and 79, are not wide enough for dedicated cycle paths. Keens Lane varies from a two way entrance at the Worplesdon Road to a 4.4m wide track at its junction with Gravetts Lane, hence insufficient space for two cars to pass, let alone creating a dedicated cycle pathway. There is no room to widen the road as the north side of the road is residential without a pavement and the south side is also residential with a pavement less than 1.5m wide so not accessibility (DDA) compliant. There are parked cars along one side of Gravetts Lane which effectively reduces this road to a single width track, again not wide enough for a dedicated cycle lane.	Stoughton

ITEM 10

10, 69	PRGui-10 and 69: Currently, National Cycle Route 223 goes up the pedestrianised High Street, although this is not shown on the map. In any event, currently the situation with 223 up the High Street is confusing: it can only be used outside pedestrian hours, and then only one-way (up), although one does see cyclists ignoring these limitations. For example, could downhill cycling be permitted outside pedestrian hours.	Town Centre
1	1 Walnut Tree close. Closure will hinder traffic especially at rush hour when they will be forced to use Woodbridge Road.	Town Centre
1	Pr-Gui1. Onslow St crossing to Odeon Bridge via Bedford Rd, Cycle path. Welcome. A logical addition to the improvements to the Odeon Bridge. However a decent crossing is needed at Walnut Tree Close, and a realigned path direct to the station entrance (which might be a part of the Solum development).	Town Centre
2	Pr-Gui2. North St from Commercial Rd, along the E side of Onslow St to the present crossing, Cycle Path. A lane alongside Onslow St, separated from the traffic by a safety barrier of some sort, would appear to be the best solution to create a cycle connection between North St and the station.	Town Centre
3	Pr-Gui3. W end of North St to Town Bridge via Town Wharf. Cycle Path. It is presumed that this would use the Friary Passage, which would have to be a walking link.	Town Centre
4	Pr Gui 4. This is needed to go the opposite way to the 1 way system towards the Odeon Walnut Bridge & the town centre.	Town Centre
10	Pr-Gui10. North St. from Commercial Road, Traffic management. Our understanding is that it is already intended that this will have some sort of pedestrianisation, but also including a cycling route; this route could be useful, particularly as a route to the station. An improved cycle route would be welcome. However the importance of this street as a major shopping street will increase, and some formal arrangement for pedestrians to safely cross the cycle route would be desirable.	Town Centre
13	PRGui-13: Proposed route using passageway and River Wey path to get from North Street to Town Bridge. I believe cyclists (including our MP) do use this unofficially at present: making it official would be great (including a dispensation to cycle the wrong way down the one-way outside the Friary). It could also link on the other side of the river to the footway around the inside of the gyratory to the subway to the station: just needs to be made officially shared use.	Town Centre
63	PRGui63 I am very much against this being designated as a cycle path. It has high sides and is too narrow in my estimation. In addition it has a fairly steep incline and cyclist going up would not easily cycle without wobbling, and going down could approach pedestrians, who could easily be mothers, buggies and loose children, at too fast a speed.	Town Centre
63	PR-Gui63, FP to S of the Castle, into Castle Hill, then S along Quarry St to Millbrook, Cycle Path It is probably not realistic to make the comparatively narrow FP section into a cycling route; this could however be a "walking link". The stretch of Quarry St is reasonable for cycling now, but would benefit from a 20mph limit.	Town Centre
69	PR-Gui69. Market St and Tunsgate, Traffic Management. Market St, which is rather narrow, is already "pedestrianised" (to the present meagre part of the working day). It is hoped that Tunsgate, a potentially busy shopping street, will soon be pedestrianised. At least part of this link would best be a "walking link" for cyclists.	Town Centre
83	Pr-Gui83. Extension of existing cycle lanes to the High St junction. Cycle path. While this makes sense the road and footways are comparatively narrow, and both are busy. Changes should not compromise pedestrian safety.	Town Centre
164	PR-Gu164, Sydenham Rd, Traffic management. This would be welcome, particularly if 2-way cycling could be provided on the current one-way section. A 20mph limit would be important. Probably the on-street parking spaces would need removing. This road is used by quite a lot of commuter traffic at peak periods.	Town Centre
218	Pr Gui 218 Wey towpath. A useful cycle route for cyclists preferring scenery on their journey to speed.	Town Centre
232	PR 232 up Castle Street and Sydenham Road is very steep. Better to permit cycles to use High Street by providing bike bypass of gate at lower end and bike use of High Street at all times (it is certainly wide enough, but perhaps excluding market days).	Town Centre

232	PR-Gui232, Castle Street / Quarry St / Mill Lane, Traffic management. Part of this is used as a reasonable return route from the station to our area, but cannot be used as an outward route due to the one-way system. It would be good if it could be made two way, extended to the town bridge via the bottom of the High St. This would presumably require traffic light control of the narrow section, which might be feasible as traffic flow is not huge (this could also divert some vehicular traffic from Castle Hill and the Castle Arch).	Town Centre
220, 2	PrGui220-PrGui2 - I'm concerned as this requires crossing multiple lanes of traffic (often fast oncoming) to get from Farnham Rd either into the Town Centre or up to Epsom Road. If there were some way to avoid that, it would be good.	Town Centre
36, 232,220	Hello, in the central zone of Guildford, it's quite difficult to read the reference numbers even when zoomed in. I've looked at the A2 printouts in the library and they are the same. Central Guildford. PR-GU-36. It's not clear whether there's a gap in the proposed route on Millbrook, or whether it's just for clarity. But, it is essential that something is done on this section as it's frequently congested and the railings on the side don't leave much room for manoeuvre. I also think that there should be consideration to a shared route along Friary Street to give a good connection to the shopping area. I support the idea of a shared path by the side of the castle PR-GUI-232 (?). That makes a lot of sense. It's not clear to me how one would get from Millbrook to the railway station as the canal path is some distance below the Walnut Bridge path. PR-GUI-220.	Town Centre
36, 31	PRGui-36 and Ex Gui-31: between Yvonne Arnaud Theatre and Shalford Park: this is very awkward and unsafe for cyclists. A safer alternative would be down Millmead, cross to the lock behind Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, towpath to Footbridge across river beside rowing club. Would require the latter footbridge to be made cycle friendly (ramp as well as steps). It would give a much nicer link to the NCN22 across Shalford Park and thence to the Downs Link.	Town Centre
71	PR GUI 71 (Mill Street) good idea.	Town Centre
11	Two way cycling with no through traffic supported. Remove all on road parking bays.	Town Centre
64	Must be two way for cycles	Town Centre
64	Support must be two way and with 1m min width cycle lane	Town Centre
83	Support with 1m min width cycle lane	Town Centre
225 / 11	Cycle path to connect to Walnut Tree Close	University
PR-Gui -44	PR-Gui -44. I walked this path across Whitmoor Common yesterday. Parts have standing water 2-3 inches deep and the surrounding area is very soft mud. I would not want to cycle this unless the drainage is greatly improved.	Whitmoor Common
33	PR-Gui33 - I'd like to see the existing overbridge facility improved (widened?), BUT ALSO the existing overbridge complimented with a second crossing of the A25 and A3 coupled to the east side of the railway bridge. This would directly connect PR-Gui32 with EXGui-4 without the need to use the narrow pedestrian connection under the railway bridge alongside the NB carriageway of the A3, and link Bellfields with the town centre so much better. Widening of the A3 under the railway bridge may occur over the coming decade, putting yet more pressure on the narrow pedestrian link, but also offering the opportunity to install a new feature bridge during potential road closures associated with HA works. This bridge could be a landmark design and provide a great "advert to Guildford" as a sustainable own as drivers pass from London to Portsmouth.	Woodbridge Hill
21 and 22	PR 21 and 22 would be very useful as a East-West route which currently requires awkward of other roads such as Aldershot Road which has difficult access.	Woodbridge Hill

Responses about the existing infrastructure shown on the consultation map

Reference number used on consultation map, prefixed 'Ex-Gui'

Map ref	Comment	Location
119	Ex-gui199 - must be one of the worst pieces of cycle path in the country. To get to it, a cyclist will have to have left an existing cycle path in order to brave a narrow piece of road that REQUIRES a cycle path to encourage nervous cyclists. When arriving at the roundabout, an experienced cyclist will use the road because they preserve their right of way and only have to stop once on this well designed open layout. If they chose to use the cycle path, then they risk punctures and giving away priority at least twice on this futile and probably expensive piece of cycle infrastructure. On leaving the open, easy to navigate roundabout, they are then thrown into another narrow section that really requires a cycle path to help nervous cyclists. EX-GUI119 is a classic piece of cycle infrastructure designed to make life easy for cars and does less than nothing for bikes. Improve the signage between Ex-gui89 and Ex-gio-88 so that cyclists who are unfamiliar with the road know that there is a cycle path into Guildford centre when heading north on the road	Artington
43	43 should be a great link next to the A3 but it is awful to use. It is poorly surfaced, often has broken glass etc, and you are completely blinded by the headlights of oncoming traffic when you cycle towards Guildford at night.	Burntcommon
43	The existing cycle path EXGUI-43 alongside the A3 is all but unusable southbound at night because of oncoming headlights (try it, it's horrible)It looks as though there is a new advisory route along the Burpham slip road PR-GUI-184, but I have no idea how one would cross the A3 to access it.	Burntcommon
46	EXgui-46 by new Aldi very dangerous. Safer for all if cyclists have on-road cycle lane into roundabout.	Burpham
16,17,4 5,46	Cycle lanes too narrow , and must not mount footpath by bus stop crossing	Burpham
103	Pride of place goes to 103 the Christmas Pie Trail. It's an absolute gem. It's a shame that a utility company has been allowed to block it completely at the Tongham end for ages now	Christmas Pie
103	EXGui-103: Christmas Pie Trail: Could consider surface improvement: do we want it to stay as a pleasant rural ride, likely to get muddy in winter, or do we want it to be a viable all-year route, connecting Wood Street Village and places west, to the Research Park, Hospital and University.	Christmas Pie
43	Highways England - make path continuous no bends / kerbs , remove root bumps and clear regularly	Guildford Business Park
39	EX GU39 is generally good but needs attention as the cycleway is enroached on by hedge in some parts and dropped kerbs in some places are very awkward.	Horsley
67	EX-Gui67 WPI support the inclusion of this existing route within the GBCP. However, WPI would like to note the potential for further improvements to Route EX-Gui67 alongside the corridor improvements to the A3.	Horsley
89	PR-Gui 86, 87, 43 and 89 This would be a useful extension to the existing Footpath 99 which cyclist have been using regularly for over 30 year in my experience. occasionally walkers protest, but widening the footpath and extending it to Clandon would be a great service to the community.	Horsley
71	The cycle lanes along Epsom Road and London Road are intermittent, pointless and dangerous. The cycle lane on Boxgrove Road stops just where it is needed most, at the railway bridge!	Merrow
72	Lanes that stop and start Eg Epsom road EXgui-72 cause many near misses - v dangerous. Glad to see proposed extensions. .	Merrow

68, 71,72	As a resident in Effingham who frequently rides into/out of Guildford along the A246, I am pleased see PR-GUi202 and PR-GUi204 being proposed. However, the Council really must take action to improve the existing cycle paths along that route, namely EXGui- 68, EXGui-71 and EXGui72. These are in an appalling and dangerous condition, being potholed, worn-out and in one place there is a complete square/rectangle of the tarmac that has been taken out and not replaced. Also, you need to take more action to stop vehicles parking on cycle lanes as this causes cyclists to have to move out into traffic. Equally, when travelling along the A246 towards Guildford, the tarmac between West Horsley and the Clandon traffic lights is very worn. Whilst it may be OK for vehicles, it is a bone-jarring experience for cyclists! Whilst I am on it, please don't get me started on the state of the road surface at the Clandon Traffic lights.....this is an absolute disgrace!	Merrow
71, 72	ExGui72, ExGui71 - this cycling facility is not fit for purpose. In fact, I would say that it is *extremely dangerous*. It consists of a "cycle lane" on the left of a road lane which is extremely narrow in parts, and simply serves to encourage drivers to perform an unsafe overtaken (insufficient room being given) on cyclists in the lane (and cyclists taking primary position on this road end up the recipient of verbal abuse or "punishment passes"). The cycle lane is also full of large cracks and potholes which mean that a cyclist has to take avoidance action bringing them into the line of traffic. I have had two near death experiences with local buses on this road. It desperately needs to be overhauled. I would suggest a lane widening with a cycle lane segregated from the traffic by a raised lip, similar to what is being introduced in some segments of London's cycle superhighways. I would ask you to *avoid* shared cycle/pedestrian paths for replacement - as a commuting cyclist, I cycle to avoid/replace car use, which means I need to get to my destination quickly, and that means cycling at above the speed allowed on such paths. (Note - this area is the most dangerous part of my entire cycling commute from Guildford to West London).	Merrow
71,72	ExGUI 71 and 72 Epsom Road. Has many potholes, is very narrow in places, we suggest hatch space next to cyclists and not in road centre, make continuous over junctions (make the cars give way as they have to for cars in the road), and join up to make a continuous cycle way.	Merrow
71, 72	Exist lanes too narrow - widen , many potholes need fixing.	Merrow
62	PRGui62 - I regularly use this route if I get off at Horsely rather than Effingham. It works well, but could benefit from better signage	Ockham
139	EXGU139? under railway bridge onto Southway appears to extend at present into Beckingham Road but no dropped kerbs and signposting non-existent - but potentially useful as quieter than Southway. Christmas Pie Trail is becoming very rutted and difficult to negotiate on anything other than a dedicated mountain bike so less of an alternative when going to Farnham now than main road.	Park Barn
5	I regret it is not possible to read the overcrowded map in the Ladymead section so I cannot quote reference numbers for the route but it would be very helpful to have a formal cycle lane along Ladymead to link Stoke Park path with the University of Surrey campus.	Parkway
8,10	Recent Parkway Gui-8 and Gui-10 pavement surfaces terrible. I cannot believe they are to spec. and should have been rejected.	Parkway
8,10	North cycle path too narrow must be 3m min	Parkway
existing not number ed	From Borough Boundary going north on the A3100 the cycle path is of very poor quality. Waiting for bus mean you're standing in the cycle route	Peasmarsh
existing not number ed	Portsmouth Road bad A3100	Peasmarsh
109	ExGui109: Part of NCN22 across Puttenham golf course. This gets very potholed making this a very unappealing route, especially in winter or after heavy rain, when there are deep puddles across the full width of the track.	Puttenham
29	Aldershot Road – replace cycle lane with cycle paths to get from Stoughton Rec to St Josephs	Rydes Hill

ITEM 10

28,29	Cycle lane intermittent, too narrow and clashes with parked vehicles. Must be wider and continuous.	Rydes Hill
87	EX-Gui-87 This has a set of steps between the church/waterworks and the bridge at the Shalford. This isn't ideal for a cycle route.	Shalford
87	EXGUI -87 a/ can you put ramps for bikes, pushchairs, wheelchairs on the pedestrian bridge over the River Wey that is adjacent to Guildford Rowing Club. This would benefit cyclists who could route via Millmead to avoid / go under the. On the same route, can you take out the "stepped" section on the bike path, south of the Thames water works, where it rises up to join Dagley Lane in Shalford.	Shalford
87	EX-Gui87 - The route south of the waterworks is not suitable for many commuting cycles. A better surface would help this (as well as removing the steps behind The Seahorse pub). Signage from the northbound A281 onto the cyclepath at the water works is very unclear meaning many continue on the road rather than coming onto the dedicated cyclepath	Shalford
91, 87	EX-Gui91. Cycling away from Guildford there used to be a cycle lane marked on the road that went up on to the pavement to lead cyclists to the Toucan crossing (EX-Gui121). This marking no longer exists which means many cyclists fail to pick up EX-Gui87. EXGui-87 is accessible from the A281 by St Mary's Church in Shalford and would benefit from markings on the road to suggest cyclists heading towards Guildford pick up the cycle path at this point. EX-Gui87 has steps and is therefore not cycle accessible near the Seahorse pub in Shalford.	Shalford
87	NCR 22 – steep bit between Shalford and Water Works (behind Seahorse) could be improved	Shalford
87	NCR 22 from Shalford Church Down could this be tarmac-ed?	Shalford
82,83	Widen cycle path connection from Peasmarsh through to Guildford. Only southern route for commuters	Shalford
87	Widen tarmac path, clean regularly, lights required, remove steps behind Seahorse Pub	Shalford
87	EXGUI-87: Shalford Parish Council would like SCC to consider this cycle path under the Safe Routes To School category. As the path goes through Shalford there is a need for A) better lighting on the path as it goes through Shalford to assist cyclist when it is dark B) Removal of the steps at the rear of The Seahorse pub in Shalford which effectively make the Cycle path unpassable on a bike. C)Improve the surface from The Seahorse pub to the caravan park at the edge of Shalford Common to improve the cycling experience for users. The parish Council would be happy to consider financially supporting any of the above schemes if it would help to bring them to fruition	Shalford
192 (existing wrongly labelled as proposed)	Improve NCR223 between Clay Lane and Spectrum where it floods so can still be cycled in winter.	Slyfield
31, Proposal 30	Show E31 on map with P30	Slyfield
8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 87	8/10/11/12/13/14/87 are all useful paths. .	Stoke
138	'AA' roundabout/Boxgrove roundabout could have improved especially north.	Stoke
85,86	Too narrow and intermittent lanes, must be continued through bridge to London Road roundabout	Stoke
24	EX GU 24 has cycles excluded from oblique footpath to Stoughton Road which limits cycles to join from Stoughton Rd right on roundabout which is dangerous. Much safer to make oblique path part of existing cycleway (it is same width and surface so simply needs change of use).	Stoughton
26,33,	Lanes too narrow must be widened, passing parked cars dangerous	Stoughton

112	ExGui-112: Part of NCN22 along the Mount. The Western end of this track gets very badly potholed – I think by vehicles servicing the aerials on the hill top.	The Mount
94, 95	EXGui-94, 95: where the Christmas Pie Trail crosses the A31 on-ramp near Tongham: this crossing is dangerous, with heavy fast moving traffic coming from the roundabout.	Tongham
20	20 is a lovely route but again is too narrow.	Town Centre
20	ExGui-20: provide a cycle friendly link (ramp?) to the existing or proposed new Walnut footbridge. Ex20 would then be a viable alternative route to the station.	Town Centre
20	EXGui-20: The present surface erodes rapidly to dangerous loose sand. Upgrade to a durable all weather surface.	Town Centre
na	Concrete paviors on the traffic tables in upper high st A3100 are still loose after 5 yrs. Very unsettling. Also, pedestrians still think they are crossings and walk out in front of cycles and cars.	Town Centre
20	Rights under the bridge on the Wey towpath where there is the ramp and steps as very easy to bounce down steps by mistake!	Town Centre
20	Use River Wey as a Greenway through Guildford.	Town Centre
20	Surfacing low priority as it floods, not suitable as a commuter route	Town Centre
1, 2	1/2 are vital paths but they are poor and unpleasant to use. They are much too narrow for the number of people using them, with awkward barriers, right angle turns, slippery gradients and intimidating dark bridges.	University
1,2	EXGui1 and Gui2. I frequently use parts of these routes as a pedestrian. Although Gui1 is wider and in some parts has a dividing line down the middle, it is not wide enough for a person pushing a child buggy with another child at his/her side. Even as a single pedestrian, it is intimidating to find a cyclist passing from behind who has no bell to ring and is making no sound as he/she approaches, and often far too fast to take avoiding action. On Gui2 the bridge over the railway and towards Dennis Roundabout is too narrow altogether. Also the joint path down and under the A3 is too narrow. Cyclists and pedestrians do not mix at all well on such narrow paths, made all the more difficult if you have a child buggy, or are accompanying someone who has difficulty walking, such as an elderly person. I also use the roads around this area as a cyclist, and although I know of their existence of these cycle paths, I much prefer using the roads because I can travel faster, and with more freedom.	University
18	Improve Jewsons Bridge	University
18	Show on map?	University
20	ExGui20: Provide direct access from the (improved) towpath, across the industrial estate to the ExGui-18 footbridge over the railway and hence the University	Woodbridge Meadows
117	Cycle path too narrow	Worplesdon

Suggestions for infrastructure not shown on the consultation map

Comment	Location
6 figure ref: SU992490 12 figure ref: 499271,149074 currently this stretch of road is overgrown to a depth of about 1m. If this was cleared, a pavement could be put in place on the west side of the Portsmouth Rd between St Nicolas School and Mount Pleasant	Artington
Make the link through Yew Tree Drive to Juniper Close a cycle path.	Bellfields
Could a route be opened through Clandon Park to Clandon Station, for example from 'Golden Gates' at A25/Park Lane roundabout on the estate road past Temple Court and Clandon House, and the back lane behind A247 West Clandon School and Village. Maybe opportunity to inject into National Trust/Clandon Estate plans for the future of Clandon House, post the fire there.	Clandon
Possible route through Hatchlands and Clandon if NATIONAL TRUST can be persuaded	Clandon
Path from Merrow Common to West Clandon and onto East Clandon be changed into cycle route.	Clandon
There is a dearth of cycle routes in Compton and indeed in many of the villages south of Guildford, despite its AONB status. Linking Down Lane (preferably at Watts Gallery) across the North Downs Way or via footpath 276 would link up the Gallery to Loseley and onto Shalford, providing a route into Guildford near the proposed 'Heritage Quarter'. The Gallery has a tea shop and small shops that residents in Compton can only reach by car as Down lane has no pavement and no designated walk-way from the village. A direct route from the village centre to the Gallery might also be beneficial.	Compton
Compton is effectively cut off from Guildford by cycle unless one is superhumanly fit and can negotiate Down Lane or Sandy Lane, is prepared to go via Farncombe, or foolhardy enough to try the lethal B3000 and the railway bridge. Some sort of cycle path along the WHOLE Compton straight - completely away from off the road would remedy a huge disconnectedness and demonstrate that GBC takes cycling seriously	Compton
Rather than PR-Gui34 diverting to Fairlands would suggest this continues past Hook Farm and join the A323 (PR-Gui73) opposite Gravetts Lane. Failing this would suggest that PR-Gui34 sings left after Hook Farm and goes across to Hunt's Farm and join Sandpit Heath thereby avoiding the school and many of the parked car problems.	Fairlands
We need proper off road cycling trails linking Guildford and Dorking on the A25. I live in Abinger Hammer and would like to be able to use the A25 to cycle safely to Guildford or Dorking to do my shopping. The example I would suggest is Cambridge where all major linking roads have wide tarmac trails adjacent to them, which are not unsightly. Currently the route between Newlands Corner and Dorking has a gesture at a footpath, which crosses the road in several places, is narrow and overgrown with varying surfaces. Yes its an AONB but its a landscape we all live in and want to use sustainably and safely. Also please can we have a pavement adjacent to Felday Road. I live in Sutton Place and regularly see people walking down to Abinger Hammer to take the bus. Its mainly older people and young people who are unable to drive. The road is fast and hazardous with many blind corners. Its an accident waiting to happen.	Gomshall
Open gate between Ash Grove and Deacon's Field.	Guildford Business Park
Improve Bridleway 31 along side of Effingham Common to Heathway for cycling.	Horsley
Off road Newlands Corner to Merrow Golf course, initially using the existing unmetalled surface. North street is very unsafe for cyclists with cars pulling out, market stalls etc., a 5mph cycle speed limit both directions in the High Street would be better.	Merrow
I am dismayed that there are no plans to improve the A323 between Ash and Fairlands for cyclists. I and a few other brave cyclists have been using this route for regular commuting from Ash to Guildford in the mornings and evenings. It has very high traffic volumes going along a somewhat narrow road and is therefore a very cycle unfriendly road, but is used instead of the Christmas Pie route because of its directness and time saving. The obvious development would have been to widen the underused pavement into a shared cycle way. I have seldom seen any pedestrians on the Normandy to Fairlands pavement for example but this could easily be widened into a shared cycle way. GBC and SCC will fail to increase cycle commuting if it only	Normandy

concentrates on improving leisure routes such as Christmas Pie.	
Southway very busy morning peak – people heading towards Egerton Road, needs cycle improvement between railway and Egerton Road roundabout	Park Barn
Create a towpath under A25 on Wickes side	Parkway
Highways Agency land at bottom of Weyside Road could be used to create a path to PC World	Parkway
Join EX-gui89 to Ex-GUI118 with a decent width cycle lane that forces cars to overtake safely when an unfortunate cyclist ends up in this narrow lane. Make the cycle path in green tarmac with a dashed line so that cars can drive on it when cyclists aren't there. When occupied by a cyclist, it would give us a sporting chance not to be hit by wing mirrors (again) if we end up on this stretch of road.	Peasmarsh
There is a good route existing off road route from Ripley village to Woking via Pyrford that could do with better route marking.	Ripley
this is desperately needed, but why not extend it along towards the existing cycle route going past St Joseph's school? Anyone heading towards the university will either have to take a longer detour or be unceremoniously dumped back onto the main road up Ryde Hill to fight with the traffic and be stuck in the tailbacks there. Plus I have reservations about how safe it would be to be diverted off this route onto the longer diversion en route into Guildford: how are cyclists supposed to cross 2 lanes of busy fast-moving traffic here?	Rydes Hill
make this a cycle lane which people cannot park in! There is a tiny bit of cycle path along this road where you feel protected, then you are chucked back into the traffic straight after when cars are parked along the road opposite the Co-op.	Rydes Hill
EXGUI-87 / PRGUI-12 / EX GUI-146. Have you thought of routing a bike path from Shalford Common, via Broadford Park > Stonebridge Fields > Stone bridge Wharf to join the A 281 and the Downs Link	Shalford
Have you looked at using the pavement on the northeast side of the A248 between Shalford towards Wonersh as a cycle path. If the overgrown parts of the pavement were cleared back it would probably be wide enough to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.	Shalford
The "Rowing bridge" (by the Weyside PH) also serves a current need, but poorly. We use it for the "round the hog's back" annual ride. I would like it cut off at the knees to weld it back at a more sensible height. My views are probably influenced by the action of offshore "gas axe" men who do this stuff routinely. As with the Dapdune bridge a ramp would then help. This would make a better NCN22 route feasible, ideally then going up Porridge Pot and Flower walk to Upper Guildown and a joint use connection to the Mount. I still worry about the danger of the junction at the bottom of the Mount for young touring parties, unfamiliar with the hazard.	Shalford
The FP link from end Pilgrims way to Ferry Lane via the footbridge is a useful cycle link, and perhaps could be recognised as such. There is a desperate need for a crossing, zebra or Toucan, to cross Shalford Rd at the end of Pilgrims Way; this is currently a difficult and dangerous place to cross.	Shalford
Wey Bridge at North of Shalford Park does it need to be so high?	Shalford
A281 Shalford – East Side, Quarry Street Pilgrim Way – little used footway, encroaching vegetation, could be converted to shared use - also west side further south	Shalford
Connect Millmead to EX GUI87 NCR22 Bridge is steep/narrow and has steps?	Shalford
DLK/NCR 22 crossing and Gosden House School Eastern Side of A281 very wide if clear vegetation and could be made into cycle route.	Shalford
Shalford – Wonersh route using footway, current vegetation encroaching.	Shalford
NATIONAL TRUST re Wey Tow Path improvement north of Guildford	Stoke
Stockton Road – Sign and Improve the half-dropped kerb at the St John's ambulance end	Stoke
Stoke Road – parallel residential road opposite Guildford College needs drop kerbs for cyclists to be able to use it	Stoke
Link between River Wey Path PRGUI 218 to NCR 223/PR GUI56.	Stoke
Footpath from Little Street to A322 (Pig Lane) made shared use.	Stoughton

ITEM 10

Footpath from A322 pelican crossing to Bryanstone Avenue made shared use.	Stoughton
Stoughton Road and Railway bridge is an essential route across north Guildford to the Stoke/ Woking Road to use one of only 3 crossing points for A3 to get into town so needs a cycleway. The railway bridge in particular needs attention as the light phasing on the uphill direction can leave a cyclist stranded in mid-bridge if they cross just before the lights change, need more time to cross. Alternatively/additionally, use pedestrian bridge alongside as joint facility though on wrong side for uphill direction. Riverside is a valuable route avoiding lower end of Stoughton Road in westerly direction but is one way - consider cycle lane in other direction, and provide ramps to cycle way along pavement of Woking Road. Lower end of North Street is currently buses and Taxis only, but provides a valuable route into the centre of town from station direction or Farnham Road and Guildford Park Road across Bridge Street so should have cycle access permitted.	Stoughton
Stoughton rec between Worplesdon Road and Shepherds Road - the paths could be converted to cycle routes	Stoughton
Given how many cyclists use the railway station in Guildford, it is frankly ridiculous that there aren't cycle paths connecting each of the main roads coming in to the centre of Guildford (including the A281) to the railway station and providing safe routes for people commuting by bike.	Town Centre
Please please please can we have more cycle parking racks in the town centre. It's no wonder people resort to locking their bikes to railings and lamp posts. There ought to be a cycle lane on Boxgrove Road that goes under the railway bridge and joins up to the paths in Stoke Park.	Town Centre
A Cycling route needs to be provided to avoid the SW part of the Gyratory. Cycling should be allowed up Porridge Pot alley or there is no route from the town centre towards Godalming other than on the Portsmouth Road.	Town Centre
Also, please consider linking Millmead onto the A281 using a shared path behind the Yvonne Arnaud theatre - could be a lot more pleasant link from Shalford to the station avoiding Millbrook (and easy to implement)	Town Centre
As an alternative to PRGui63: Much better would be to use the existing track from the Horsham Road up to the end of Abbot Road up to Warwicks Bench. Very little would have to be done to this route as it is mostly road and the track is well founded.	Town Centre
I often cycle down Farnham Rd to Guildford Station. However, I am quite happy that there is no cycle lane on that road. Given that it is a fairly narrow road (and downhill), I think it is a lot smarter to simply take central position on that road. An educational sign saying "cyclists make take centre of lane" or similar might avoid the occasional aggravated motorist / dangerous overtake.	Town Centre
Provision to allow cyclists to ride up and down North street. I cycle from Mellow to Guildford Main line station, as do a large number of other cyclists, and there is no provision in the town centre for an easy route to and from the station that doesn't involve walking or taking on the traffic at the one way section by the Electric Theatre. The Bridge at Walnut close doesn't address this problem but is a step in the right direction.	Town Centre
My own preferred priority is a contraflow cycle route in North Street. At present several cycle routes converge on the river at the bottom of town and more meet at the top but there is no clear direct two way connection between the two. The Cycle Plan includes a route in North Street but there is no indication that it would be a two way route from the river, through the tunnel and various one way streets to the junction with at least Chertsey Street if not the High Street. While the nature of development in the North Street area is still uncertain it is important to put down a marker as to what should be aimed for even if it has to wait for other projects to catch up	Town Centre
As someone who does most of my local journeys around Guildford on foot or cycle I read your plans with interest. Sadly none of them address the issue of cyclists having to cross the gyratory system at Friary Bridge and Bridge Street. This is inevitable on most journeys as it is where the major routes converge. Currently if cycling from the town centre to another part of town I have to go along North Street, along Woodbridge Road to the junction with Onslow Street and join the gyratory system at this point. With three lanes it is very busy, with large vehicles. This is an area where the Council should be looking to take cycles off the road. Cyclists should be able to cross the Town Bridge near Debenhams (it would be possible to have a crossing here to link with the High Street) there are currently railings sealing this off. Also there should be consideration given to a route around Wey House to the Rail Station	Town Centre

<p>I don't believe you address a fundamental problem with a main cycle routes in central Guildford. Currently, when travelling from the top of town, say the library, to the main-line station, a cyclist has to go down North Street, then head right past the bus station, then turn back left on to the one way system, take this all the way around whilst crossing the bridge and coming around again at the top section, going through at least 7 sets of traffic lights in the process and navigating four lanes of horrible traffic at the road's worst point. This is actually an appallingly unpleasant and dangerous journey for a cyclist who wants to achieve a short journey that is only a few hundred metres in direct distance. My guess is that this is a high volume issue because there's a huge number of homes on the upper-side of town, many of which will be commuters cycling to the station. The return journey is a little better because 50% of the one-way system is cut out and one can cycle up the cobbled high street. Coming from London to Guildford a few years ago, I was shocked that no cycle path or route existed to navigate cyclists through this mayhem. Please consider this issue, it's a big one.</p>	Town Centre
<p>We badly need more bike racks in the town. It is ridiculous that there are none on the high street and very few elsewhere. People resort to chaining their bikes to railings as they have no choice and I understand the council have a problem with this. Well, supply more bike racks. There needs to more bike parking at the station and again if necessary this should be at the expense of car parking spaces.</p>	Town Centre
<p>The Wey Navigation towpath from Burpham to the town centre and beyond to Shalford Park (via Ferry Lane footbridge) provides a potential traffic free route through the town, but the surface is not all-weather. I believe there is opposition from the National Trust, but it is worth re-opening the debate about improving the surface to provide an all-weather 'greenway' path. (The existing NCN223 route from Bowers Lane to near Stoke Lock could be used, to leave this part of the towpath untouched.)</p>	Town Centre
<p>Thank you for seeing me yesterday to discuss proposals from the Green Party for cycle routes in Guildford Town Centre. I gave you a coloured A3 copy of my sketch dated 6/11/2015.</p> <p>As we see it the primary need is to improve the access between the town centre and the railway station and this needs to be done quickly. The object should be really to encourage cycling as an alternative method of getting to the station from the north east, south east and east of the town, from Merrow, Burpham and Boxgrove and the residential areas to the south of the Epsom Road. At present cyclists from these areas are confronted by the barrier of the gyratory system as they head for the station.</p> <p>Following your comments about the cost of the ramp which makes the transition in our proposal between the road level (gyratory system) and the canal path I have looked again at this and realise that it would be possible to use more of the existing ramp adjacent to the gyratory system before turning off it onto a new ramp (turning through 180 degrees) and heading back to the canalside. This means that the new ramp need only be about 30m long and as I said it would be a light structure as it is only for cyclists. I think this should allay your concerns about the cost of it.</p> <p>It seems to me that there is now a choice between 3 options:</p> <p>Option 1: This is the option that you explained as SCC's proposal to replace the current footbridge over the Wey which leads to the cinema with a much wider bridge at a cost of around £2.6 million. It is difficult to see how this can be justified since the route does not appear to be on a genuine desire line ie towards the town centre.</p> <p>Option 2: This is the other proposal that you explained to direct cyclists down Bridge street which would have one car lane transformed into an improved/pedestrian cycle route. This will necessitate cyclists waiting at 2 controlled crossings, thus slowing down their journey. If it were possible to reduce the traffic lanes in Bridge Street from 3 to 2 it would be preferable to give this extra space entirely to pedestrians and create an improved route to the town centre. The present footpath along the north side of Bridge Street is 1.9m wide across the bridge itself. I cannot see this proposal being realised quickly.</p> <p>Option 3: This is the proposal that I put to you to create a speedy, dedicated cycle route between the station and the west end of the town centre, ie North Street and the High Street. This would involve making the existing underpass between the station and Wey House for cyclist use only and making some minor alterations in order to extend the dedicated cycle route towards North Street. As noted above it would involve the construction of a new ramp, again to be dedicated for cyclist use. I think this option could be carried out quickly.</p> <p>I think that option 3 is clearly the best for cyclists. I would like to see pedestrians crossing over the roads in the gyratory system at road level via controlled crossings. I told you that I felt your proposals for improving cycling in the town centre were insufficiently ambitious. We would like to see a big movement towards cycling,</p>	Town Centre

ITEM 10

<p>encouraging Guildford residents to leave their cars at home and at the same time helping to reduce Guildford's carbon footprint. You seemed to be content to reduce traffic flows by 3%. As I said to you we need to look at speeding up cycle traffic and the best way to do this is to create a dedicated cycle route which minimises conflict with pedestrians. This should be done quickly and at low cost.</p> <p>You also explained your proposals for improving cycling along Parkway, Ladymead and Middleton Road and these are generally to be welcomed. I hope that you will give our suggestions further consideration.</p>	
<p>A useful cycling diversion to avoid the narrow and one way section of Warren Rd is from Cooper Rd to Warren Road via St Lukes Sq, St Catherines Park, and Lancaster Avenue. This is currently spoilt by difficult steps down to Cooper Rd; a ramp of some form is needed here.</p>	Town Centre
<p>A useful short cycling link from Sydenham Rd to High St and North St is via Bakers Yard; some of this could be a cycle path</p>	Town Centre
<p>Bury Road – Contraflow required</p>	Town Centre
<p>Bury Street officially one way but is part of the NCN22, but not clear enough</p>	Town Centre
<p>The Mews exiting on to Walnut Tree Close – parking at junction on yellow lines – widen pavement to prevent parking</p>	Town Centre
<p>Crossing by Debenhams should be a Toucan</p>	Town Centre
<p>ASLs at new junctions – for example new Waitrose.</p>	Town Centre
<p>More cycle parking at cinema (covered?) used by commuters, in middle of town centre and in areas like Merrow.</p>	Town Centre
<p>Make the footway shared used on inside of gyratory from River Wey round to Station Subway.</p>	Town Centre
<p>Make the entire town centre 20 mph!</p>	Town Centre
<p>GCF recognise that the central area is subject to other consultations. However, the central gyratory provides a major barrier to movement across the town centre. Few utility cyclists will venture into this hostile environment and no would-be cyclist would be prepared to cycle on the gyratory. There are proposals to radically change the gyratory. It is essential, if Guildford is to get a significant increase in cycling to provide dedicated space to cyclists, preferably separated totally from motor traffic for cyclists. There should be a route both ways along North Street, or whatever is its equivalent</p>	Town Centre

<p>Introduce contraflow cycling on one- way streets with or without marked lanes. These should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Street. There is no clear route through the town from West to East. This should be installed within any changes made in the town centre. - Sydenham Road. Avoids use of High Street. - Bedford Road. This appears to be included in Pr Gu 118 - Warren Road. This would avoid the need to use steep hills. - Bury Street or allow cycling up Porridge Pot alley. This would provide a through cycling route from the town centre to St Catherine's/ Portsmouth Road cycle paths - Cooper Road & Riverside Road 	Town Centre
<p>GCF are disappointed that the consultation did not include a cycle route along Middleton Industrial Estate Road, using land forming the eastern part of the industrial premises adjacent to the main line railway, to cross (either under, over or 'at grade') the Guildford to Reading railway line into the Surrey University campus and on to Yorkeys Bridge. This route is defined as a Desired Cycle Route in the approved Guildford Borough Local Plan of 2003; it has been consistently promoted by the Forum in response to earlier consultations and would provide a good link from the cycle paths being created alongside the A25.</p>	University
<p>this is a nice quiet offroad route but is very slippery in places as soon as it rains: a better surface would make it safer and would allow people to commute along it</p>	Unknown
<p>A ramp up the footbridge by the rail line on Woodbridge Meadows and the bridge and path along the north side of the cricket ground made shared use.</p>	Woodbridge Meadows
<p>The footpath between the rail line & Guildford cricket ground should be widened & turned into a cyclist/pedestrian way.</p>	Woodbridge Meadows
<p>I very much like the idea of upgrading the path between the railway and the cricket ground in Woodbridge Road together with an approach to Network Rail to allow a connection under the railway bridge to Faraday road. To make this part of the wider network this should also include upgrading the pavement from the railway to Wharf road into a cycle path so that it links to the already proposed new crossing of Woodbridge Road (PR-Gui9). There is the future possibility of connection from next to the Sea Cadets base to the link to William Road.</p>	Woodbridge Meadows
<p>Path next to Wickes (Faraday Road) to be upgraded to Cycle Path</p>	Woodbridge Meadows
<p>Footbridge over River Wey at Dapdune could be made more cycle friendly – a cheap option would be just to have a runner to wheel the bike up.</p>	Woodbridge Meadows
<p>Link from River Wey path to Jewsons bridge for students.</p>	Woodbridge Meadows
<p>Dapdune bridge – make cyclable</p>	Woodbridge Meadows

Comments about other aspects of the Cycling Plan, comments on strategy and priority and general comments

Comment
Cycle friendly traffic management sounds like something that should be implemented on all roads.
The 'interactive' map is almost impossible to operate making it impossible to comment on the proposed infrastructure.
I'm pleased to see many of my own ideas on the plan, as well as many others well thought-out. Excellent.
General comment - The Travel Smart page at http://www.travelsmartsurrey.info/cycling/guildford-consult is excellent with valuable links. I endorse the Guildford Cycle Forum input and request that Strategy be enhanced to include the following affordable improvements: a. Cycle lane entry to all Advanced Stop Boxes so that cyclists can get in to the box. b. Continuous Cycle lanes, abrupt turns onto the pavement and cycle lane ends increase the risks to cyclists. c. Give Cyclists Priority when insufficient room for car lane and cycle lane. (i) Signage stating "No Overtaking of Cyclists" when road is narrow and shared. (ii) "1.5m clear when overtaking Cyclists" signage where cycle lanes are next to traffic lanes. d. Dedicate with signage more back roads to shared usage, allowing car access to housing but blocked to through traffic except walkers and cycles. e. Maintaining and opening more alley ways and cycle short cuts away from cars. f. Prioritise sweeping of cycle lanes. g. Introduce contra-flow cycling on one- way streets with or without marked lanes. h. Seal road repair edges with tar to prevent water ingress and pothole formation. Cycle wheels are narrow, and wide inline cracks are dangerous. The budget/fund holders for each of the above should be identified.
There is no key for the interactive map so it's impossible to tell the nature of the proposed facilities i.e. are they on or off the road.
It's a shame that none of the consultation meetings were on a weekend - getting there on a Friday is quite difficult for many people. I remember previous consultations at Holy Trinity being very well attended.
If cycles are on the pavement and need to yield at every side road, it will fail. Look at the failed Walton on Thames town centre plan. Useless and unsafe. Please learn from this.
General I support all the proposals. I particularly support proposals where the cycle lane is separated from the road. I also support separated cycle lanes being installed as a mandatory requirement on all new developments.
ALL. The suggested routes are disjointed; in fact they aren't really routes at all, in that they have just been put in where it's easy. If you want cycling to work in Guildford - or anywhere - you have to properly prioritise cycling over motor traffic. That means every reasonably busy road either has segregated cycling facilities on it - not shared pavements with peds - or a more attractive, shorter, more convenient alternative route. Less busy roads need filtered permeability so that they do not form through routes for motors, while still allowing motor vehicle access. The Dutch have been doing it right for some time. Please don't waste money on half baked schemes that won't do any good. Send your highway engineers to Groningen or Amsterdam to see how it's done.
There are many features that form barriers to cycles and pedestrians. eg New surrey sportspark was an ideal planning gain opportunity for a cycle/foobridge over the A3 that currently separates Onslow Village and Guildford from Royal Surrey Hospital/University/Science Park. Also long stretches of A3/railway/river that similarly prevent sensible routes cyclists and pedestrians that could be separate from motor vehicles
If cycles are on the pavement and need to yield at every side road, it will fail. Look at the failed Walton on Thames town centre plan. Useless and unsafe. Please learn from this.
20 mph areas are a low cost and effective way of making a safer and more pleasant environment for cyclists and pedestrians.
As a car driver and cyclist I wish to see safer sharing of roads through: a. Cycle lane entry to all Advanced Stop Boxes so that cyclists can get in to the box. b. Continuous Cycle lanes, abrupt turns onto the pavement and cycle lane ends increase the risks to cyclists. c. Give Cyclists Priority when insufficient room for car lane and cycle lane. (i) Signage stating "No Overtaking of Cyclists" when road is narrow and shared. (ii) "1.5m clear when overtaking Cyclists" signage where cycle lanes are next to traffic lanes. d. Dedicate with signage more back roads to shared usage, allowing car access to housing but blocked to through traffic except walkers and cycles. e. Maintaining and opening more alley ways and cycle short cuts away from cars. f. Prioritise sweeping of cycle lanes. g. Introduce contra-flow cycling on one- way streets with or without marked lanes. h. Seal road repair edges with tar to prevent water ingress and pothole formation. Cycle wheels are narrow, and wide in-line cracks are dangerous. i. Many more 20 mph zones, in nearly all residential areas, and many central main roads where traffic is slow on average yet races between junctions. j. A code for shared pedestrian/cyclist sharing to encourage better relations and behaviour, including ear-phones, mobile phone use, slower passing by cyclists etc.
I would like to see more provision for cyclists of all ages and abilities to be able to use the roads in and around Guildford safely. I do not currently use a bike on the roads as I am afraid to do so as I feel I am very likely to be hit by a vehicle and be injured.
According to the World Health Organisation, the key to making roads safer for cyclists and pedestrians (and motorists) is reducing speed. I would therefore like to see the development of many more speed calming humps along routes that are unsuitable for dedicated, continuous cycle lanes or traffic-free routes.
The GBCP sets out the practical local implementation of the Surrey Cycling Strategy under which it sits. WPI understands that the main planning focus for the GBCP must in the first instance be the identification of a cycle

<p>facility network for the Borough itself. However, WPI considers that a great opportunity would be lost if a more strategic approach is not taken in the production of the individual Local Cycling Plans. By virtue of its location, Wisley Airfield has strong functional links with the surrounding local authorities. The development of Wisley New Settlement provides the opportunity to support the delivery of selective enhancements to the local road network to strengthen the cycle links between Guildford and its neighbouring towns and villages namely Cobham (circa 4km) to the northeast, Woking (circa 7km) to the northwest and Leatherhead (nearly 9km) to the southeast of the site. WPI remain committed to working with all stakeholders to assist fully in delivering improvements to the local cycle network.</p>
<p>If cycles are on the pavement and need to yield at every side road, it will fail. Look at the failed Walton on Thames town centre plan. Useless and unsafe. Please learn from this.</p>
<p>All cycle routes should be removed. Cyclists are dangerous when they mix with pedestrians - especially those who just come up behind you. There should be no priority given to them. Instead they should be encouraged to use buses.</p>
<p>There are parts of Guildford where cyclists use the pavement because it is the only safe option – e.g. past my shop. More consideration should be given to allowing shared use of pavements in selected roads.</p>
<p>As soon as possible it would be good to advertise the changes that will be made in the short term and when. Currently people thinks that the council simply don't care.</p>
<p>Cycle stands: we need more, and more secure, cycle stands eg CCTV monitored. These days, many people have quite expensive bikes, and fear of theft is a real disincentive to using them for town centre visits.</p>
<p>Guildford Cycle Forum support the overall objectives of the plan to provide continuous routes, without breaks or sudden turns. The suggested routes are all desirable. They will help existing cyclists and encourage current non-cyclists to become cyclists. They should increase the percentage of journeys undertaken by cyclists.</p>
<p>Priorities from GCF: The A3 forms a major barrier for cyclists, and also pedestrians, for access from North Guildford across the A3. The Woodenbridge bridge over the A3/A25 was not built to accommodate cyclists, is awkward to get onto & off and too narrow for the number of people wanting to use it. A Mott McDonald report in March 2007 (A3 Wooden bridge cycle route study 228756/02/B) is relevant. The bridge needs to be rebuilt to make it suitable as a major artery for cyclists on a traffic free route across the A3. Continuation of work on paths alongside the A25. Much work has been done to create cycle paths alongside the A25 and it is logical to continue with these to create a continuous route through the middle (geographically) of Guildford. Create a cycle friendly route across the river Wey by the existing rail bridge, widen the footpath by the rail line and Guildford cricket ground to the café and make it a cycle path. This should link with the path down to Wharf Road & Guildford College. It should also link with the Wey towpath. Routes with no motor traffic are particularly attractive to non-cyclists. The Shalford Park route and the old rail line to Cranleigh are examples of this. Another such route could be the path Pr-Gui 190 by the South of the A25 would provide another such route to encourage non-cyclists.</p>
<p>The Proposed Guildford Cycling Plan is fully supported. It needs to first sort cycle connections through the town centre 'hub' and then work on the 'spokes' leading to the town centre and it also needs to incorporate the A25 movement corridor from Spectrum to through to the University, and the proposed Guildford Master Plan movement corridors as well. SCC should prioritise the work such that it is completed from the centre outwards, however improvements to the main spoke routes to the town centre hub should also be prioritised such as the Shalford and Burpham routes. We have been badly in need of a Long term plan which will can now be based on the Guildford Cycling Plan as marked up. All the proposals must be priced and then prioritised to be implemented as funds becomes available. All schools should be shown on the plan with all surrounding roads having a 20mph limit. I understand 300 expanding schools have to submit their own travel plans. I presume these will show preferred safe cycling routes that parents will allow their children to use. These should be incorporated on the plan. Routes would be better signed on the road surface as well as having signposts which can be small and often difficult to spot and follow. All cycle lanes should be 1.5m wide with a minimum width of 1.2m. Cars should not be allowed to enter cycle lanes. Most of the existing lanes are too narrow and therefore of little use. If future lanes are cannot be created wide enough then signs should stop vehicles from overtaking, it is crucial that cyclists feel safe on a cycle lane More Cycle Storage must be provided at Guildford and London Road Stations. The rear west side of Guildford Station should have storage as well. Cycle parking areas must be provided throughout the town. There should be more education and training for motorists in Surrey to encourage more patient and less aggressive motoring. Too often the motorist relies on their acceleration and power to overtake cyclists dangerously only to find themselves stopping or slowing for traffic, traffic lights or roundabouts. Education of motorists is important as they're the biggest threat to cyclists and the highest perceived danger from new and less confident cyclists.</p>
<p>All town centre amenities are within an easy cycling distance, and many HTAG members, (from some 450 households), would appreciate easier, safer and quicker cycling routes, particularly to the station. This is a rather briefly considered response, as our time has been taken up with the Town Centre Masterplan. We hope there will be future opportunities to contribute to cycling policy and plans.</p>

ITEM 10

Where streets are fully pedestrianised, or where this is planned, it is felt that cycling should not be allowed during the closed times. However, it would be reasonable to designate comparatively short walking links to maintain an obvious key cycling route.

A huge improvement on town centre routes, to help bring them into the "cycle friendly traffic management" category would be the introduction of 20mph limits.

Good cycling routes to the station are vital.

Paths shared by cyclists and pedestrians is not generally felt to be the best solution, unless the path is wide enough to allow it to be clearly divided. We wonder if a category of pedestrian / cyclist shared path could be introduced where pedestrians are given priority, as we believe is the case with the National Trust towpath.

We would like safe links from our residential area to the safe off-road routes such as Sustrans 22 and 223 to allow families with young children to access these from their homes.

It would also be good to have safe cycling routes to the nearest secondary schools to allow students to cycle to school.

There is scope for providing integral cycle ramps on various steps which are on short walking links, to avoid having to carry bikes.

There needs to be more training and education of motorists if we are to safely increase the number of cyclists on our roads. Speed and impatience are, in my opinion, the biggest problems that affect the confidence of new and less confident cyclists in Guildford. Too often, motorists take advantage of their acceleration power and try to pass cyclists at dangerous points only to slow or stop 50 or so metres later at lights or roundabouts. Motorists need to be educated into a more patient and less aggressive driving style in our town.

As a seasoned cyclist and a rare breed of Guildford resident who actually cycles through the town, I applaud the encouragement of cycling. Guildford is on par with Kingston as one of the worst towns in Surrey for cyclists. Narrow poorly maintained roads (Walnut Tree Close, Barratt Homes Dev :A good example) coupled with dangerous junctions litter the town center provide a novice cyclist with a crash course in self preservation.

Guildford should look to Oxford and similar towns. Too many lazy motorists and school run 4 wheel drivers clog up town roads on a daily basis.

I write on behalf of Wisley Property Investments Ltd (WPI), who Savills represent in respect of the ongoing promotion of a sustainable new settlement at Wisley Airfield. As Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is aware, the Site is presently subject to a planning application for up to 2,100 dwellings. WPI would like to offer its support to the delivery of the Guildford Borough Cycling Plan (GBCP) and its associated cycle infrastructure improvement initiatives. It is recognised that walking and cycling can contribute to a stronger sense of community and form part of a healthier lifestyle. We are also interested in the fact that the potential cycle routes identified in the consultation have been identified through pre-consultation workshops with community stakeholders, previously identified potential routes and through a Local Committee task group. This reinforces the fact that these links are important to the current needs of the local community as well as in the future in support of development proposals for housing in the Borough. In support of the planning application at Wisley Airfield (ref: 15/P/00012) a strategy for Non Motorised Users (NMU) is being further developed to provide a mix of highway improvements and contributions intended to deliver safe and attractive links to local facilities, particularly those in Ripley, Ockham, Horsley and Effingham Junction Railway Stations. Proposed local traffic measures are intended to enhance highway/cycle safety. Alongside early Travel Plan monitoring, it is envisaged that funding for additional cycle parking/ facilities at the Site and local centres and railway stations can help encourage cycle trips. In addition a traffic management budget can be used to enhance these and other cycle routes in the form of safety enhancements, including for example speed limit gateways, cat's eyes and anti-skid surfacing on bends to tackle excessive speeds and thereby encourage walking and cycling. Existing Cycle Provision After nearby Ockham, Ripley is the closest village to Wisley Airfield. It provides a post office, a pharmacy, various food stores, a dentist, two schools and numerous other useful facilities for residents. Slightly further afield in Cobham, there are amongst other facilities and services two large supermarkets (Waitrose and Sainsbury's), various healthcare facilities, a post office and a large community recreation ground. Preserving the amenity of the most direct route to Cobham would also provide some value and thus potential traffic management and/ or NMU infrastructure improvements might be appropriate. Horsley (12 minute cycle ride), provides a railway station, two schools, a post office, healthcare facilities, a range of shops and a small public library and other facilities available to residents of the proposed Wisley Airfield development. Some PROW routes are already available, linking the site to the south, however some investment in NMU improvements might also be appropriate. There are nine rail stations within five miles of the development. The closest rail station to the site is Effingham Junction, which is situated on the Guildford to London Waterloo mainline, just two kilometres from the proposed development. From the existing Ockham Lane or proposed Old Lane site access, the route to Effingham Junction follows Old Lane directly into the village and the railway station. Horsley Train Station is accessible via Ockham Road. Measures to preserve cycle safety, reduce speed and enhance crossing infrastructure at the existing staggered junction with Forest Road could make this a more attractive route. Other nearby rail stations are located in Bookham, Byfleet & New Haw, Clandon, Cobham and Stoke D'Abernon, Horsley, Oxshott, West Byfleet and Woking. Many of the routes connecting the site to these stations follows existing quiet lanes. Measures to preserve or enhance the cycle environment could therefore support communities in combining healthier and cheaper ways to access local stations. Given the multitude of stations and routes, alongside the development phasing, early Travel Plan monitoring might best inform which routes attract the greatest priority. As set out above, a network of excellent cycle routes already exists, most on quiet rural roads, including the 2012 Olympic Cycle Route; supplemented with the public rights of way network. Parts of the network are discontinuous, include roads which are forecast to experience increases in traffic or include routes where speeds

<p>can be excessive such and so affect the willingness for some people to walk and cycle. As such WPI recognise the opportunity to deliver significant improvements to the local cycle network through the delivery of a new settlement in this location and by working in conjunction with the GBCP. Whilst WPI recognises that the proposals subject to this consultation are not detailed proposals, WPI also agree that the proposals identify useful links to access services and would provide a cycling option for people who are discouraged by the prospect of cycling on busier roads. Status of the Guildford Borough Cycling Plan In order to work most effectively, WPI would appreciate some clarity as the intended purpose of the GBCP. Is the Plan intended to become part of the Local plan Evidence Base or is it intended to inform the forthcoming Guildford Infrastructure Delivery Plan?</p>
<p>There is no point in cycle lanes as often cars are parked on them! Maybe they should all have double yellow lines. Also they are often too short to be of any practical use.</p>
<p>All a waste of money - better spent on maintenance of the sad, neglected, far too narrow excuses for cycling facilities Guildford thinks it's built already.</p>
<p>Many of the roads are unfit and dangerous with large potholes. More cycle paths need to be created</p>
<p>Please provide safe roads to cycle to George Abbot school.</p>
<p>It is all very well promoting cycling if you fail to ensure cycle lanes are fit for purpose and maintained. Further all the time Cyclists refuse to use cycle lanes and paths (as with Clay lane Burpham) the principles fall apart on all aspects of cycling - cycle paths should be along side Pedestrian paths no in the road and where cycle paths are provides (and maintained) ALL cyclist should use the paths provided and FINED if they do not.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank