

Ashted to Leatherhead Cycle Path Consultation Responses to the end of 20 August 2013
(Final closing date for responses 27 August 2013)

Section 1 – Leatherhead Town Centre to St John's School (Plans 1 to 2)

3. Do you have any comments about this section of the proposed cycle path?

No	ID	Comment
1	2753048579	
2	2750849452	
3	2750390462	This section is good, though I would prefer to have a segregated pathway.
4	2749629075	What will there be to ensure that cyclists dismount or rejoin the road when they come to the end of the cycle path?
5	2749291332	
6	2749270972	The bus pull-in should be maintained as it will ease traffic flow around the junction and reduce noise and emissions without inconveniencing cyclists.
7	2747523846	Too narrow and gets congested at school times. Too many trees to cut down.
8	2746970443	I am sending in my comments on all sections to Chris Townsend
9	2745543421	1. Connection to High street seems to be a name on a diagram rather than a proposal for a connection. There is no detail, not even of curbs. 2. Beside the bus lay-by there is a tree in the path. Trees have trunks and branches through which cycling is impossible. More space is required to go around the tree. 3. Near the electricity substation on Epsom Road the cycle path has been narrowed by 27%, the road by 0%. Rather says we don't actually care about cyclists, only about kudos for building cycle paths. If the roadway were narrowed to 2 x 2.95 m and the cycle path to 2.8 m, then the cyclists and motor vehicles would have shared out the narrowing fairly, and the road traffic might actually slow down nearer the speed limit.
10	2744270965	No
11	2743919804	Keep the bus lay-by to maintain traffic flow
12	2743530877	
13	2742526357	Reducing the width of Epsom Road at the Institute junction will cause difficulties for long vehicles turning from Leret Way.
14	2742055876	I am glad to see raised tables at the points where the proposed cycle route crosses vehicle access roads. These must make a very smooth join as cyclists will choose to use the roadway if the cycleway is too rough.
15	2741891569	Although this is a great idea, the pathways are narrow, and therefore pedestrians will be placed in danger from speeding cyclists, and even the dreaded 'Lycra louts' who bully their way through Leatherhead. This is not fair for disabled, old, infirm or vulnerable pedestrians, and makes crossing the road dangerous.
16	2741053162	
17	2741012330	No
18	2740355968	No
19	2739961451	Much prefer removal of existing bus lay-bys. Buses have much difficulty in pulling out of bus lay-bys. Buses with lay-bys and many passengers disadvantaged by single occupancy car drivers
20	2739920452	No
21	2739915058	Will there be street furniture obstructing the path?
22	2739903496	
23	2739897881	Prefer the option to lose bus lay-by but keep the tree
24	2739893290	
25	2739889437	Not really vital but segregated cycle path / walkways are bit better than shared if possible)
26	2739002711	
27	2738523217	No comments
28	2738303829	
29	2737623558	
30	2737522747	
31	2737521273	I support removing the bus bay but why only move the phone box and tree for the option? Please move as many obstacles as possible.

ITEM 8

32	2737519003	
33	2737518515	
34	2737517087	
35	2737515454	
36	2737514362	Lot of money for very little benefit
37	2737513339	No
38	2737512292	I would prefer the option closing the bus bay
39	2737509838	
40	2737506852	
41	2737042069	
42	2736981200	
43	2736322000	Too narrow past electric sub-station - crosses a lot of driveways
44	2736310699	See no. 8
45	2736301654	
46	2736294167	
47	2736277295	All these sections mean that any car coming out of a drive or Miner Rd has priority over the cyclist on the shared pavement. If they stop early they can't see the road. More importantly the cyclist has to be aware that they have to stop at any point so it is much easier for them to ride on the road.
48	2736264708	Prefer reviewing bus lay-by
49	2736248283	
50	2736230098	
51	2736224982	See section 8
52	2736214726	
53	2736208191	I agree with the preferred option of an on-road bus stop
54	2736175390	
55	2735947231	
56	2735651003	I think the scheme is expensive and unnecessary in this time of financial stringency. I see little evidence of high cycling volumes and such a need for these alterations.
57	2735618139	
58	2735434108	
59	2735367744	See below for overall comment
60	2734771963	
61	2734571775	I'd like to see the paved margins on plan 2 reinstated to grass verge as they were several years ago.
62	2734374949	
63	2734247052	
64	2733718464	
65	2732069805	As no. 4
66	2731905847	No
67	2731844691	
68	2731821559	
69	2730433883	Moving the bus shelter will cause traffic delays because the bus will halt on the main road. Also bus users will be exposed to the weather as the bus shelter will be non-existent.
70	2730417515	I agree with the preferred option of an on road bus stop
71	2730407113	
72	2730397709	
73	2730154140	
74	2730123754	Not necessary.
75	2729970552	
76	2729531461	No
77	2728920029	
78	2728454205	Excellent
79	2728232877	This is a busy section of road with numerous entrances and turnings meaning a cycle path here will be constantly interrupted and of little use
80	2727706364	
81	2727689790	Waste of time and money very few need it

82	2727629587	
83	2727624595	For the bus stop near Leret Way, maintaining the 3m path is my preferred option. Would it also not be better to move the bus shelter next to the road so that people getting on and off busses do not cross the path of cyclists? The path could then go behind the bus shelter. Travelling west into Leatherhead the access to the High Street appears to be very awkward.
84	2727416703	As above
85	2727293474	
86	2727254961	
87	2727191604	Cyclists already use pavements in contravention of the law. Please keep cycles away from pedestrians. Do not just share the pavement even with a white demarcation line. Please consider lowering the level of the cycle path so that it not part of the pedestrian area. If necessary reduce it to road level.
88	2727130406	Not suitable. Road too narrow-Dangerous
89	2726965053	
90	2726954833	
91	2726546819	No
92	2726481864	
93	2726439613	
94	2726353724	
95	2726201688	
96	2726118514	No
97	2726049528	
98	2725872090	My main concern is crossing that v busy road at the Knoll Roundabout. That is where the problem lies. The rest i.e. Using a shared footpath and cycle route good idea.
99	2725801353	
100	2725772199	
101	2725767979	Would have thought linden pit path would be a quieter route
102	2725760755	
103	2725723327	
104	2725705510	Yes - it sets off down the main road. Why not Linden Path - its much quieter
105	2725670024	
106	2725661188	A fantastic idea.
107	2725576778	Not quite sure I understand the crossing arrangements for cyclists at the junction. Also as below re removal of trees
108	2725559397	Not a fan of shared paths - cyclists and pedestrians both meander about.
109	2725095366	
110	2724876966	
111	2724752639	I think cycle paths are good idea if cyclists used them, from my experience they don't use the ones already in existence. Particularly the one made especially for them between Leatherhead and Dorking. Most cyclists don't seem to use them.
112	2724404884	
113	2724392227	
114	2724386668	Relocate it to behind St Johns school
115	2724374936	
116	2724343196	
117	2724196508	
118	2723952502	
119	2723888132	
120	2723871600	
121	2723863052	A shared cycle path is simply allowing cyclists to ride on the pavement - which is very dangerous. Cycle paths should be completely separate. Cyclists should be banned from riding on the pavement and pedestrians should be banned from walking on the cycle paths. Separating cyclists and pedestrians is essential.
122	2723765839	Looks fine
123	2723272922	
124	2723051125	I wish to retain the tree, and am happy to see the bus stop filled in.
125	2722844148	

ITEM 8

126	2722735616	The road is too narrow for additional paths for cyclists
127	2722632840	
128	2722458228	Use of the Linden Pit Path would avoid further congestion on a busy stretch of road
129	2722264853	
130	2722260407	As a keen cyclist, it sounds good; however, the proposal to retain the bus lay-by will directly impact my life and right to privacy - the removal of the tree and relocation of the telephone box. These provide shelter to my property from the traffic waiting at the lights on Epsom Road to either turn left into Church Road or right into Leret Way.
131	2722173433	I am in favour of any developments, which would make cycling along the A24 safer. It is disappointing that the changes do not include 'Dutch style' physical separation of the cyclists from both motorists and pedestrians at all stages of the proposed route.
132	2722158169	I don't believe that removing the bus stop is an option as this will create havoc every time a bus stops during peak times, which is bad enough already. I also believe that it will create an accident black spot on that corner as cars impatiently try to go around the bus and face cars head on turning right. I also consider the removal of the tree by the bus stop outrageous, if the bus stop is to remain. This and the proposals to remove many other trees along the route is disgraceful and degrades the leafy green character of our town that people love. I firmly believe that a shared pedestrian/cycle path is also not the best idea. This route is used by many families and young children, and older people and shared path increases the danger of accidents for all parties.
133	2722136383	Currently this section of road offers no restrictions on vehicle parking and is already not the easiest roads to navigate down when faced with oncoming traffic. Widening the pavement by narrowing the road risks restricting traffic flow further unless parking restrictions are implemented. This action in itself will have obvious implications.
134	2722108533	
135	2722070560	None
136	2722067465	
137	2722037193	Not happy about removing the bus lay by as this will cause congestion, and material benefit to society of this scheme may be limited. I would prefer to keep the lay by and narrow the cycle path.
138	2722002871	
139	2721984425	We think it is an excellent idea, for everyone. My husband would be able to cycle to work, as now it's just too busy and dangerous. Excellent plan.
140	2721947650	I have cycled along there and it is a dangerous and frightening experience. A cycle path would be a great asset
141	2721906161	
142	2721378098	
143	2721345393	No
144	2721069218	
145	2721055481	No
146	2720984494	No
147	2720708457	See 8.
148	2720678440	Whilst I am all for getting more people cycling, this is less than awesome. Why not just cycle along Ottway's lane? It is quiet and interesting; it starts close to the proposed Ashted end on the cycle path. Then there's just the bit from Downsends to Leatherhead.
149	2720539133	Will there be a speed limit for cyclists (school entrance)
150	2720525302	
151	2720410135	
152	2720312806	
153	2720246871	
154	2768968825	
155	2768042858	
156	2767706360	
157	2765300417	Would prefer to see Linden Pit Path

ITEM 8

158	2764703370	As a deaf and disabled pedestrian, I am horrified by this proposal, walking with two sticks or in an electric buggy makes this an impossible passing place.
159	2763269828	
160	2762936786	Are there any St Johns pupils that actually cycle - in my experience if they are day pupils they are either dropped off or go by train.
161	2761214108	
162	2761044061	
163	2761034153	There is insufficient room on the pavement for cyclists, children's buggies, pedestrians and elderly people on motorised buggies. Cyclists should continue to use the main road.
164	2761029692	
165	2761022345	No
166	2760040513	
167	2759547758	
168	2759351521	
169	2759319404	
170	2755899227	No, see section 8
171	2754896868	It needs to go all the way to Epsom. The councillor's comments about Lycra wearing cyclists alienate the millions of hobby cyclists and he obviously has never ridden a bike or he would know it is simply the most comfortable attire for cycling. With an obesity epidemic in the UK we need to grasp any opportunity to make exercise easier for the masses and to give people an alternative to their car.
172	2754713323	Yes, it's more shared path rubbish, build them properly or not at all.

ITEM 8

Section 2 – St John's School to Knoll Roundabout (Plans 3 to 5)

4. Do you have any comments about this section of the proposed cycle path?

No	ID	Comment
1	2753048579	
2	2750849452	
3	2750390462	Similarly I would like a segregated pathway here to avoid any confusion with pedestrians.
4	2749629075	Will there be adequate protection for child pedestrians who already regularly use this section of the path to get to school (Downsend, St Peters, St Andrews)
5	2749291332	The part around the roundabout is a brilliant Idea. I cycle between my home in leatherhead and friends/shopping/business in leatherhead and on to Epsom. I enjoy cycling but feel incredibly vulnerable on the roundabout.
6	2749270972	An uncontrolled crossing on the Leatherhead bypass could lead to conflict between cyclists, has the potential to be dangerous and will discourage less confident cyclist from using the path. A toucan crossing is better but the position is still not good for motorists heading south on the Leatherhead bypass queuing to get onto the roundabout.
7	2747523846	Very young children using this section all day every day, with pushchairs scooters small bikes, they will be unsafe with cyclists sharing the pavement.
8	2746970443	As above
9	2745543421	4. At Garlands Road, if cyclists are cycling along the roadway, they have priority over traffic in and out of Garlands Road. With the cycle path as proposed, the priorities reverse. This deters cyclists from using the cycle path. Such crossings need the priority to be for the cyclists as well as pedestrians (by law it is for the pedestrians already, but you might not think so from motorists behaviour). A raised table with give way lines and signs can achieve this, but is best set back further from the main road. 5. A segregated cycle path is unlikely to assist safety where there is no physical barrier between pedestrians and cyclists and where the number of cyclists and pedestrians is not high, so whilst I have no objection to segregation, I see no benefit either. 6. Homelands – same comments as Garlands Road. 7. Melvinshaw – same comments as Garlands Road. And the more such cases of losing priority, the more strong the incentive for cyclists to use the roadway instead. 8. A controlled crossing will be essential at Knoll Roundabout. The speed and frequency of motor vehicles makes crossing at this roundabout very awkward for pedestrians and cyclists.
10	2744270965	Yes
11	2743919804	
12	2743530877	
13	2742526357	There is no mention of how the plans for the Knoll Roundabout fit (or conflict) with Surrey Future's ideas for reducing congestion there.
14	2742055876	I feel it is a good idea to have separated cycle and pedestrian pathways wherever possible. Even if it is only a white line it is a reminder to pedestrians that there may be cyclists approaching.
15	2741891569	Parts of this section are wider than the previous pathway, however having observed a similar combined cycle-path/pavement scheme on Hampton court way, unfortunately pedestrians are put at a disadvantage, as cyclists bully along the pedestrian section as well as the designated cycle path. Indeed pedestrians will now be forced to cross over a cycle path, and then have no sanctuary points before attempting to cross the highway. It seems to me that this design is inherently dangerous for pedestrians, especially mothers pushing prams with young children. The proposed 'Panda style' crossing on the main road is probably going to be avoided by cyclists, and therefore the roundabout will become a dangerous junction for all road, cycle path, pavement users, perhaps a good rethink might be helpful. Some junctions like Garlands Road are difficult and obstructed now, and raised table crossing points will increase the likelihood of accidents, especially through the road narrowing caused by on street parking.
16	2741053162	A toucan crossing would be a disaster on the Leatherhead bypass leading to the M25. The roundabout is already heavily congested and blocked at peak times.

ITEM 8

		Traffic using this route is usually coming from further away heading for the M25, so more cyclists would not decrease traffic. Also this is prime time for parents and children heading from Leatherhead to ST Peters school. Why not have a bridge instead similar to the one at the Grange Road junction, with ramps for cyclists.
17	2741012330	Slight concern that crossing at Knoll roundabout is safe. Would have preferred subway or bridge
18	2740355968	Segregation for a short stretch may be confusing. Better to leave all un-segregated. Toucan crossing of Leatherhead bypass is essential. Whole project will be a white elephant with cyclists using Linden Pit Path bridge (as they do now) if the crossing is unregulated.
19	2739961451	
20	2739920452	No
21	2739915058	Toucan crossing at Knoll roundabout a very good idea. Not keen on segregated path with no separation from the road. Risk of cyclists coming off the edge into oncoming traffic, shared use probably safer.
22	2739903496	
23	2739897881	The crossing on the by-pass looks dangerous. Traffic accelerates left from the roundabout
24	2739893290	Concern that Knoll Roundabout becomes even more congested and encourages more traffic onto Barnetwood Lane (already a rat run!)
25	2739889437	
26	2739002711	
27	2738523217	Knoll's round about it going to be an issue at peak driving times, any use by cyclists will cause delays. Need to invest in overpass or alternative.
28	2738303829	
29	2737623558	
30	2737522747	
31	2737521273	Concerned that traffic lights will a problem especially at rush hour, but if the path goes ahead it will be the safer option.
32	2737519003	
33	2737518515	It might assist the traffic flow at the Knoll roundabout to have pedestrian lights there
34	2737517087	
35	2737515454	
36	2737514362	
37	2737513339	No
38	2737512292	I support this proposal and would give cyclists right of way at junctions with raised tables. I would prefer the segregated paths.
39	2737509838	Concerned about the removal of trees
40	2737506852	Plan 5 - Rather than a crossing have a ramped bridge. A crossing would cause greater congestion A243 and roundabout
41	2737042069	Improve the existing bridge over the slipway to M25. Ann uncontrolled crossing will be very dangerous and also hold up busy traffic
42	2736981200	
43	2736322000	
44	2736310699	See no. 8
45	2736301654	Consideration must be made for pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross the road at Knoll Roundabout - especially at peak times. It is unsafe to cross! You have to be young and fit to do so, so this excludes older people and those with young children. Many people must opt to drive locally rather than risk trying to get across this roundabout, this then adds to the terrible congestion. (As soon as the private schools in the area shut for the summer the local roads became less busy!). Is there no way of providing a footbridge over the roundabout or dare I say a crossing? The unmanned crossings are less than useless against a vehicle coming speeding around the roundabout and accelerating off. Could you suggest reducing the speed limit on the approach to the Knoll roundabout from Dorking (currently 50 mph!), M25 (currently 40 mph) and Ashted (currently 40 mph) to 30 mph? This I am sure would making crossing easier for all - pedestrians and cyclists.
46	2736294167	
47	2736277295	See above

ITEM 8

48	2736264708	Can see advantage of segregated path over shared use - safer - but shared use would look less cluttered Toucan crossing preferable at busy knoll roundabout junction.
49	2736248283	
50	2736230098	
51	2736224982	As 1
52	2736214726	
53	2736208191	A crossing on Dene Street must be made available to ensure safety and use of the proposed route
54	2736175390	If there were no traffic lights to make my crossing of this very busy road safe. I would not use the proposed cycle way.
55	2735947231	
56	2735651003	I think the scheme is expensive and unnecessary in this time of financial stringency. I see little evidence of high cycling volumes and such a need for these alterations.
57	2735618139	
58	2735434108	
59	2735367744	
60	2734771963	
61	2734571775	I don't like the idea of segregated paths they never seem to work as well as shared paths. Cyclists and pedestrians should be encouraged to share space. Does the crossing at the Knoll roundabout need to be so far down the Leatherhead Bypass I think it will push cyclists to go on the road.
62	2734374949	I believe the proposals for the knoll roundabout are unsafe. Given the volume and speed of traffic using the roundabout I believe the Linden Pitt path route would be safer.
63	2734247052	The roundabout is busy with traffic and good modelling will be needed to avoid the area being congested.
64	2733718464	
65	2732069805	North pavement is used by many partially disabled elderly people with mobility problems who rely on walking aids, hearing aids and, in some cases, electric buggies to do their shopping and attend medical appointments etc. In Leatherhead A highly lethal combination when mixed with cyclists travelling in both directions at the speed of modern bicycles.
66	2731905847	No
67	2731844691	
68	2731821559	In order to provide a safe and alternative cycle free pedestrian route the opposite pavement on the South side needs to be refurbished.
69	2730433883	Pelican crossings for cyclists at the roundabout will cause huge traffic delays on an extremely busy route to/from motorways. Very costly and creating severe traffic delays during construction.
70	2730417515	A crossing of some sort must be made available to ensure safety of use of the proposed route
71	2730407113	
72	2730397709	
73	2730154140	
74	2730123754	Not necessary. Toucan crossing would create unnecessary holdups at roundabout.
75	2729970552	
76	2729531461	No
77	2728920029	
78	2728454205	Excellent
79	2728232877	The Knoll roundabout is notoriously busy and dangerous. The proposal does nothing to mitigate this and will in fact (if it is used) be introducing more cyclists into a fast roundabout. It's an accident waiting to happen, although in reality I suspect that most cyclists will vote with their wheels and the cycle path will be a little used white elephant
80	2727706364	
81	2727689790	Waste of time and money very few need it
82	2727629587	
83	2727624595	I like the idea of a paved margin. Having a two way route feels very unsafe when

ITEM 8

		you going against the flow of traffic. Raised tables are essential to give confidence to younger and elderly cyclists. For the section between Garlands Road and Melvinshaw my preference is for an un-segregated path. These work better. People can work out their own best position on the path. Pedestrians and other cyclists do not always keep to a narrow segregated area. A Toucan crossing is needed at the Knoll roundabout. I would not let my child cross on an uncontrolled crossing.
84	2727416703	As above
85	2727293474	
86	2727254961	
87	2727191604	See above
88	2727130406	Not suitable. Road too narrow.
89	2726965053	
90	2726954833	
91	2726546819	No
92	2726481864	
93	2726439613	
94	2726353724	
95	2726201688	The crossing of the Leatherhead By-pass at road level is unsafe. There should be a bridge to carry cycle traffic across the by-pass
96	2726118514	No
97	2726049528	
98	2725872090	
99	2725801353	
100	2725772199	
101	2725767979	There does not seem to be any description as to how cyclists will get across the roundabout
102	2725760755	
103	2725723327	
104	2725705510	The Knoll roundabout is very dangerous for cyclists. The scheme does not particularly help as traffic going into the Leatherhead by-pass will go into any crossing (whether Toucan or not) at far too high a speed. A toucan crossing at this point will cause horrendous traffic jams on the bypass road. It is bad enough already at rush hour.
105	2725670024	
106	2725661188	A fantastic idea.
107	2725576778	Would be concerned re uncontrolled crossing.
108	2725559397	Keep the path segregated if built. The option without an uncontrolled crossing is suicidal. The option for a controlled crossing would add to the already horrific traffic problems at Knoll Roundabout. As someone who cycles through there everyday (along the proposed route path) I would be reluctant to cycle along the right-hand side of the road, especially given the number of roads to cross
109	2725095366	
110	2724876966	
111	2724752639	No comment
112	2724404884	
113	2724392227	
114	2724386668	Totally unacceptable to put a crossing at one of the busiest roundabouts in the area. Build an underpass for the safety of everyone concerned
115	2724374936	The proposals for the Knoll Roundabout will (if anything) increase congestion there. How do they fit with Surrey Future's plans for reducing congestion?
116	2724343196	
117	2724196508	
118	2723952502	
119	2723888132	
120	2723871600	
121	2723863052	
122	2723765839	As you know - the Leatherhead by-pass is an extremely busy road - there have been a number of accidents involving cyclists around the roundabout area. There must be a controlled crossing area for cyclists - the road is just too busy for an

ITEM 8

		uncontrolled crossing
123	2723272922	I live on this section. To make a new path you will remove the lawn part of the existing pavement, and my hedge, which protects my property from the main road. You already removed the lawn on the other side of the pavement in 2009, to make a cycle path, which failed. My property value will fall due to your urbanisation of Epsom Road, which only ever really sees an appreciable number of cyclists on a Sunday, a day that is extremely quiet for cars! Which begs the question, why the need for a dedicated cycle path?
124	2723051125	
125	2722844148	
126	2722735616	The road is too narrow for additional paths for cyclists
127	2722632840	
128	2722458228	
129	2722264853	
130	2722260407	I am concerned as to how the cycle path is going to work on a busy and dangerous roundabout. Cars do not keep to the correct lane or signal - sometimes they are three abreast which is not correct. I believe this roundabout should be controlled with traffic lights to make it much safer.
131	2722173433	See comments at 3. The Knoll Roundabout is very dangerous and unless a dedicated bridge is built to separate the cyclists (and pedestrians) from the cars, the scheme will not be much used, as parents will be concerned about the safety of their children. Given the high volume of traffic at the roundabout it is not likely that a Toucan crossing will be implemented.
132	2722158169	Remove the grass verges? Are you kidding me? Again these verges form part of the leafy green character of our town and removing them is degrading that character. Additionally, my property has a boundary on Epsom Road and despite having a grass verge between the footpath and our wall we still suffer with a significant amount of litter thrown into our garden, and damage to both the wall, fences and plants. Removing the verge and having the path right next to the boundary will only increase these issues. Making it a divided path without widening the path didn't work last time, why would it work this time? There is a huge road sign with two legs at the end of Melvinshaw that will be in the middle of both paths. My feelings remain about having any of the route as a shared path. The Knoll Roundabout is significantly congested at peak times and whenever there is any kind of minor (or major) incident on the M25. My immediate feeling is that adding a toucan crossing will only extend the periods that the congestion last for, so this is unlikely to help. I also strongly object again to the removal of the trees that would be required to put the path in. In addition to my earlier points about the removal of trees, these trees also provide some sound barrier from the M25 noise, which for the residents cannot afford to be lost.
133	2722136383	
134	2722108533	
135	2722070560	The toucan crossing at the Knoll roundabout would be preferable
136	2722067465	
137	2722037193	See below regarding raised tables.
138	2722002871	
139	2721984425	We think it is an excellent idea, for everyone. My husband would be able to cycle to work, as now it's just too busy and dangerous. Excellent plan.
140	2721947650	
141	2721906161	
142	2721378098	
143	2721345393	Please make the cycle path consistent. If you are going to make it shared use keep it like that throughout and do not change it for part of the section to segregated pedestrians and cyclists as that will just confuse (and not look very good)
144	2721069218	
145	2721055481	I think the bus stop should be retained and the shared facility reduced.
146	2720984494	No
147	2720708457	See 8.
148	2720678440	

149	2720539133	As above. How will they safely cross dangerous roundabout
150	2720525302	Knoll Roundabout. Any type of crossing that close to the roundabout will be dangerous for all road users approaching from the Leatherhead Town side and is likely to cause more delay on an already very busy roundabout.
151	2720410135	
152	2720312806	
153	2720246871	Controlled toucan crossing is essential at this point.
154	2768968825	Strongly support signalised pedestrian crossing at Knoll Roundabout.
155	2768042858	
156	2767706360	If bicycles are allowed this path the cars coming out of drives may not see the cyclist. This gives many opportunities for collisions or near misses.
157	2765300417	Would Prefer to see Linden Gardens and St John's Close used
158	2764703370	
159	2763269828	
160	2762936786	Already very congested, and if shared space be introduced then are you taking into account there are two sheltered housing developments in this area ?
161	2761214108	
162	2761044061	
163	2761034153	There is insufficient room on the pavement for cyclists, children's buggies, pedestrians and elderly people on motorised buggies. Cyclists should continue to use the main road.
164	2761029692	
165	2761022345	As a resident of Pegasus Court, I must express my concerns about the proposals regarding the stretch of Leatherhead Bypass heading north west from the Knoll roundabout linking the area to the M25. The proposed Toucan crossing is dangerously close to the roundabout exit with accelerating traffic on "top of the crossing" far too early. The Knoll roundabout is virtually gridlocked during rush hours and is further clogged by school traffic during term time. The traffic lights at Grange Road causes long tailbacks, at certain times as far as the M25 slip road roundabout. The introduction of a pedestrian controlled crossing can only add to problems already existing, particularly if it is not synchronised with other traffic lights. The alternative uncontrolled crossing is far more sensible - this junction has no history as an accident black spot. It would not add to existing traffic problems. In either crossing scheme, the felling of the three trees is most regrettable, particularly as they help provide an effective screen from road noise for nearby residents of Pegasus Court.
166	2760040513	
167	2759547758	
168	2759351521	
169	2759319404	
170	2755899227	No, see section 8
171	2754896868	If it is to be on the current pavement it will require a disproportionate investment as the pavement is totally unsuitable due to differing elevations and disruption due to protected mature tree roots. If it could be part of the road then the road needs repairing as it is treacherous due to potholes and cheap resurfacing where the ironworks have not been raised to road level.
172	2754713323	Yes, it's more shared path rubbish, build them properly or not at all.

ITEM 8

Section 3 – Knoll Roundabout to Ermyn Way (Plans 6 to 7)

5. Do you have any comments about this section of the proposed cycle path?

No	ID	Comment
1	2753048579	
2	2750849452	
3	2750390462	I find crossing the Knoll roundabout difficult at the best of times! However if there is to be no toucan crossing then these plans look adequate. I might prefer to use the overhead crossing further down the A243 northbound.
4	2749629075	
5	2749291332	
6	2749270972	Removal of the footbridge is a retrograde step and a toucan crossing will slow traffic flow during the critical start and end of the school day.
7	2747523846	Existing footpath is appalling. Very fast heavy traffic. No point adding on cycle lane. Schoolchildren to Downsend, St. Peter's and west Ashtead using pavement. Dangerous to add cycle path.
8	2746970443	As above
	2745543421	9. School entrance and exit: clarification of the right of way of pedestrians and cyclists over entering and exiting traffic is needed. 10. Grange Road: the tree to the northeast of the junction would tend to push cyclists and pedestrians towards the road as the path narrows to go around it as proposed. It would be better to make the roadway narrower. It's very wide here as two lanes merge back to one, yet the merging of these two lanes in practice is problematic as drivers in the left lane approaching from Leatherhead tend not to realise that the right hand lane is also an ahead lane; they often move from the left lane into the centre of the road, encroaching badly on traffic in the right lane which gets caught by the central island and a vehicle in the middle of the wide road. Making the right hand lane right turn only would simplify the traffic flow at this junction and allow the shared use path to stay at least 3 m wide around the tree, narrowing the roadway accordingly, but still leaving plenty of width for the road.
9	2744270965	Yes
10	2743919804	
11	2743530877	
12	2742526357	
13	2742055876	I am concerned that the practical aspects of cyclists crossing the carriage way should be properly thought through and assessed by a cyclist where it has already been implemented.
14	2741891569	Cyclists will not enjoy using the section from the Panda crossing as it will be uphill.
15	2741053162	
16	2741012330	Turn into / out of Downsend very busy, would cars give way to bikes?
17	2740355968	Uncontrolled crossing of Grange Road is clearly in the interests of maximising traffic flow (vehicles and cycles) but risks from eastbound vehicles turning left off A24 need to be fully considered. Cycles should have right of way over Downsend school entrances!
18	2739961451	
19	2739920452	No
20	2739915058	
21	2739903496	
22	2739897881	
23	2739893290	Grange Road is key to success of this project as key link to 3 schools! Efforts must be made to encourage cyclists to use Grange Road
24	2739889437	
25	2739002711	Living off Barnet Wood Lane, this is the nearest point that I can connect with the cycle path if I decide to cycle into Leatherhead this way I would have preferred you to have adapted the path along the Linden Pit as it has far great connectivity with most of the people living in Ashtead - let alone enabling school children to cycle to school). My suggestion is that if you have a surplus of funds you ought to create a cycle path from the crossroads down Grange Road to connect and go alongside both the schools, which would at least allow children to connect between the

		schools and the proposed cycle path.
26	2738523217	No comments
27	2738303829	
28	2737623558	
29	2737522747	
30	2737521273	
31	2737519003	
32	2737518515	
33	2737517087	Toucan crossing may need to be further from the junction
34	2737515454	
35	2737514362	
36	2737513339	No
37	2737512292	I support the proposal particularly the removal of the footbridge
38	2737509838	Removal of footbridge and use of controlled crossing will aggravate traffic congestion 8 - 9am
39	2737506852	Plan 6 - suggest a no right turn into school entrance (Downsend School)
40	2753048579	
41	2737042069	Improve the existing bridge over the slipway to M25. An uncontrolled crossing will be very dangerous and also hold up busy traffic
42	2736981200	
43	2736322000	Don't need to model traffic at Knoll Roundabout to see this will cause more congestion!
44	2736310699	See no. 8
45	2736301654	
46	2736294167	An uncontrolled crossing at the Knoll Roundabout is shown as an (less preferred) option. The whole scheme would be pointless if a controlled crossing is not installed.
47	2736277295	If there are lights it will cause the traffic to back up alarmingly. A central island would help pedestrians enormously.
48	2736264708	Applaud revival of footbridge and new toucan crossing at Ermyn Way
49	2736248283	Concerns about congestion on roundabout - have a hatched area on the roundabout? One very muddy part of the footpath - bad drainage - needs to be sorted out
50	2736230098	See question 8
51	2736224982	As1
52	2736214726	
53	2736208191	
54	2736175390	
55	2735947231	
56	2735651003	I think the scheme is expensive and unnecessary in this time of financial stringency. I see little evidence of high cycling volumes and such a need for these alterations.
57	2735618139	
58	2735434108	
59	2735367744	
60	2734771963	
61	2734571775	Replacing the footbridge with a Toucan crossing is a great idea; this bridge is hardly used now. Everyday I watch dozens of school kids crossing the road and waiting in the middle it is an accident waiting to happen. Does the tree have to be cut down? I would like to see the Scheme extended to include some of Grange road so that the St Andrews & Downsend kids can get to school safely.
62	2734374949	
63	2734247052	It would be sensible to extend the cycle path down Grange Road to the schools to enable school children to safely cycle to the new cycle path - at least you will be able to show some connectivity for people in Grange Rd and it might just be worthwhile for me to cycle up to the new path rather than cycling along Linden Pit path to / from Leatherhead.
64	2733718464	
65	2732069805	
66	2731905847	No

ITEM 8

67	2731844691	
68	2731821559	This I believe is the most dangerous part of the route for cyclists, pedestrians and car users. The removal of the footbridge and replacement of a pedestrian crossing (which I support) will place more pedestrians in danger from irresponsible car drivers. The junction at Ermyn Way has suffered a number of accidents mainly due to drivers overtaking and speeding in order to beat the lights. In order to make this junction safer I would propose that the outside lanes from both Epsom and Leatherhead be RIGHT TURN ONLY.
69	2730433883	Shared pathway for cyclists and pedestrians is a serious Health and Safety hazard. I was almost hit by a selfish cyclist who insisted on using the footpath outside the cycle shop and the guitar shop in Leatherhead on 21/07/13. He did not use a bell to warn me he was behind me! I consider It's a disgraceful waste of finances to build an unnecessary cycle path when funds could be invested in other projects the local public feel strongly about.
70	2730417515	
71	2730407113	
72	2730397709	
73	2730154140	
74	2730123754	Not necessary. Leave the bridge alone.
75	2729970552	
76	2729531461	No
77	2728920029	
78	2728454205	Excellent
79	2728232877	Given the above regarding the Knoll roundabout an expensive section of cycle path here is a waste of money
80	2727706364	
81	2727689790	Waste of time and money more people cycle along Barnett Wood Lane between Ashtead and Leatherhead
82	2727629587	
83	2727624595	Between Knoll roundabout and Ermyn Way the grass verge is a good idea, provided the width of the cycle path can be maintained.
84	2727416703	As above
85	2727293474	
86	2727254961	
87	2727191604	See above
88	2727130406	Too much congestion at busy times
89	2726965053	
90	2726954833	
91	2726546819	No
92	2726481864	
93	2726439613	
94	2726353724	
95	2726201688	
96	2726118514	Just some concern about people turning right from Ashtead section of A24 into Grange Road, if altering traffic signalling here, may be an opportunity for a turn R filter light at this point. Would be safer for road users and pedestrians and cyclists
97	2726049528	
98	2725872090	The footpath, in the dip, just before the car entrance to Downsends School. Floods regularly and is often impassable.
99	2725801353	
100	2725772199	
101	2725767979	Would have thought a more 'adventurous' option would be Ottway's lane?
102	2725760755	
103	2725723327	
104	2725705510	The crossing of Grange road is a problem and if no priority is given at anytime to cyclists (in the phasing of the lights) then it will be dangerous.
105	2725670024	
106	2725661188	A fantastic idea
107	2725576778	Good but is the removal of the tree necessary? Can another be planted in lieu?

		(Even elsewhere...)
108	2725559397	Keep the path segregated if built
109	2725095366	
110	2724876966	
111	2724752639	No comment
112	2724404884	
113	2724392227	How safe is this section going to be? As a pedestrian this is a very unsafe place for crossing the road at Knoll Roundabout.
114	2724386668	
115	2724374936	
116	2724343196	
117	2724196508	
118	2723952502	How will this be accomplished without causing undue delay to vehicular traffic? The Knoll Roundabout scheme drawing is flawed. How is pedestrian and vehicle detection to be provided?
119	2723888132	
120	2723871600	
121	2723863052	
122	2723765839	Looks fine
123	2723272922	
124	2723051125	
125	2722844148	
126	2722735616	Should be OK
127	2722632840	
128	2722458228	
129	2722264853	
130	2722260407	My main concern here is an uncontrolled crossing at Grange Road - this road has three schools and child safety may be impacted. This would be similar to Ermyn Way as children also cross there to get to their respective schools.
131	2722173433	See comments at 3 and 4.
132	2722158169	Removal of the island at the top of Grange Road will only make a dangerous road harder to cross, especially during school run time. The addition of a Toucan crossing will only fuel the tail back of traffic there already is at peak times from the cross roads across the bridge to the Knoll roundabout. The footbridge is a far safer option for children who are always tempted to run across roads than wait for the green man, and this removes the need for the Toucan crossing adding more disruption to the traffic flow. Again I object to the removal of trees. The path being only 1.8m wide past the bus stop, is this really safe?? Not in my opinion
133	2722136383	The construction of any crossing which will temporarily and frequently halt traffic flow at this already overly congested route will be disastrous. Has any thought been given to innovative redesign of the pedestrian bridge, which crosses the A243 a few yards further down the road? Could this not be altered so that cyclists could use it to cross the A243? A simple up, over and down section could be possible (cost dependent of course) and this would be far safer for cyclists without impeding traffic flow.
134	2722108533	
135	2722070560	At the Ermyn Way junction rather than a Toucan crossing would a pedestrian / cyclist phase be preferable since it would also protect anybody crossing Ermyn Way or Grange Road.
136	2722067465	
137	2722037193	
138	2722002871	
139	2721984425	We think it is an excellent idea, for everyone. My husband would be able to cycle to work, as now its just too busy and dangerous. Excellent plan.
140	2721947650	
141	2721906161	
142	2721378098	
143	2721345393	It is essential to have the toucan crossing. If that is not provided then there is no point providing the rest of the route since the Knoll roundabout will continue to be a

ITEM 8

		big barrier - unless that barrier can be negotiated no-one is going to use the whole route. At the junction with Ermyn Way a controlled crossing of Grange Road is needed - again unless this is provided when it is busy there will be on safe point during the traffic signals stage when cyclists can cross the road safely. Further more the staggered crossing of the A24 should be provided as a straight across crossing but could be to the north of the junction.
144	2721069218	
145	2721055481	I do not believe with the volume of traffic at peak times that the Toucan crossing on the Knoll roundabout is practical.
146	2720984494	Do not feel removal of the footbridge is appropriate. The road during peak hours is exceptionally busy and when lots of children get off buses and need to cross this is the safest option. A toucan crossing would result on more pedestrians on an extremely busy and congested road and on my opinion would be too dangerous.
147	2720708457	See 8.
148	2720678440	Crossing Knoll Roundabout is obviously the scary bit for non-cyclists.
149	2720539133	How will they cross roundabout safely
150	2720525302	
151	2720410135	
152	2720312806	
153	2720246871	
154	2768968825	
155	2768042858	
156	2767706360	The pedestrian crossing at the Knoll roundabout will hold up traffic considerably. Also all cars will not be able to see the crossing until it may be too late. There are better alternative routes.
157	2765300417	Would prefer to See Linden pit path over the motorway and A243 Used
158	2764703370	
159	2763269828	
160	2762936786	Already a dangerous area, with parents from the private schools who take no notice of any road rules Together with parents from St Andrews. No room for a cycle path
161	2761214108	
162	2761044061	
163	2761034153	There is insufficient room on the pavement for cyclists, children's buggies, pedestrians and elderly people on motorised buggies. Cyclists should continue to use the main road.
164	2761029692	
165	2761022345	No
166	2760040513	
167	2759547758	
168	2759351521	I can see this being the most dangerous part of the route. Already this is congested by people turning into the private school and they try and zoom into the school entrance. People turning right into the school will not see cyclists approaching from leatherhead, and people coming from roundabout by car will not see the cyclist when they turn in. Also you mixing motorists many of whom are driving large cars or 4x 4 with cyclists on a congested entry into the school a recipe for a big accident.
169	2759319404	
170	2755899227	No, see section 8
171	2754896868	
172	2754713323	Yes, it's more shared path rubbish, build them properly or not at all.

Section 4 – Ermyn Way to the Ashtead Village Gateway (Plans 8 to 10)

6. Do you have any comments about this section of the proposed cycle path?

No	ID	Comment
1	2753048579	I do not see a need for spending public money on this; the road is already well lit, straight and has good visibility for cyclists to ride on the road. The grass verges are an important visual amenity and contribute to the "village" feel. I have ridden my bike along the road regularly at all times of day for many years and never had any problems. The shared use cycle lane along Barnett Wood Lane is often ignored by cyclists who prefer to ride on the road, as shared use cycle paths tend to be mainly used by pedestrians, who tend to get in the way of cyclists. Further bollards, tarmac and road markings will cheapen the overall look of the village, and for the amount of money spent on such a scheme, it will not pay for itself.
2	2750849452	
3	2750390462	These plans look safe and make much better use of the areas on each side of the A24. This part could have a shared pathway as there are not so many pedestrians.
4	2749629075	
5	2749291332	
6	2749270972	A second toucan crossing by Stag Leys seems excessive.
7	2747523846	
8	2746970443	As above
9	2745543421	11. Uplands – same as Garlands Road and Melvinshaw. 12. House numbers 15 to 21 Leatherhead Road and opposite number 76: the roadway here is wide enough that the width of the shared use path could easily be maintained at a minimum of 3 m. 13. Ashtead Gateway: the path should go both sides of the tree, adjusting the position and design of the gateway to accommodate it.
10	2744270965	Yes
11	2743919804	Provision of Warning signs at all raised table crossings
12	2743530877	Given the current gradient at Old Court, the 'raised table' at the junction with the A24 will have to be higher than normal and the approach will also have to be re-graded (i.e. Made steeper). During winter many cars have had difficulty exiting Old Court because of ice and compacted snow and this will make it more difficult. There is therefore a strong case to install a sand/salt bin at or near the junction
13	2742526357	
14	2742055876	I think it is a sound idea to separate cyclists from other vehicles. This is a good proposal.
15	2741891569	
16	2741053162	
17	2741012330	I think cycle path should be extended down Grange Road to link St Andrews and St Peters school to it - more people would be likely to use it
18	2740355968	No. It looks fine.
19	2739961451	
20	2739920452	No
21	2739915058	
22	2739903496	There are innumerable house exits across the pavement which will it make it very dangerous for cyclists
23	2739897881	
24	2739893290	Consideration / awareness of dangers of emerging traffic from driveways must be made
25	2739889437	
26	2739002711	
27	2738523217	No comments
28	2738303829	
29	2737623558	
30	2737522747	
31	2737521273	
32	2737519003	
33	2737518515	
34	2737517087	

ITEM 8

35	2737515454	
36	2737514362	
37	2737513339	No
38	2737512292	I support this proposal
39	2737509838	Seems a crazy place to reduce the width of the road, need 2 lane approach to lights
40	2737506852	
41	2737042069	Use Ottway's road which is quieter and takes cyclist to the bridge over the slip road to the M25
42	2736981200	
43	2736322000	The road is a racetrack and not pleasant to cycle alongside
44	2736310699	See No. 8
45	2736301654	
46	2736294167	
47	2736277295	See above
48	2736264708	Welcome toucan crossing at Stage Leys
49	2736248283	
50	2736230098	
51	2736224982	As 1
52	2736214726	
53	2736208191	
54	2736175390	
55	2735947231	
56	2735651003	I think the scheme is expensive and unnecessary in this time of financial stringency. I see little evidence of high cycling volumes and such a need for these alterations.
57	2735618139	
58	2735434108	
59	2735367744	
60	2734771963	
61	2734571775	I would like to see more grass verge retained. There seems to be a discrepancy on the match line between plans 9 & 10 the grass verge doesn't continue?
62	2734374949	
63	2734247052	
64	2733718464	
65	2732069805	
66	2731905847	No
67	2731844691	
68	2731821559	Have concerns about the width of path available given the number of mature trees
69	2730433883	Delays traffic flow during construction. Funds would be better spent on vital projects eg.car parks / improving the roads within Leatherhead
70	2730417515	
71	2730407113	
72	2730397709	
73	2730154140	Would be good if the path could divert down to Grange Road/Ottway's Lane to cover the four schools on this stretch of road
74	2730123754	Not necessary. Toucan crossing not necessary.
75	2729970552	
76	2729531461	You should make special provision for an entrance to West Ashtead school and movement in and out of here. Should the crossing at Stag Leys be nearer the West Ashtead school? If you don't do this you will have kids and parents running across at any point on the road. They will not walk further down from Ashtead away from the school to double back.
77	2728920029	
78	2728454205	Excellent
79	2728232877	Once again, a busy main road with numerous driveways and turnings which will be far from ideal for a cycle path, but in any case this whole route is wrong and will be little used
80	2727706364	
81	2727689790	Waste of time and money more people cycle along Barnett Wood Lane between

		Ashtead and Leatherhead
82	2727629587	
83	2727624595	Raised tables and the grass verge separating from traffic are important.
84	2727416703	As above
85	2727293474	
86	2727254961	
87	2727191604	See above
88	2727130406	Road far too congested and narrowing it will make it far worse
89	2726965053	
90	2726954833	
91	2726546819	Yes - see comments about scheme as a whole
92	2726481864	
93	2726439613	
94	2726353724	
95	2726201688	
96	2726118514	No
97	2726049528	
98	2725872090	
99	2725801353	
100	2725772199	
101	2725767979	As above
102	2725760755	
103	2725723327	
104	2725705510	
105	2725670024	
106	2725661188	A fantastic idea
107	2725576778	Good but is the removal of the tree necessary? Can another be planted in lieu? (Even elsewhere...)
108	2725559397	You gotta keep em separated
109	2725095366	
110	2724876966	
111	2724752639	No comment
112	2724404884	
113	2724392227	Again how safe is this going to be?
114	2724386668	
115	2724374936	
116	2724343196	
117	2724196508	
118	2723952502	
119	2723888132	
120	2723871600	
121	2723863052	
122	2723765839	Looks fine
123	2723272922	
124	2723051125	
125	2722844148	
126	2722735616	Should be OK
127	2722632840	
128	2722458228	
129	2722264853	
130	2722260407	Stag Leys crossing has been long overdue and will be welcomed.
131	2722173433	See general comments at 3.
132	2722158169	Toucan crossing at Stag Leys, a further disruption to the traffic flow
133	2722136383	
134	2722108533	
135	2722070560	No
136	2722067465	
137	2722037193	

ITEM 8

138	2722002871	
139	2721984425	We think it is an excellent idea, for everyone. My husband would be able to cycle to work, as now its just too busy and dangerous. Excellent plan.
140	2721947650	
141	2721906161	
142	2721378098	
143	2721345393	Why not make the road narrower on this section. In Ashtead village at the start / end of the cycle route it is less than 6 metres anyway. A 6,5 metre wide road should be sufficient even taking into account that buses and hgvs use the A24 - this width of road would encourage the traffic to slow down - perhaps this section should be 30 mph and not 40 mph
144	2721069218	
145	2721055481	No
146	2720984494	Too many toucan crossings, which will slow traffic that is already very slow moving and backs up towards Epsom and onto the M25 during peak time.
147	2720708457	See 8.
148	2720678440	It'll be noisy
149	2720539133	No
150	2720525302	
151	2720410135	
152	2720312806	
153	2720246871	
154	2768968825	
155	2768042858	
156	2767706360	
157	2765300417	Would prefer to see Ottway's lane used
158	2764703370	
159	2763269828	
160	2762936786	A fast straight stretch of road, the cyclists who use this are very visible and there is enough room to get around them without inconveniencing anyone else.
161	2761214108	
162	2761044061	
163	2761034153	
164	2761029692	
165	2761022345	No
166	2760040513	
167	2759547758	
168	2759351521	
169	2759319404	
170	2755899227	No, see section 8
171	2754896868	
172	2754713323	Yes, it's more shared path rubbish, build them properly or not at all.

Section 5 – Ashtead Village Gateway to Ashtead (Plans 11 to 14)

7. Do you have any comments about this section of the proposed cycle path?

No	ID	Comments
1	2753048579	See above.
2	2750849452	
3	2750390462	This section of the cycle path is very good and gives cyclists a much better chance of getting over Ottway's Lane.
4	2749629075	
5	2749291332	
6	2749270972	The cycle path ends as you approach The Street - the narrowest section and where cyclists need most protection from motorists.
7	2747523846	
8	2746970443	As above
9	2745543421	<p>14. Old Court – same as Garlands Road and Melvinshaw. 15. Tree three houses northeast of Old Court where proposed to narrow path to 2.4 m. The roadway is wide enough here to maintain the width of the shared use path around the tree. 16. Warren Court – same as Garlands Road and Melvinshaw. 17. Northeast bound traffic around Parker's Hill is frequently well in excess of the 30 mph speed limit which the vehicles have entered some way back. Crossing at this uncontrolled crossing is already difficult because of the excessive speeds, and especially so with young children from whom this is a route to West Ashtead School along a nearby footpath. The combination of the narrowing of the pathway, the pedestrians and cyclists who may be waiting to cross to Parker's Hill, or who are crossing and arriving at the path and needing to get onto it to avoid cars, together with the need for cyclists and pedestrians on the path to go around the tree, and the high traffic speeds make this narrowing of the path to 2.5 m at this point to preserve the tree less tolerable than in other places with a similar width. On the other hand, a squeeze to help slow the traffic and shorten the distance pedestrians and cyclists need to cross would be beneficial to everyone (including motorists who can avoid the police ticketing them at the nearby bus stop where there is often a speed trap). Thus widening the path and making this a squeeze for the road would help everyone. If the uncontrolled crossing beside Warren Court and the island in between these crossings were also used as squeezes, that would assist too. 18. Ottway's Lane: The traffic island here provides a crucial refuge for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Ottway's Lane. While many people do use the narrower but islandless place where the curbs are dropped as a crossing further down Ottway's Lane and close to Timberhill, many others choose to use the island instead, where they have a better view of the traffic on the A24. Keeping an island is therefore important, although it may need to move southeastwards 19. Greville Park Road -- same as Garlands Road and Melvinshaw. 20. Greville Park Road and Northfields: the raised table would be better extended to Northfields, which should have signs banning bicycles removed and replaced with ones permitting bicycles but requiring cyclists to give way to pedestrians. In practice even the police cycle along Northfields, Cyclists cause no problems to pedestrians provided they give way on such paths. Cycling should be encouraged not banned. 21. End of shared path: how utterly typical, it just stops. No provision for cyclists to merge safely onto the road, just a sudden stop. This needs to join up to the Street. I know it's narrow, but some provision is needed</p>
10	2744270965	Yes
11	2743919804	Cyclists still have to negotiate The Street /Woodfield Lane Junction
12	2743530877	Given the current gradient at Old Court, the proposed 'raised table' at the junction with the A24 will have to be higher than normal and the approach will also have to be re-graded (i.e. Made steeper). During winter many cars have had difficulty exiting Old Court because of ice and compacted snow and this will make it yet more difficult. There is therefore a strong case to install a sand/salt bin at or near the junction

ITEM 8

13	2742526357	
14	2742055876	I think it is much safer, for both drivers and cyclists, to separate cyclists from other wheeled traffic. This is a good proposal.
15	2741891569	
16	2741053162	Ottway's Lane junction: Busy junction, traffic turning right off the A24 has to move fast to cut across heavy traffic along the A24. No time to praise for raised tables. Ditto if turning out - have to accelerate into busy traffic, often cars queue up to get out of Ottway's Lane. Why on earth take away the island? This is vital for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. What is the point of a toucan crossing near Greville Park Road when there is already a similar crossing by the Shell Garage?
17	2741012330	No
18	2740355968	Ottway's Lane. Pulling stop line back as shown will reduce visibility for vehicles turning right onto A24; unacceptably so if a bus is at the bus stop. This visibility must not be reduced. Text and plan do not seem to agree between Greville Park Road and Woodfield Lane. Plan shows cycle lane ending before Shell garage presumably putting cyclists back on the A24. This sort of ending by throwing cyclists back into traffic they cannot see without looking 170 degrees behind them is all too common and totally unacceptable. The path must end so that cyclists have good sightlines, either by exiting at Greville Park Road or Woodfield. Text says the cycle path rejoins the A24 east of Woodfield but no indication of how Woodfield is crossed or protected from left turning vehicles.
19	2739961451	
20	2739920452	No
21	2739915058	
22	2739903496	
23	2739897881	Ottway's Lane - traffic turning right from Ashtead Village direction could possibly have to stop for cyclists to cross in the path of oncoming traffic from Leatherhead
24	2739893290	Must link to Glenville Park Road and Parkers Lane to connect other village areas
25	2739889437	
26	2739002711	
27	2738523217	No comments
28	2738303829	
29	2737623558	
30	2737522747	
31	2737521273	The least successful section, especially in the area of the Ashtead gateway sign. Now that Ashtead starts at the M25 could it be moved to a better place or just restricted to one side.
32	2737519003	
33	2737518515	
34	2737517087	I endorse the toucan crossing
35	2737515454	
36	2737514362	
37	2737513339	No
38	2737512292	I support this proposal. I think there should also be a 'friendlier' crossing at the junction with the Warren - space to have a push chair or bike on the central reservation and even lights
39	2737509838	
40	2737506852	
41	2737042069	Use Ottway's road which is quieter and takes cyclist to the bridge over the slip road to the M25
42	2736981200	
43	2736322000	What about narrow section by the petrol station?
44	2736310699	See No. 8
45	2736301654	
46	2736294167	
47	2736277295	See above
48	2736264708	Welcome retention of grass verges
49	2736248283	
50	2736230098	

51	2736224982	As 1
52	2736214726	
53	2736208191	
54	2736175390	
55	2735947231	
56	2735651003	I think the scheme is expensive and unnecessary in this time of financial stringency. I see little evidence of high cycling volumes and such a need for these alterations.
57	2735618139	
58	2735434108	
59	2735367744	
60	2734771963	
61	2734571775	
62	2734374949	
63	2734247052	
64	2733718464	
65	2732069805	
66	2731905847	No
67	2731844691	
68	2731821559	Ditto above
69	2730433883	The cycle path is unnecessary and very unpopular. A complete waste of time and finances.
70	2730417515	
71	2730407113	
72	2730397709	
73	2730154140	Would be great if pathway could continue down through Ottway's Lane as traffic is very fast on this road and there are a few areas with no pavements and limited visibility on the way to the schools
74	2730123754	Not necessary.
75	2729970552	
76	2729531461	Yes. You have now got a lot of traffic lights on the road. Others are near Milners carpet store just 100 yards down the road. You have stopped short of the dangerous crossing / junctions at the Brewers pub. Woodfield land and Rectory lane are nightmares for cars and cyclists. Seems a shame a child could die here if you have installed a new cycle path and they can't get to it. This is where it should start and the traffic lights need installing. Also you can solve the visibility issue at the junction for all with Woodfield lane and the A24. This would help any future shopping and car park development at Ashtead. To not do this would be a waste of taxpayer's money and to drivers they would start going down Craddocks avenue to avoid the 4 sets of traffic lights you will have from the Street in Ashtead to the M25 bridge on the A24.
77	2728920029	
78	2728454205	Excellent
79	2728232877	Ditto above
80	2727706364	Do the plans affect the proposed changes to the junction for the Tesco development, particularly the narrowing of the A24 carriageway at the junction with Woodfield Lane, which has been proposed as part of the Tesco planning application? If so, how has this been taken into account?
81	2727689790	Waste of time and money more people cycle along Barnett Wood Lane between Ashtead and Leatherhead
82	2727629587	
83	2727624595	Raised tables and the grass verge separating from traffic are important.
84	2727416703	As above
85	2727293474	
86	2727254961	At the junction between Old Court and Leatherhead Road, it is not clear who has priority cyclists or cars when cars are exiting from Old Court. Line of sight at present is poor because of the down slope and the proposed raised table should help, but if cars are required to stop BEFORE the cycle lane (i.e. Further back than at present), sight lines will become worse and even dangerous
87	2727191604	See above

ITEM 8

88	2727130406	Will make a bad situation worse
89	2726965053	
90	2726954833	
91	2726546819	Yes - see comments about scheme as a whole
92	2726481864	
93	2726439613	
94	2726353724	
95	2726201688	
96	2726118514	No
97	2726049528	
98	2725872090	
99	2725801353	
100	2725772199	
101	2725767979	As above
102	2725760755	
103	2725723327	
104	2725705510	Where are cyclists meant to appear from/disperse at this end of scheme? It seems to leave them in a busy limbo just before the narrow part of the road entering the village.
105	2725670024	
106	2725661188	A fantastic idea
107	2725576778	Looks good
108	2725559397	Go with separated option at all points where this is an option
109	2725095366	
110	2724876966	
111	2724752639	No comment
112	2724404884	
113	2724392227	
114	2724386668	
115	2724374936	
116	2724343196	
117	2724196508	
118	2723952502	
119	2723888132	
120	2723871600	
121	2723863052	
122	2723765839	Looks fine
123	2723272922	
124	2723051125	
125	2722844148	
126	2722735616	Should be OK
127	2722632840	
128	2722458228	
129	2722264853	
130	2722260407	Why are the traffic islands on Ottway's Lane being proposed to removal? If they are kept, there is half a chance of getting across the road safely, rather than having to wait for both ways to become clear.
131	2722173433	See general comments at 3.
132	2722158169	Removal of the island at Ottway's Lane makes this a very difficult road to cross, not realistic when you bear in mind how many retirement/old people housing is near-by and they would use this regularly to access Ashtead village on foot.
133	2722136383	
134	2722108533	
135	2722070560	Although there are clear lane markings at the Parkers Close / Ottway's Lane junctions onto the A24 there is a tendency by drivers to (a) cut the corners and (b) get into the opposing lane early. Removing the bollards could reinforce this tendency.
136	2722067465	

137	2722037193	
138	2722002871	
139	2721984425	We think it is an excellent idea, for everyone. My husband would be able to cycle to work, as now its just too busy and dangerous. Excellent plan.
140	2721947650	
141	2721906161	
142	2721378098	
143	2721345393	
144	2721069218	
145	2721055481	I do not think a Toucan crossing at Greville Park Road is necessary
146	2720984494	Cycle path runs out just as the shops and pavements start to widen out for pedestrians. Will see cyclists taking this as an ok to cycle on the pavements here as the road is busy with parked cars And deliveries. A recipe for disaster.
147	2720708457	See 8.
148	2720678440	
149	2720539133	No
150	2720525302	
151	2720410135	
152	2720312806	
153	2720246871	To be completely effective the cycle path needs to be taken further into Ashtead village.
154	2768968825	
155	2768042858	
156	2767706360	
157	2765300417	Would prefer to see Ottway's Lane and the The Street used
158	2764703370	
159	2763269828	
160	2762936786	NO ROOM, road is already tight. Definitely NOT.
161	2761214108	
162	2761044061	
163	2761034153	There is insufficient room on the pavement for cyclists, children's buggies, pedestrians and elderly people on motorised buggies. Cyclists should continue to use the main road.
164	2761029692	
165	2761022345	No
166	2760040513	
167	2759547758	
168	2759351521	How are cyclists supposed to merge in with the 30 mph traffic line into a very narrow entrance and bend coming into Ashtead
169	2759319404	
170	2755899227	No, see section 8
171	2754896868	
172	2754713323	Yes, it's more shared path rubbish, build them properly or not at all.
173	2768968825	

ITEM 8

8. Would you like to make any comments on the scheme as a whole?

No	ID	Comment
1	2753048579	I would rather see pressure on cyclists to use lights on bikes at night and in the dark. It does seem like a waste of rather a lot of money, I believe the Barnett Wood Lane to Therfield cycle route cost in the region of £165000. I'd be interested to see any research that shows that this would a) decrease any cycle related accidents (are there any along this route?) And b) encourage the population of Ashtead to ride bicycles more often?
2	2750849452	The cycle lanes around Surrey have cost a lot of money and further funds are being apportioned to this scheme. As a simple survey perhaps a Sunday spent on the A24 between Dorking and Burford Bridge roundabout will indicate that whilst it is in the interest of cyclists to use these special lanes they appear to ignore them entirely. I counted 5 from 48 cyclists using the designated lanes in a period of 30 minutes whilst the remainder dived with fast moving traffic on the dual carriageway. Therefore the expense of £600,000 of Surrey resident's funds will not be well spent. A question to the cycling fraternity had the response that the cycle lane was not fit for purpose. This surface is better than the main road. Please consider enforcing the use of cycle lanes before any other schemes are considered. I like cycling but many cyclists appear to ignore safety of other road users, including walkers.
3	2750390462	I think the scheme as a whole is well planned and much needed to encourage safe cycling. Removal of some trees is necessary as it will 'open up' the pathway and make it lighter and safer. I am sure a lot more people will be able to cycle to Leatherhead from Ashtead because it will provide a safer more level path. I am retired and would enjoy keeping up my cycling which the scheme would enable me to do. I live in Albert road Ashtead.
4	2749629075	I have no objection to the concept of the scheme and will probably use it as a cyclist. But I am currently a pedestrian and am very aware that cyclists already use pavements and generally pay very little regard to pedestrians. I have great concern that either accidents will happen or children who currently walk to school may end up back in cars.
5	2749291332	
6	2749270972	It would be preferable to add a cycle lane to the east side of Barnett Wood Lane, which passes the school and keeps cyclists away from heavy traffic by passing beneath the M25 and the A243. This could be extended up Woodfield Lane to bring cyclists safely and conveniently to The Street where additional cycle parking should be added. At the southern end the cycle path could be taken across the A245 using a Toucan crossing and from there extended into the centre of Leatherhead. This would encourage more people to cycle than the proposed route.
7	2747523846	Find quieter roads to add cycle paths. A24 too busy and fast, and Epsom road is route to many schools for pedestrians. Adding cyclists to path is dangerous.
8	2746970443	As above. After looking at it in detail I do not support this scheme mainly because I do not feel it will meet its stated objectives. I also suspect that the cost has been underestimated and that the ongoing annual maintenance to the cycle path and control of the trees and vegetation has not been considered. I do not feel this is a good use of my Central Government taxes nor of my Council Tax.
9	2745543421	Comments on Leatherhead Ashtead cycle path proposals Generally, cycle paths between Ashtead and Leatherhead are much to be welcomed. The questions is the details, which in the past have been grotesquely wrong, demonstrating a total lack of understanding of the needs of safety and utility for cyclists. At present the cycle path in Ashtead along Craddocks Avenue is obstructed by trees, which completely obstruct the path and endanger cyclists, and wiggles in the path and road at the chicanes, which force cyclists and motor vehicles into dangerously converging paths. The fiasco of the earlier "cycle path" along Epsom Road in Leatherhead had obstructions in it which made the path impassable by bicycle ... The question therefore is can we have a path which is safe and useful for cyclists, which is pleasant and efficacious to use, and which doesn't force them to give way if they use it at points where they would otherwise have had priority on the road. If these conditions are not met, then another fiasco will result, which instead of encouraging people out of cars and onto bicycles will continue to send the signal that says "we

ITEM 8

		make token gestures to cyclists, but actually we ourselves never use a bike and we don't care about cyclists, only about whether we can pretend that we do." Without a path that is safe and convenient, we will end up with cyclists not using the path, and no reduction in motor traffic. I welcome the shared use path, but as it stands I would choose to use Ottway's Lane and Linden Pit Path or to cycle along the road on the A24 for much of the route so as not to have to stop and give way at side roads where priority hasn't been clearly enforced over motor traffic.
10	2744270965	Yes - it would safer for road users if the cyclists were directed along the back of St Johns School and through to the bridges over the M25/A24 then present footpath next to St Andrews School, then if necessary along Ottway's Lane to the Street.
11	2743919804	I comment as both a cyclist and motorist , if the cycle path goes ahead is there any compulsion for cyclists to actually use it and get off the road
12	2743530877	Based on London's experience, one can anticipate a threefold increase in cycle traffic if the cycleway goes ahead. With pedestrians and cyclists sharing the same pathway, there is therefore a real danger to pedestrians from cyclists approaching silently from behind. Could not the pathways be segregated by at least painting a line or colour coding of the tarmac? Note, many elderly people walk from Warren Court to the village centre and this will scare them.
13	2742526357	It cannot be right to spend public money to benefit one group to the detriment of a larger group - i.e. Pedestrians (especially children and elderly people). How many people who have cut down on car use will feel forced to go back to driving, because it has become unsafe to walk? Has anyone consulted the cyclists? Last time a cycle track was put in along Epsom Road the cyclists objected and it was removed. As I understand it, they would prefer a route along Linden Pit Path and Ottway's Lane, using the bridge over the By-Pass instead of the Knoll Roundabout. Why not live and let live, as we have done successfully all these years?
14	2742055876	I hope the council will remember that cyclists will only feel safe to use the proposed cycle route if it is well maintained and smooth. Rough or potholed surface is likely to be shunned as too dangerous. I think this is an excellent proposal in principle and, as a driver who uses this route regularly, welcome its implementation.
15	2741891569	I basically believe that proper roadside cycle paths are a good idea, but detest the danger created by mixing cyclists with pedestrians on one pavement with a bit of tatty paint for guidance. Cyclists are wheeled vehicles speeding along at up to 25mph, and not pedestrians walking along gently at 3mph.
16	2741053162	I think that it is unsafe for all concerned especially pedestrians and cyclists. The planned need to monitor traffic at busy times and see for themselves what chaos this would cause.
17	2741012330	I think it will be a benefit to the area and hopefully a first step to encouraging people out of cars and onto bikes
18	2740355968	The two most difficult sections are crossing the Leatherhead bypass and the Greville Park Road to Woodfield sections. These have least certainty in the plan. Without satisfactory (cycle safe) solutions people will not be encouraged to use the scheme and regular cyclists (I am one) will continue to use Ottway's Lane/Linden Pit. Note that my answer to additional cycling (below) is no because I already cycle regularly. I am answering this as an individual as I have no brief for the organisation I belong to (CTC SW London) but our members already use the Linden Pit route regularly and I am sure they will wish to see the same issues addressed
19	2739961451	I would like a cycle lane into the High Street from Epsom Road. This would have to have time restrictions (e.g. On Sundays when car parking is allowed.) I agree that the Linden Pit Path scheme would have been preferable had it been technically or financially feasible.
20	2739920452	Safe provision for cyclists away from main road traffic will be a great improvement for this route
21	2739915058	A very good idea and very welcome
22	2739903496	The scheme is so unattractive to cyclists that it will rarely be used. It is therefore a waste of public money and a great shame to remove some wonderful old trees
23	2739897881	Not sure about question of segregation - cyclists are sometimes aggressive when walkers in their way. If cyclists used their bell to warn walkers of their presence it would be helpful. On Thames Towpath they have a 'two tings on the Towpath'

ITEM 8

		catchphrase
24	2739893290	We still believe it's the wrong route and therefore maybe under utilised Ottway's Lane / Linden Pitt path obvious choice
25	2739889437	Fine-ish
26	2739002711	It has little connectivity with most of the people in Ashstead who are likely to cycle to Leatherhead - and I will continue to cycle along Linden Pit Path and/or the new cycle path if you create a link along Grange Road
27	2738523217	Good idea - risks around cyclist traffic crossing roads and entrances need clear sign posting. If possible need to invest in over-pass or by-pass to knoll round about as cyclist traffic will find it difficult to cross during peak road traffic hours.
28	2738303829	Excellent idea
29	2737623558	This is an excellent proposal that will encourage more use of cycling - and hopefully reduce short car journeys. It would be good if Epsom council extended the scheme into Epsom (and beyond!)>
30	2737522747	The segregated path may be useful for children and less confident cyclists, but because it has numerous obstacles, detours and crossings, it will offer nothing to more experienced cyclists, who will still preferentially use the main carriageway instead, where they maintain priority over minor roads. I am generally in favour of segregated cycle facilities, but I do wonder if they're appropriate for this route.
31	2737521273	It is pleasing that the need for a path had been recognised and you have made the best of a difficult job. It is to be hoped the other schemes on your list e.g. The Linden Pit Path route will follow soon.
32	2737519003	Excellent- anything that separates cars and cycles sounds good to me
33	2737518515	I still think a path shared between pedestrians / buggies and cyclists would or could be dangerous
34	2737517087	I would like to see a centre line down the shared use cycle path, with directional arrows and/or central flash left signals
35	2737515454	It's an improvement. However the scheme runs out in Ashtead village. The road is narrow and cars do not give you enough room. Also cars coming out of Woodfield Lane pose a danger as visibility to their right is poor. We should change the traffic laws, like France the car driver is responsible for accident.
36	2737514362	The surface must be machine laid or rolled in two directions. All the cycle routes done recently in this area, e.g. Barnett Wood Lane are so badly laid that cyclists use the road in preference.
37	2737513339	I think this scheme is an excellent idea and should be done all over Surrey where it does not exist. I would like to see a cycle path between Bookham and Leatherhead as desperately needed.
38	2737512292	I think this proposal is a positive step forward. It is of course limited, but a very good start to 'joined up' cycle ways and initially very good for local cycling.
39	2737509838	Will not take cyclists off the A24 Need firm controls when entering Ashtead village. Good to provide for cyclists. Need segregated areas where lots of pedestrians use the pathway. Will be detrimental t peak hour's traffic with extra lights. Will any grants be given to householders to make visibility exiting their driveways better? Does NOT in anyway address the critical situation for Therfield pupils cycling along Barnett Wood Lane. Need far more education on roadside use and safety for cyclists, could mean pathways more dangerous for mobility scooter users.
40	2737506852	
41	2737042069	The speed of the racing cyclist will be too dangerous to combine with pedestrians, as the racing bikes are doing up to 40 mph currently along the A24
42	2736981200	I would object to any scheme, which means digging up more of the grass verge and laying down more asphalt. By all means however delineate a section of the existing tarmac road as a cyclist only lane and road mark it accordingly. Cyclists, particularly youngsters, need to learn road sense, and will not get this completely segregated or mixed up with pedestrians. I say this as a one-time cyclist and as both a pedestrian and a car driver who frequently uses both means to go from Leatherhead to Ashtead.
43	2736322000	Don't think this is a good scheme. The Ottway's Lane / Linden Pit Path option should have been considered more seriously.
44	2736310699	I object strongly to having any pedestrian and cycle shared sections. It will be very

		dangerous having this mixture. If they do exit cycle lanes should be compulsory and then on bits not using the lanes
45	2736301654	I agree that the scheme would be a significant improvement on the existing footpath to and from Leatherhead to Ashtead, but is this an improvement for the whole community? Could the money be used to improve other essential public services in the area? I walk locally, run and own a mountain bike (live off Ermyn Way) so do have personal experience of using this road for exercise However, even if the scheme is successful, I feel that the risk of trying to cross Knoll Roundabout outweighs the benefits of having a wide path between Ashtead Village and Leatherhead town centre!
46	2736294167	I am not convinced this is the best use of money to improve cycling facilities in the area. Or that it is the best route compared with the Linden Pit path where a ramp of cycle gully on the Leatherhead end would be relatively low cost and very useful. Barnet Wood Lane also is an obvious route than needs extending through to Lower Ashtead / Pond roundabout. As an experienced cyclist I will continue to use the road carriageway, not going at the slow speed of a shared path requires
47	2736277295	A vast amount of money to 1. Make present cycling on the pavement legal 2. I doubt it will make any difference to people who currently cycle on the road in the normal way - so no difference to accident rate 3. Money would be much better spent on upgrading the linden pit path / Ottway's Lane, which has been promoted by local cyclists for 10 - 15 years.
48	2736264708	I welcome the scheme. I wonder if the cycle path will be use by skateboarders and if this additional use will be acknowledged and accepted explicitly. Will elderly folk living on Epsom Rd using motorised wheelchairs or invalid vehicles use the pedestrian path, the cycle path or the road? Will signage clarify the correct use?
49	2736248283	Very positive but shame it doesn't go all the way to Ashtead Centre
50	2736230098	Section 5 - would suggest the inclusion of a 'joining' section to enable cyclists coming on to new route from The Warren and Parkers Hill - similar to proposal for access from Stag Leys.
51	2736224982	I disapprove of creating cycling lanes, which have to be shared by pedestrians. In an ideal world, cyclists are experienced and responsible. In my experience most are not! We should not have any road narrowing schemes as this would lead to more road congestions. Cars are not going to go away. Cycling is too dangerous for children in Ashtead and Leatherhead even if such a scheme was to go ahead.
52	2736214726	I have cycled down to leatherhead today using the existing safe and very convenient route, AKA Linden Pi path. Improvement this, publicise this for all ages to use rather than spend £000s on an unnecessary scheme. SCC cannot afford to waste money. Your scheme must add delays to the already congested traffic along the A24.
53	2736208191	Good notice and long overdue
54	2736175390	I would advocate the use of the footpath that runs between St Peters and St Andrews Schools as the safest way to cycle from Ashtead to Leatherhead.
55	2735947231	Adults refuse to use the Barnett Wood cycle path. It is only used by schoolchildren. I would like the police to monitor it and insist that adults use it all the time otherwise it is a waste of money.
56	2735651003	I think the scheme is expensive and unnecessary in this time of financial stringency. I see little evidence of high cycling volumes and such a need for these alterations. In fact. My wife is blind and there seems to be little consideration given to the needs of pedestrians. I recognise that Surrey CC has gone 'Bicycle Mad' because of the Olympics legacy but as a young man no-one proposed alterations for cyclists in my hometown, Wembley. I cycled regular long distances and into the centre of London. This proposal might fulfil your Olympic legacy dream but fails to meet and real local need, in my view. Stop it now!
57	2735618139	I don't believe this will be used much; the dedicated road cyclist will still use the road with only one road crossing, the Knoll roundabout, as vs. 9 on the cycle lane. The casual cyclist will still use Linden Pit Path as quieter. Removal of traffic islands, via Ottway's, will make it more dangerous for pedestrians. Finally there is no indication of who has preference on the road tables?
58	2735434108	
59	2735367744	The first point I would like to make is the picture on the flyer I received. This shows

ITEM 8

		two youngsters cycling - but WITHOUT cycle helmets. This must be one of the biggest faux pas's I have seen on a consultation. I think the scheme since it will reduce the width of the A24 in a very busy road will increase the danger to pedestrian's cyclists and traffic. This is particularly so in the busy High Street of Ashtead village. I do not agree with the proposals
60	2734771963	It needs to be practical to use. The Dorking Leatherhead path is sub optimal: sections are flooded, curb joins are too high, there is a requirement for cyclists to yield their right of way to joining car traffic from side roads (why!?).
61	2734571775	I think the scheme is a great idea; I would like to see more grass verge retained even if it is at the expense of the road width. I would also like to emphasise that a level route should be maintained as much as possible, going up and down as you crossroads and people's driveways encourage people on to the road. I think the crossings at Stag Leys and Ermyn way are urgently needed.
62	2734374949	What options are there for cyclists travelling from Ashtead to Leatherhead? The proposed path seems rather narrow for cyclists travelling in both directions, especially given the schoolchildren using sections of the path.
63	2734247052	
64	2733718464	Completely conflicted by crossing side roads - safer to stay on main roads and have priority over emerging side road traffic. Knoll roundabout crossing may help. Legalising cycling on Linden Pit Path and providing a ramp rather than steps would work well. Bridge is far better than crossing. Existing side roads work OK. Cycle lanes only attractive if continuous - i.e. At the side of a widened main road, side roads are a no no. Look at European design - hard to do a proper job as not designed into infrastructure
65	2732069805	Potentially dangerous alternative proposals as no mention of dealing with two way bicycle traffic meeting head on amongst pedestrians in relatively narrow sections.
66	2731905847	Very good idea, thoroughly support it, particularly a safe way to cross the Knoll Roundabout for cyclists,
67	2731844691	A very beneficial scheme which will make it an option for me and my children to cycle from Ermyn Way to Ashtead - using the A24 would be much too dangerous for them
68	2731821559	In principle I support it. However it has potential safety implications for pedestrians. The scheme will need to remove a lot of street furniture. It is essential that the traffic arrangements i.e. Right turn only are implemented at the Ermyn Way /Grange Road junction otherwise I see more fatalities
69	2730433883	I totally oppose the project. The cyclists have been indulged with the provision of extensive cycle ways already. SCC please provide for the needs of the local public by listening to what we have to say.
70	2730417515	Good idea and long overdue
71	2730407113	Helen - testing - second test
72	2730397709	Helen - testing
73	2730154140	Fantastic scheme, could it be extended to West Farm avenue and through to Barnett Wood lane?
74	2730123754	This scheme is not a priority. Lots of people cycle already. You have far more important highway issues to resolve.
75	2729970552	Is there not a back street option going down Ottway's & Linden that would be quieter and virtually as direct?
76	2729531461	I recommend the idea but it MUST be extended to Woodfield land and address this dangerous location for all traffic. No parent would let their kids across the A24 to use a cycle path to get to school if this is not fixed.
77	2728920029	We are a retired couple who do not have a car but get about by bike and public transport. We are greatly in favour of this and any other development of cycle path as long as - and this is vital- the issue of what happens at side road junctions is confronted realistically. If anyone is interested one would be willing to explain further. Paddy and Marion Bannard, 75 Stag Leys. Marionbannard@yahoo.co.uk
78	2728454205	Excellent
79	2728232877	The proposed scheme is expensive and will not provide a useful route between Leatherhead and Ashtead. A far better route is available using the existing pathway between Ottway's lane and Linden Pit path. This route keeps cyclists and motorists

ITEM 8

		apart, would be cheaper to instate and would be used more. It would have the additional advantage of increasing footfall along the passageway beside St Andres school and therefore increasing safety for students
80	2727706364	It's a great idea. I wholeheartedly approve.
81	2727689790	Waste of time and money more people cycle along Barnett Wood Lane between Ashtead and Leatherhead
82	2727629587	I am pleased something is being done - I was knocked off my bike in June 2011, breaking my second vertebra. So I no longer cycle - but if I did the changes would encourage me - I mostly cycled into Ashtead and Leatherhead, using the A24.
83	2727624595	Please keep the width of the path as wide as possible to avoid creating confrontation between pedestrians and cyclists. Ensure that the route is continuous and convenient. No "Cyclists dismount" signs please! It is important that where the cycle path crosses entrances that the level of the cycle path is maintained. Traffic emerging from these entrances should give way to traffic on the cycle path. Details such as flush kerbs are essential to enable people on bikes to use the route without being unnecessarily hindered. It is equally important to ensure that there are no sharp turns forcing you to slow down unnecessarily.
84	2727416703	The plan to narrow existing roads and to have shared pedestrian/cycle paths is dangerous and will add to existing traffic congestion. I do not think the area between Ashtead and Leatherhead is safe enough for any child or inexperienced rider. The volume of motorised vehicles will never decrease. It is unrealistic to think that cycling lanes will (a) change peoples' attitudes to the car, (b) be a safe option for either pedestrians or bikers, (c) enhance riders' health (d) cut down carbon emissions significantly. This scheme is simply pandering to government philosophy. It is misguided.
85	2727293474	I'm happy with the whole proposal. However, I think that there is a bigger requirement to link the Ashtead to Leatherhead along the Barnetwood Lane route in order to safeguard the high volume of children travelling along it to and from Therfield School everyday.
86	2727254961	Interesting, but with a 'shared' 2-way system, how to keep pedestrians safe from cyclists approaching from behind and who has priority?
87	2727191604	See above
88	2727130406	Utter madness! Considering the heavy traffic and number of lorries. Scenario is accidents waiting to happen
89	2726965053	It would be an excellent idea, especially considering the proximity to the Olympic route.
90	2726954833	The crossing at the main road roundabout is crucial.
91	2726546819	I cycle regularly, as does my son. I rode the route today myself and have looked at the plans. The proposed changes will result in significant reductions to the grass verge along the routes. Ashtead Community Vision identified grass verges as second equal in the character of Ashtead (see slide 21 of their presentation). This is a significant disadvantage to the plans and will result in further unwelcome urbanisation of the village. This scheme will not result in our family cycling more often. My 14-year-old son cycles to Therfield via Barnett Wood Lane and to friends in Leatherhead via Ottway's Lane and Linden Pit Road. There is no reason why he would use this cycle path and in general the cycle path is of little use for children on their route to school. Most adults would cycle on the road. The proposes scheme is expensive, detrimental to the character of Ashtead. Improving the Ottway's Lane route would be preferable.
92	2726481864	I think this is a very good proposal and should make cycling safer on this routes, which is very busy.
93	2726439613	I find cycling along the road between Ashtead and Leatherhead quite frightening. Anything to improve the situation would be very welcome and would encourage me to use my bike rather than drive to Leatherhead.
94	2726353724	Why does it stop where it does? It needs to go on to Epsom. As a cyclist, I think that cyclists need to cycle on the road, but that a separate lane (and possibly wider lanes) should be provided. Knowing how busy those footpaths are at the moment, I don't think it's a good idea for a shared use footpath/cycle path. A separate lane should be provided on the road.
95	2726201688	

ITEM 8

96	2726118514	I think it is an excellent idea and would hope that something similar might be done at the other end of Ashtead to encourage safe cycling from lower Ashtead to Therfield school
97	2726049528	I think the whole thing is pointless. There is a lovely back route already along Ottway's, the alleyway over the motorway and the back roads of leatherhead. Nothing would convince me to change my route to alongside the incredibly busy A24. There seems to be a lack of thought regarding crossing the A24 in Ashtead and also crossing the main roundabout just after Downsends school coming into leatherhead. It sometimes takes me ten minutes to get out of Old Court onto the main road because of the density and speed of traffic. And crossing any of the roads around the roundabout is a death trap, which is why people use the back routes. Is there a pedestrian crossing planned to cross the A24, ideally near Old Court to allow schoolchildren access to West Ashtead school, and people to the allotment, or traffic lights around the roundabout? Without this, there really is no point at all.
98	2725872090	Good idea.
99	2725801353	I often cycle to Ashtead from Epsom with my young children. We always prefer the quieter routes, through Epsom Common or down Craddocks Avenue rather than down the busy and fast main road. Even with a separate cycle path, the speed of vehicles and the fumes from such a busy road would deter us from using this route and venturing into Leatherhead. We would probably consider the route past Ashtead pond and under the M25 as a quieter, cleaner route. This, in my opinion, is where the link should focus.
100	2725772199	I live in Ashtead and sometimes cycle to Leatherhead and use the Linden Pit Path route as recommended by the white/blue signage in Leatherhead (and ignoring the bizarrely placed 'no cycling' signage at the Ashtead end). I would probably prefer to continue to use this route for most journeys. I would prefer to see consideration given to the use of the network of separate (i.e. Not beside a road) footpaths in Ashtead made legal for cyclists - for example - the path that runs from the southern end of Greville Park Road in a westerly direction via Northfields crossing Paddocks Way, Skinners Way and on to Agates Lane, also the cattle creep under the railway which runs from Stephens' Avenue to Overdale. It is particularly noticeable when cycling from Ashtead to Epsom that in Ashtead cycling on footpaths is mostly banned and in Epsom is actively encouraged. Another route worthy of improvement runs from the eastern end of the motorway footbridge of Linden Pit path northwards alongside the M25 and joins Barnetwood Lane - this would then link up with the cycle route used Therfield students which unfortunately terminates at Caen Wood road. Hopefully the current scheme can be seen as the start of a number of improvements for the area's cyclists and it would serve SCC well to present it as such. The current scheme terminates in Ashtead in a position where most cyclists would probably not want to be.
101	2725767979	Seems the 'simplest' scheme has been selected rather than that which could encourage more cycling
102	2725760755	The scheme should encourage schoolchildren to cycle safely to school and therefore should take Therfield into consideration. At the moment it is too dangerous for them to cycle along Barnett would lane and that cycle path is inadequate and dangerous. I don't think the proposed route will encourage many more cyclists. I live in Ashtead and would love to cycle to my office in leatherhead but would be unlikely to use the proposed route - disappointing
103	2725723327	
104	2725705510	It strikes me that going along the A24 is the most difficult route choice - Ottway's Lane and Linden Path etc would be quieter and less hazardous to most cyclists.
105	2725670024	Good idea. More appealing for children than middle-aged cyclists who are more likely to stick to the road than share paths with pedestrians.
106	2725661188	A fantastic idea
107	2725576778	Great in general - thanks! Would like to know trees planted in lieu of those removed?
108	2725559397	The scheme, while laudable, appears to be restricted by the terrible measures that we have in the UK for retrofitting cycle paths onto existing infrastructure. 'Raised tables' in particular, are awful. Some drivers have no respect for them and the result

		is that cyclists (and pedestrians) treat junctions with them with extreme caution. For a recreational cyclist using part of a route, this may not be a hindrance, However, for someone hoping to go a longer distance with relative speed, raised tables inevitably involves slowing down and expending excess energy to get back up to speed. The result is that cyclists will remain on the road. This is where drivers expect to see them. They do not expect cyclists to appear on the 'pavement / shared cycle route'. The solution is proper cycle lanes where they can be fitted, better education for drivers and cyclists and to move the 'give-way' point away of raised tables to before the cycle path crosses. It must be clearly marked. There must be a sign for 'give-way to cyclists'. Only then will you get serious and recreational cyclists using existing routes to their full potential. Another problem point is crossing Knoll Roundabout. The council is damned if it installs a crossing and damned if it does not install a crossing. See a typical Friday evening of frustrated drivers waiting to cross onto the M25 or get to Dorking from London. They will be massively annoyed by another obstacle. However, the last thing that a frustrated driver is expecting to see on the exit of a roundabout is a cyclist taking his or her chances at a uncontrolled crossing. Not a decision I envy. Please bear in mind the previous attempt at this. I remember a 'cycle path' that was painted along the road from St. Johns to Knoll Roundabout. It was so ill conceived that it wobbled around trees, lampposts, close to the road. It was removed ('un-painted') after a week. This should not be allowed to happen with the new route.
109	2725095366	
110	2724876966	The cycle existing path on Barnett Wood Lane is ignored by a minority of selfish cyclists who are too macho to use the path and insist on using the road delaying the motorised traffic. This also happens on the A24 to Dorking. Unless these people use the paths the schemes will be a waste of money and time.
111	2724752639	Please see comment in section 1
112	2724404884	Totally support the scheme but it should go further into Ashtead village centre, right along The Street ideally. It's in the village itself that traffic is most problematic to bikes and/or bikes cycle on the pavements to avoid the cars.
113	2724392227	If this scheme is really made cycling friendly then it would be a great asset to the area. A major point. That I have is the lights at Ermyn Way (already reported to Police in the past) Regarding the amount of drivers that go through red lights at this junction which is bad enough for other drivers turning right or left out of Grange Road or Ermyn Way what chance does a cyclist have ?
114	2724386668	I cycle from Ashtead to leatherhead and never use this route. Is there demand for a cycle lane along this road?
115	2724374936	I object to this proposed waste of public money. How many cyclists would use the path, and what would be the capital cost per head? Shared use cycle/pedestrian paths are dangerous and unpleasant for pedestrians. If there is to be a cycle path, it would be much better for it to follow Ottway's Lane and Linden Pit Path, to take advantage of the footbridge for crossing the A243.
116	2724343196	Fantastic idea. I have nearly been knocked off a couple o times along those roads
117	2724196508	I am opposed to this proposed waste of public money. How many cyclists would use it, and what will be the capital cost per head? Shared use cycle/pedestrian paths are dangerous. How will the proposals for the Knoll roundabout
118	2723952502	I'm speechless! How much money is WSP charging for producing these "design drawings"? Who is the designer and who will be responsible for the traffic signal element of the scheme design (TR2500 controller configuration and detailed design)? Are WSP capable of providing the traffic signal design and controller configurations? If not, then why are WSP being paid to provide these flawed plans? SCC is not acting as an "intelligent client"! Has anyone checked these drawings? The road markings are incorrect! For example, no hatched road markings are shown! These drawings contribute nothing to the proposed scheme. Please tell me what the grey colour on the drawings (re: proposed islands, etc) represents? This is not included on the drawing Key!
119	2723888132	I cycle regularly and use the cycle lanes on the A24 with my children and appreciate the additional safety this provides. However I do note that many cyclists, particularly those who seem to be more enthusiastic do not seem to use the provided cycle lanes. On this basis I am concerned that the provision of cycle lanes

ITEM 8

		is therefore not a valuable use of resources.
120	2723871600	I am very pleased to see this scheme being planned. However, since I am a road cyclist operating at 20 - 40 km/h on the stretch suggested, a shared path would slow me down considerably. The same would be the case with all the crossings, even if levelled. I would therefore most likely still be in the road. My wife would use the path as she would feel much safer (she is a newly converted cyclist). The scheme would not have an effect on my frequency of cycling, but it would have an effect for guests that would find it safer to get from Ashted to the cycling area in the Mole Valley, Box Hill and Surrey Hills. I am really pleased to see it!
121	2723863052	
122	2723765839	Great idea - long overdue. But the crossing at Knoll roundabout needs to be thought through carefully - the road is too busy and dangerous to allow an uncontrolled crossing
123	2723272922	I do not support the plans to build a cycle path because 1. It will cause massive disruption to the traffic whilst it is being built, I see trees will have to be removed and existing pavements widened around Knoll roundabout especially, a site that sees heavy traffic at peak times. 2. I live on this road. Having the pavement completely paved over will urbanise the road, and affect property prices adversely and discourage people from moving to the area. One of the reasons I bought the property was that although Epsom Road is a main road, the pavement looked beautiful running between two stretches of grass and you hardly noticed it was there. 3. Cyclists are only really seen on Epsom Road on Sundays, when car traffic is very light. Why do you need a dedicated cycle path? 4. Who will meet the cost of having to remove pavement side private hedges and privately owned trees that will overhang your proposed pathways to ensure safety for pedestrians and cyclists? 5. What observational studies have been done to ascertain the requirement for a proposed cycle path? Where are the results? Are they publicly available? Where? And if not, why not? 6. Why do you think having dedicated cycle paths will encourage cycling? What evidence is there? Is it safer for pedestrians and cyclists to share the same path? Why? In London, a city with much more traffic than Mole Valley, cycle paths are on the road, including the A24 in SW London. Why not here? 8. If you reduced the speed limit to 20mph on Epsom road from Leatherhead town centre to Knoll roundabout, and introduced speed cameras along it, and put double yellow lines along the whole length of it and introduced a blue cycle path just like on A24 in SW London, you would make the entire road safe for cyclists at a fraction of the cost and disruption that you are proposing. Please email me with your answers and any relevant evidence to aaliakhan@hotmail.com. I will be in touch with my local councillor as well.
124	2723051125	I regularly commute to work by bike, cycling daily from Leatherhead to Cobham. I used to live in Epsom and routinely cycled between Epsom and Leatherhead. When cycling from Epsom to Leatherhead I would cycle along Craddocks avenue. I would still do this even with the new scheme as it does not extend far enough, and I expect is unlikely to be extended further due to narrow pavements on the A24 between Epsom and Ashted. I am concerned about the loss of the crossing over the A24 near grange road. This is currently used by St Andrews pupils alighting at the Bus stop. I am concerned that this cycle path will not be widely used. Many commuters may still cycle on the road as this path will be considerably slower, particularly as you need to cross drives / joining roads. Could you instead create a segregated path on the carriageway with raised curb to stop traffic crossing? I hope the new scheme is better planned than the cycle path on Barnet wood lane (which is incredibly unsafe and an absolute waste of money). Shared use pavements such as these often are more dangerous than cycling on the road due to cars pulling out of obscured drives. Could the money instead be spent upgrading the crossing over the A243 / M25 at the end of St Johns close, to make this safe for cycling. This would provide a safe route between Ashted and Leatherhead without the need for further cycle paths.
125	2722844148	I think the scheme would be very welcome and allow more people to start cycling, however cyclists must use the cycle paths and not ride on the road .how this is going to be in forced would be a problem
126	2722735616	I don't think the scheme will get rid of the irritating number of 'serious' cyclists who

		clog up the area, especially at the weekend.
127	2722632840	No specific comments for different sections, but wholeheartedly behind the scheme generally - will encourage my kids and me to cycle more.
128	2722458228	Upgrading the existing path/route from Grange road in Ashtead through the Linden Pit Path and behind St John's school would keep cyclists away from busy main roads.
129	2722264853	Dangerous for pedestrians where the cycle path is shared.
130	2722260407	I'm not completely sure I understand the High Street, Leatherhead proposal. I do not agree with the Leret way/Epsom Road proposal. I am concerned about crossing the Knoll Roundabout as it stands now, and am not convinced that without traffic lights, the system will just be ignored as are the 'Keep Clear' boxes at present - perhaps they should be yellow boxes? I am concerned about crossing Woodfield Lane. As for question 9 - It would be increase or decrease my cycling and think that the areas of grave concern are Knoll Roundabout. Crossing Grange Road, Stag Leys and Woodfield Lane.
131	2722173433	I am, subject to my comments at 3 and above, generally in favour of the scheme, but cannot see that it will be a success unless the cycle traffic can avoid having to mix with the buys traffic at the Knoll roundabout. I would much prefer a dedicated cycle path with physical separation from other road users. Parents are much more likely to encourage their children to cycle to school if that were the case.
132	2722158169	Overall, I DO NOT believe that this scheme is in the best interests of residents of the area, for the following reasons: I am appalled by the removal of some many trees which add to the green leafy character of the area, this is what makes it what it is. I do not believe that a shared path is safe for the families, older residents of the area or cyclists, especially when there are a number of areas where the path becomes as narrow as 1.8m. A shared path on Epsom road didn't work two years ago and by removing grass verges and therefore damaging the green, leafy character of the area, this is not sufficient space to attempt it again. Further toward Ashtead and around the Grange Road junction there is proposal for removal of a number of traffic islands. I fear that this will make these roads very difficult to cross for the older community and also for those will buggies and children. The addition of a number of Toucan crossings and the removal of the footbridge will significantly impact the traffic flow along the route and extend the period for which the peak traffic flow lasts. This is bad enough already and adds enough time to a peak journey, this cannot be made worse.
133	2722136383	I'm struggling to understand the need for this. I presume that analysis of the usage of this route currently by cyclists has been done? I have driven along this route countless times and only very rarely see cyclists on any part of it. Are that many journeys (be they walking, driving, cycling or any other mode of transport) made with the intention of travelling from Leatherhead to Ashtead and vice versa? A scheme such as this must surely be considered taking in to account the potential relevant impacts that the MVDC sell off of the Leatherhead allotments site will have. Also, it is far safer to travel by bike between Leatherhead and Ashtead via Barnett Wood Lane where traffic speed is currently restricted anyway. I commend you for the ambition and for obtaining funding from Central Government but I sense this scheme requires much more thought.
134	2722108533	I think it is a good idea
135	2722070560	A very good plan. I would use my bike more to get into Leatherhead if the road was better partitioned for cyclists.
136	2722067465	
137	2722037193	1) Reducing road width - this is a safety issue. Many cyclists will continue to use the road rather than new path and narrower road will make it more difficult for cars to overtake. 2) Raised tables - the bane of my life as a motorcyclist and car driver. It is almost impossible to stop safely on these as a motorcyclist and they damage suspensions. They are also incredibly uncomfortable to drive over. Some of us work too far away to cycle in and I do not think it is right that we should have to suffer these raised tables every day for the doubtful benefit of cyclists. Given that few cyclists with road bikes will actually use the cycle path (just look at the a243 south of Mickleham roundabout in this recent hot weather); I fail to see the point of these at all. Only those on mountain bikes will use the path and I'm sure they can deal

ITEM 8

		with drop kerbs. I have cycled a pedal bike for many years and on roads such as those proposed to take the path; I have always been happy to cycle on the road and have never used the pavement. 3) Do we have any idea how many cyclists this will actually serve? There is no point to the money spent and extra congestion caused if very few cyclists will actually use it.
138	2722002871	I am a cyclist. I currently use the Ashtead to Leatherhead Plough Roundabout cycle route. Shared paths with pedestrian do not work easily at busy times - e.g. School start/end times. You need to always segregate cyclist from pedestrian. Surely the Ottway's Lane/Linden Pit Path route would be far more cost effective and safe - avoiding all busy junctions.
139	2721984425	This will make the village a better place to cycle to and link the two towns making business for both better
140	2721947650	
141	2721906161	A great idea to protect cyclists and encourage more people to cycle.
142	2721378098	Making the current pavements a shared route for cyclists and pedestrians will not, in my opinion, work and would probably be a waste of time and money. In my experience, cyclists will not use the prescribed cycle ways already in existence e.g. The cycle path built from Gimcrack Hill to the Givons Grove roundabout. The speed that some of these cyclists ride would be dangerous if done in close proximity to pedestrians which will include mothers with prams, toddlers, people walking dogs and elderly people on invalid buggies. There just would not be room for cyclists to pass safely and very few of them are willing to slow down around pedestrians. How would these areas been policed and made safe? Just don't bother and use the money for mending the roads.
143	2721345393	I am not certain that a cycle path on this short section from Leatherhead to Ashtead is going to appeal to many people - it would have a lot more appeal if it was extended to Epsom. Please try and make the whole route as consistent in design approach as possible without too much finicky traffic engineering of kerbs and islands
144	2721069218	Great idea!
145	2721055481	I hope that Toucan crossings can accommodate tandems as we use this method of transport from Orchard Drive to Leatherhead.
146	2720984494	I think for the number of cyclists that you see using this route particularly during peak hours and off peak hours; it is a waste of money. I use The route daily and in one week could count on one hand the number if cyclist I see using the road and pavement to get to work. There a handful of children, that brave the traffic on Ottway's lane in the mornings to cycle to school at St Andrews but this scheme does not seem to have taken this into account appearing to cater for the recreational/occasional cyclist. I see an awful lot if disruption for a very small minority.
147	2720708457	Given the cutbacks in public spending at the national and local levels, the money required for this scheme would be much better spent on something more useful to more people, e.g., improving care/facilities for the elderly, improving the school system, improving care/facilities for the disabled etc.
148	2720678440	I already cycle most days. This would not increase my cycling. I expect I would continue to use Ottway's, not least because it would be quieter than cycling beside the A24.
149	2720539133	Good idea, but needs more thought about safety of cyclists & pedestrians
150	2720525302	
151	2720410135	A very positive step forward. Ashtead to Leatherhead is a short distance, which lends itself to cycling, but the current road layout makes it a potentially dangerous proposition.
152	2720312806	Another example of the Council wasting taxpayer's money. This won't be used by cyclists and will create havoc if the work goes ahead
153	2720246871	Excellent, please get started as soon as possible. All toucan crossings should be large enough to allow a tandem bike to pass through chicanes etc.
154	2768968825	I am OPPOSED to this scheme generally for the following three reasons: 1) Pavement cycling is inappropriate for urban areas. It is not fair on more vulnerable pedestrian's particularly older people and disabled people, who may not have the option of driving, and deserve a safe space where they need not worry about

ITEM 8

		colliding with bicycles. I am aware of research showing that such paths are supposedly "safe" based on accident statistics, but what such research does not show is how many vulnerable people have avoided using a pavement because of the risks they perceive. For an older person, even a minor injury could be life limiting. Shared-use paths normalise the idea that it is ok for cyclists to cycle on the pavement more generally. A scheme like this would not be considered in the Netherlands unless pedestrian counts were very low. 2) No priority for cycling at every single side road. This will make cycling on these pavements a stop-start affair – a tiring and frustrating experience, with danger crossing every side road since the cyclist must look for and give way to traffic coming from absolutely any direction. Why should pedestrians and cyclists in urban areas always come last? The raised tables that are present at some junctions create ambiguity over who's right of way it is, which is not necessarily good either. Expecting pedestrians and cyclists, especially young or old, to "negotiate" their way across such ambiguous spaces with people driving fast, heavy and dangerous vehicles is not fair - vulnerable road users deserve more protection and priority than this. It is also possible that the ambiguity may encourage some less experienced cyclists to cross such junctions without looking properly – presenting a risk to themselves and others. 3) Increased conflict for people cycling on the road. People desire convenient and direct routes to their destinations, and owing to the problems above, it is likely many existing cyclists will continue to cycle on the road. These people will suffer adverse consequences as a result of the narrowing of the road. They will experience more hostility from drivers, who will find it harder to overtake them, and may therefore lose patience and overtake recklessly. They may also be abused for not using the signed shared-use paths that run parallel to the road. I have suffered such abuse myself on several occasions, and it can be a very frightening experience. Such incidents will increase for cyclists using the road under this scheme. I do however SUPPORT the introduction of new signalised pedestrian crossings on this route, particularly on the Leatherhead Bypass arm of the Knoll Roundabout, with the proviso that these crossings are NOT STAGGERED. It should be possible for cyclists and pedestrians to cross-junctions in one go, even where the road is wide. These junctions can be crossed by motorised traffic in one go, and more vulnerable road users should be afforded the same courtesy and respect for the progress of their journeys.
155	2768042858	
156	2767706360	I agree with the cycle club that we are better off with no cycle path than the one proposed.
157	2765300417	Totally wrong route due to very heavy traffic on A24
158	2764703370	This proposal is a nightmare to the elderly and disabled. As a former cyclist, riding five miles to school and back, rules of the road give safety to cyclists. Pedestrians should have safe pavements
159	2763269828	Bytes is moving offices from West Ewell to Leatherhead in December 2013 Bytes employs around 250 staff and at least 25 of these staff will cycling to work mostly from Epsom & Ewell area. This scheme would not only benefit those already cycling but will encourage more to cycle.
160	2762936786	Why are SCC, in these stringent times when some many essential services are being cut, wasting money on a cycle path ? When cyclists pay road tax, have insurance then and only then should a separate cycle path be made. Really only the very hardy souls cycle in the inclement months
161	2761214108	
162	2761044061	
163	2761034153	I object to this scheme. There is insufficient room on the pavements to accommodate safely cyclists and pedestrians of all ages. A shared scheme from Leatherhead town centre to Knoll roundabout was tried several years ago and aborted at enormous expense. Please do not repeat this folly.
164	2761029692	As a keen cyclist I welcome the introduction of any new and viable safe routes. I think in balance the "Linden Pat Path" suggestion probably has more merit and am a little disappointed it was not chosen. Also, I think early consideration should be given to the possibility of acquiring a track of the railway embankment adjacent to the Westside of Waterway Road. If achieved, this could provide a safe width 2 way

ITEM 8

		path, which would provide a continuous link from Fetcham to Therfield School, Leatherhead. I would be interested in your response to this suggestion.
165	2761022345	"Mixed" parking traffic wise - risk to elderly
166	2760040513	
167	2759547758	Why was this scheme selected over any other location in the area? Are there more cyclists using this route than, say, Bookham to Fetcham? Will reducing the width of the carriageway impact on-road parking?
168	2759351521	This is a much needed scheme but oh so poorly thought out. It would be a much better idea to create a cycle route away from the A24 using Linden Pitt road putting a decent cycle bridge rather than the current bridge across A24 /M25 past St Peters School and onto Ottway's Lane. Giving priority to cyclists and either making these roads in particular residents only or reducing speed limits to 15 mph. This route could then be linked both to Ashtead village and also Craddocks avenue where by clever use of footpaths you could provide a cycling route with priority which would link back to the A24 north of Craddocks lane. You will need to build a segregated path along Craddocks lane as current situation is very dangerous. Now that would be an imaginative use of the road network
169	2759319404	I am very much in favour of the scheme and would like to see the route extend to Epsom. With the successes of the Olympics road race and Ride London Surrey is the cycling capital of the UK. Let's do all we can to make Surrey's roads cycle friendly for children and families, especially around schools.
170	2755899227	This piecemeal approach does not benefit anyone. Next time you modify the roads in this area the "infrastructure of the day" will no doubt be different and the result will be a confusing patchwork of different approaches, no improvement on (or very similar to that which) we have now. If you insist on a shared use approach, you need to make all footways in the Borough shared use en bloc without modification, except signage. That way there is consistency across the network, and you won't end up with road users not knowing what set of rules apply - especially the kids who I think will be the main users. The main interventions needed in this case are a) raised tables at junctions and b) signs saying give way to cyclist and pedestrians. However, while it is all very well having raised tables at road junctions, but I doubt that you will be installing them in front of the drives of the many properties that exit onto the road. And many of those properties have poor lines of sight. So even that fails to be much use. In fact if you take a few moments to look at the A2043 between the A3 and New Malden town centre, you'll appreciate that the west side with the cycle lane (http://goo.gl/maps/NC9gp) - though the lane could be mandatory - is a far better design than the mess on the footway on the west side (imagine it without the paint as a shared use) http://goo.gl/maps/C9u0A . The key point is that different modes get clearly demarcated zones, and without that you perpetuate the conflict, which is rife at present. I'd recommend your highway designers all have a trip to Copenhagen, Bremen or any Dutch town before doing any more plans.
171	2754896868	A brilliant concept that requires some rethinking, the gentleman that runs the bicycle cafe in Ashtead would be the ideal man to consult.
172	2754713323	Yes, it's more shared path rubbish, build them properly or not at all.