

12-08-2015

Application Reference P20/15/0579

I write with reference to the proposed cycle path through St Peter's Valley.

Whilst applauding the advantages of safety on this road plus it's potential benefits for the valley, I am greatly concerned on hearing the cost entailed to achieve this project and fear for its future maintenance.

Funny how money seems to be unavailable to resurface the road itself which is in a dyer state yet money can be found for a cycle path!

Also I trust your budget has aloud for proper crossings where necessary especially for walkers with prams and you have duly noted the SPEED at which vehicles pass through this valley, otherwise I doubt cyclists or walkers will be able to stand up to the draft created by them. The thought of a vehicle leaving the road in an accident so close is this path to the road is beyond belief.

A walking path which passes through the country beauty of the valley has not been the greatest of success and is now impassable due to lack of maintenance. I wonder if this new path will go the same way.

The word 'safety' opens another can of worms, as I am sure you are well aware, plans for certain premises in this area for a change of use where deferred a while ago on the grounds of 'safety'. Do I detect some hidden agenda here.

As a resident of long standing in this valley who has spent a lot of money on their property and who thought they were living in a certain environment It is depressing to be faced yet again with the worry of what might be.

Please in you deliberation give a thought to us residents, as so called progress is not always the best foot forward in some cases.

I remain anonymous as is my right to privacy.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2015 16:38
To: Tracey Ingle
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: P/2015/0579 - Construct 2 mile pedestrian and cycle path from Moulin de Tesson to Le Dimerie.

Categories: Blue Category

Thanks very much for the reassurance [REDACTED]

I will pass this on to [REDACTED] as Chairman of the Board of Directors of La Hague Manor Property Holding Limited and ask [REDACTED] to sign off on this.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2015 16:02
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: P/2015/0579 - Construct 2 mile pedestrian and cycle path from Moulin de Tesson to Le Dimerie.

Dear [REDACTED]

I'm aware that there have been amendments to the scheme above to deal with the historic gateway to the grounds of the School. I spoke with my colleagues in TTS and Planning shortly before I went on leave and we agreed an approach which would allow the path to run through the gateway with some reduction in the height of the end piers to ensure adequate visibility in this busy area of the road.

I will pass formal comments on the revised plans to the Case Officer in due course but understand that the proposed changes need to be signed off by you as land owner and that you wanted to be assured that the proposals had been considered from a historic environment viewpoint. Whilst always reluctant to see changes to the historic fabric of a Listed Building and its grounds this proposal retains much of the character whilst allowing a safe crossing point and helps deliver the proposed pathway to help pedestrian safety and wider access.

Please let me know if you need further information.

Regards

[REDACTED] Principal Planner Historic Environment - Planning and Building Services
Department of the Environment, South Hill, St Helier, Jersey, JE2 4US

[REDACTED] 0 | mobile - [REDACTED] | email. [REDACTED]@gov.je | web site: www.gov.je |

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 July 2015 13:20
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Proposed Roadside footpath, St Peter's Valley

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED]

I appreciate your point that the valley route is not the only way from the north of the Island to towards town, and an assessment of cycle use does account for not all cyclists using the valley route. The key attraction for the more leisurely cyclists will be that the valley path will provide a steady climb along its length, avoiding the steep routes of some of the green lanes. As you point out, the sports cyclists will probably be confident to ride at traffic speed and still ride down the valley with the traffic.

I would like to emphasise that whilst cyclists will benefit, the primary reason for the path is the safety of pedestrians, who have very poor access at the moment and the valley road has a poor traffic safety record.

A great deal of design thought, landscape advice and consultation has been carried out to minimise the impact on the valley and avoid 'urbanisation', whilst improving access for vulnerable users, including walkers, schoolchildren catching school buses and some cyclists.

I hope this helps explain the project aims.

I have copied this reply to planning and environment for completeness.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2015 10:39
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Proposed Roadside footpath, St Peter's Valley

Dear [REDACTED]

I appreciate your response to my letter regarding the proposed roadside footpath in St Peter's Valley and I agree that there is an opportunity to redevelop the existing footpaths through the valley for the use of horse riders - subject to approval from the landowners - and that is a project that the Jersey Riding Club will be looking at both in St Peter's Valley and island-wide over the coming months.

but I do still find the reasoning behind the proposal confusing.

There is a green lane route from pretty much from St Mary to the Avenue already. This is a safe existing route for cyclists and appears to be a popular route to town. It runs from La Dimerie, briefly along St Peter's Valley, up Mont de la Hague, along Rue de la Hague, La Rue de la Fontaine, La Mont des Grupieaux and down into Sandybrook, through the perquage and onto the cycle track on the Avenue.

I encounter many cycling commuters on this route both mornings and evenings (counted 18 yesterday evening) and very few cyclists through St Peters Valley apart from one MAMIL sprinting down the valley as if competing in the Tour de France!

It would seem that provision is being made for cyclists where there is already a safe route into town?

Please be assured I am delighted that folk are being encouraged to cycle more - but it seems a shame to urbanise St Peter Valley with this as an objective.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, 9 Jul 2015 14:33:13 +0100
Subject: Proposed Roadside footpath, St Peter's Valley

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached for your information a copy of a letter sent to Planning and Environment in response to your letter to the Planning Department of 22 June.

With thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Secretary to Directors and Officers
Transport and Technical Services
PO Box 412 | States Offices | South Hill | St Helier | JE4 8UY
[REDACTED]

Care : If you have received this email and it was not intended for you, please reply to the sender, and then delete it. Please treat our information in confidence. This communication may contain legal advice which is confidential and/or privileged. It should not be forwarded or copied to anyone else without the prior permission of the sender.

Contract : This email does not form any binding agreement unless it is supported by an official States of Jersey purchase order form.

Content : All States information systems may be monitored to ensure that they are operating correctly. Furthermore, the content of emails and other data on these systems may be examined, in exceptional circumstances, for the purpose of investigating or detecting any unauthorised use. This email has been scanned for viruses by the States of Jersey email gateway.

Confidentiality : The confidentiality of this e-mail and your reply cannot be guaranteed. As a public authority, the States of Jersey is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011. Under this Law we may be required to disclose information we hold, including the contents of this email and any response to it, unless the information is protected from disclosure by an exemption under the Law or any other enactment, including the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2015 08:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Valley path - Letter please to [REDACTED]
Attachments: SPV representation [REDACTED] SPV representation [REDACTED]

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi [REDACTED]

Please find attached a draft of a letter in response to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] representations on the Valley path. Any comments gratefully received with regard to accuracies, additions or omissions.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

St Peter's Valley Roadside path

In response to [REDACTED] e-mail dated 22nd April and [REDACTED] e-mail dated 4th May expressing their concerns regarding the above planning application I arranged to meet with [REDACTED] and their immediate neighbour [REDACTED] on site on XXXX 2015. We first met with [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] own and then met with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as a group and walked the site and listened to their concerns.

Since that meeting myself and other TTS officers have met with [REDACTED] on a number of further occasions (some of which you have attended to provide pre – planning advice) to discuss [REDACTED] issues in particular and TTS's proposals for mitigating her concerns.

Based on these meetings, revised drawings and a detailed maintenance plan of the immediate area have been developed and have been submitted with the recently amended planning application. The final drawing and maintenance plan has been arrived at following a number of iterations which have included discussions with [REDACTED] Jersey Water as the land owner and yourself providing pre – application advice. I enclose a copy of drawing number SPV 011 and Maintenance Plan reference "South of La Hague Reservoir Landscape Management Plan" which are the final conclusion of those meetings.

During our discussions with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] we have sought, where possible to address their concerns and to include appropriate mitigation in our amended application. I list below our response to their joint comments which hopefully reflect our attempts to mitigate the impact of the proposed scheme on both of their respective properties. As the issues raised are similar in both representation e-mails my response covers both representations. I have copied this letter to both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] so they are aware of my response to you.

1. **Overall need for the Path** – St Peter's Valley is a dangerous road for pedestrians and cyclists to travel on and has a high historical accident rate as a consequence of its limited road width, and the lack of suitable footpaths or pavements. There have been numerous requests over the years for this situation to be improved with requests being received from Politicians, Parish representatives, businesses, residents, parents and individual members of the Public. In an attempt to rectify this unsafe situation informal roadside walking paths have been developed in previous years by States departments and NGO's, by agreement with landowners in the valley, which, in part, still exist today. These paths are not joined up and in some cases have fallen in to disrepair

2. **Links to existing Policy** - The States Sustainable Transport Policy (STP) undertakes to change the way we travel about our island in order to reduce congestion, pollution and increase our levels of physical activity. This will deliver significant tangible benefits. The Island Plan (Policy TT1) also has an objective to enable and promote walking, cycling and public transport as a more sustainable mode of travel than the private car. Road safety is also a key aspect of STP. Whilst cars have become safer in recent decades, pedestrians and cyclists remain very vulnerable road users and the States policy to reduce injury rates and encourage more walking and cycling, must be accompanied by measures which make those road users safer. The Valley Path therefore, is an excellent opportunity to deliver a facility which meets the requirements and fully supports the objectives of the Island Plan and the STP.

3. **Inaccurate plans** – The Digimap mapping tiles which our original drawings were based on were out of date as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] point out. These tiles have now been updated by Digimap and the amended application is now based on these tiles which updates the plans for the entire Valley. In addition a new detailed drawing and maintenance plan, as referred to above, have been created for the immediate vicinity of Numbers 1 and 2 Westward Ho.

4. **Surfacing of the path** – With the exception of a small length of path, the path is proposed to be surfaced with brown tarmac. This surface will provide a surface which can be easily maintained and a level solid surface for pedestrians and cyclists. As part of the public consultation, four short sections of path were created with different surfaces for the public to view and comment on. The majority of people who viewed these trial surfaces agreed that brown tarmac would provide a sustainable, usable surface which would, over time, blend in with the natural character of the valley.

5. **Road safety**
 - a. **Mont de L'Ecole junction** – Both respondents expressed concern with regard to the safety of the Mont de L'Ecole junction and suggested that a survey was carried out in peak time hours. This survey has been carried out and has been submitted with the amended application. The survey, carried out by a UK Road Safety expert, confirms the design is safe and adequate. That said we have re looked at the junction and have improved a number of visibility lines where we are able. Details are included on the amended application drawings.
 - b. **Signing/ marking of Le Rue de la Moulin de la Hague** – As a general rule we do not put down lines or erect signage in small country lanes unless absolutely necessary. In this instance we do not believe that either is necessary. However, if the application is successful and in the event that users are unclear of the route small directional signage could be added.
 - c. **Parking in La Rue du Moulin de la Hague** – We do not believe the proposed path will cause additional parking in the area. However, as explained to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in our initial meeting we would be willing to approach the Connetable of St Peter to discuss parking restrictions if this became a problem at any time in the future

6. **Loss of privacy and amenity and potential for noise and disturbance** – We accept that the location of the proposed path could have a detrimental impact to the privacy and amenity value of Numbers 1 and 2 Westward Ho and have therefore been to considerable lengths to include mitigation factors in to the amended application to reduce the impact of the path on their properties. As part of these discussions we have agreed to move the path as far away from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] properties as we can and have realigned the route to move as quickly away from [REDACTED] property as we can. We have engaged an Ecologist and Landscape Architect to develop a planting scheme which will provide a visual barrier to the path once it is established. We have also agreed to provide temporary fencing behind the new planting scheme to provide screening until the planting is established. Furthermore, and to ensure the planting scheme matures successfully, we have agreed to maintain the new planting scheme for five years following which maintenance will revert to Jersey water as the landowner. We have also agreed to install the compensation planting and temporary screening in the next available planting season (this will be before the end of this year if the application is successfully determined).

7. **Location of waterworks gate** – As requested in the representations we have now left the waterworks gate in its current location such that vehicles cannot drive up in front of the Westward Ho properties. A small local realignment will be required in order to accommodate the new path. We believe that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are happy are now happy with these proposals.
8. **Environmental issues/route of path/stream crossing** – The revised route in the amended application does still cross the stream which has been highlighted as worthy of environmental protection. Our Ecologist has considered the revised route and stream crossing and is comfortable that the location, construction and ongoing maintenance proposed will have no detrimental effect on the stream banks. The suggested rerouting of the path such that it did not cross the stream at all was discussed, drawn up, and put to Jersey Water as a suggested alternative route. Unfortunately they were not supportive of these proposals as it took the route of the path to close to live operational areas.
9. **Landowner approval of the scheme** – We have liaised extensively with Jersey Water throughout the development of the scheme and they have generally been supportive of the principal of the scheme from the outset. They have been fully cooperative with regard to route planning except where the route of the proposed path conflicted with their operational requirements. They are now happy with all aspects of the path with regard to proposed route, construction, maintenances and safety issues.

I trust this demonstrates that we have taken [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] concerns seriously and have proposed appropriate mitigation measures to reduce the impact of the scheme on their respective properties

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Director of Engineering and Infrastructure

Cc [REDACTED]

Cc [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2015 11:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Valley path - Letter please to [REDACTED]

Made a few suggestions

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2015 08:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Valley path - Letter please to [REDACTED]

Hi [REDACTED]

Please find attached a draft of a letter in response to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] representations on the Valley path. Any comments gratefully received with regard to accuracies, additions or omissions.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

St Peter's Valley Roadside path

In response to [REDACTED] e-mail dated 22nd April and [REDACTED] e-mail dated 4th May expressing their concerns regarding the above planning application I arranged to meet with [REDACTED] and their immediate neighbour [REDACTED] on site on 14 May 2015. We first met with [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] and then met with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as a group and walked the site and listened to their concerns.

Since that meeting myself and other TTS officers have met with [REDACTED] on a number of further occasions (some of which you have attended to provide pre – planning advice) to discuss [REDACTED] issues in particular and TTS's proposals for mitigating her concerns.

Based on these meetings, revised drawings and a detailed maintenance plan of the immediate area have been developed and have been submitted with the recently amended planning application. The final drawing and maintenance plan has been arrived at following a number of iterations which have included discussions with [REDACTED] Jersey Water as the land owner and yourself providing pre – application advice. I enclose a copy of drawing number SPV 011 and Maintenance Plan reference "South of La Hague Reservoir Landscape Management Plan" which are the final conclusion of those meetings.

During our discussions with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] we have sought, where possible to address their concerns and to include appropriate mitigation in our amended application. I list below our response to their joint comments which hopefully reflect our attempts to mitigate the impact of the proposed scheme on both of their respective properties. As the issues raised are similar in both representation e-mails my response covers both representations. I have copied this letter to both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] so they are aware of my response to you.

1. **Overall need for the Path** – St Peter's Valley is a dangerous road for pedestrians and cyclists to travel on and has a high historical accident rate as a consequence of its limited road width, and the lack of suitable footpaths or pavements. There have been numerous requests over the years for this situation to be improved with requests being received from Politicians, Parish representatives, businesses, residents, parents and individual members of the Public. In an attempt to rectify this unsafe situation informal roadside walking paths have

been developed in previous years by States departments and NGO's, by agreement with landowners in the valley, which, in part, still exist today. These paths are not joined up and in some cases have fallen in to disrepair

2. **Links to existing Policy** - The States Sustainable Transport Policy (STP) undertakes to change the way we travel about our island in order to reduce congestion, pollution and increase our levels of physical activity. This will deliver significant tangible benefits. The Island Plan (Policy TT1) also has an objective to enable and promote walking, cycling and public transport as a more sustainable mode of travel than the private car. Road safety is also a key aspect of STP. Whilst cars have become safer in recent decades, pedestrians and cyclists remain very vulnerable road users and the States policy to reduce injury rates and encourage more walking and cycling, must be accompanied by measures which make those road users safer. The Valley Path therefore, is an excellent opportunity to deliver a facility which meets the requirements and fully supports the objectives of the Island Plan and the STP.
3. **Inaccurate plans** – The Digimap mapping tiles which our original drawings were based on were out of date as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] point out. These tiles have now been updated by Digimap and the amended application is now based on these tiles which updates the plans for the entire Valley. In addition a new detailed drawing and maintenance plan, as referred to above, have been created for the immediate vicinity of Numbers 1 and 2 Westward Ho.
4. **Surfacing of the path** – With the exception of a small length of path, the path is proposed to be surfaced with brown tarmac. This surface material will provide a surface which can be easily maintained and a level solid surface suitable for both pedestrians and cyclists. As part of the public consultation, four short sections of path were created with different surfaces for the public to view and comment on. The majority of people who viewed these trial surfaces agreed that brown tarmac would provide a sustainable, usable surface which would, over time, blend in with the natural character of the valley.
5. **Road safety**
 - a. **Mont de L'Ecole junction** – Both respondents expressed concern with regard to the safety of the Mont de L'Ecole junction and suggested that a survey was carried out in peak time hours. This survey has been carried out and has been submitted with the amended application. The survey, carried out by an independent UK Road Safety expert, recommends improvements to the visibility splays to comply with highway safety standards. The design for this crossing point has been revised accordingly and details are included within amendment No.1 to the planning application.
 - b. **Signing/ marking of Le Rue de la Moulin de la Hague** – Adequate signage for connectivity and wayfinding will be included in the scheme, but this level of detail is not included in the planning application. As a general rule we do not put down lines or erect signage in small country lanes unless absolutely necessary. In this instance we do not believe that either is necessary. However, if the application is successful and in the event that users are unclear of the route small directional signage could be added.
 - c. **Parking in La Rue du Moulin de la Hague** – We do not believe the proposed path will cause additional parking in the area. However, as explained to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in our initial meeting we would be willing to approach the Connetable of St Peter to discuss parking restrictions if this became a problem at any time in the future.
6. **Loss of privacy and amenity and potential for noise and disturbance** – We accept that the location of the proposed path could have a detrimental impact to the privacy and amenity value of Numbers 1 and 2 Westward Ho and have therefore been to considerable lengths to include mitigation factors in to the amended application to reduce the impact of the path on their properties. As part of these discussions we have agreed to move the path as far away from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] properties as we can and have realigned the route to move as quickly away from [REDACTED] property as we can. We have engaged an Ecologist and Landscape Architect to develop a planting scheme which will provide a visual barrier to the path once it is established. We have also agreed to provide temporary fencing behind the new planting scheme to provide screening until the planting is established. Furthermore, and to ensure the planting

scheme matures successfully, we have agreed to maintain the new planting scheme for five years following which maintenance will revert to Jersey water as the landowner. We have also agreed to install the compensation planting and temporary screening in the next available planting season (this will be before the end of this year if the application is successfully determined).

7. **Location of waterworks gate** – As requested in the representations we have now left the waterworks gate in its current location such that vehicles cannot drive up in front of the Westward Ho properties. A small local realignment will be required in order to accommodate the new path. We believe that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are happy are now happy with these proposals.
8. **Environmental issues/route of path/stream crossing** – The revised route in the amended application does still cross the stream which has been highlighted as worthy of environmental protection. Our Ecologist has considered the revised route and stream crossing and is comfortable that the location, short-term and long-term impacts are minimised by the construction of a timber deck with minimal footprint. Options to reroute the path such that it did not cross the stream at all were discussed, drawn up, and put to Jersey Water as a suggested alternative route. Unfortunately they were not supportive of these proposals as it took the route of the path to close to live operational areas.
9. **Landowner approval of the scheme** – We have liaised extensively with Jersey Water throughout the development of the scheme and they have generally been supportive of the principal of the scheme from the outset. They have been fully cooperative with regard to route planning except where the route of the proposed path conflicted with their operational requirements. They are now happy with all aspects of the path with regard to proposed route, construction, maintenances and safety issues.

I trust this demonstrates that we have taken [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] concerns seriously and have proposed appropriate mitigation measures to ~~reduce the impact of the scheme on their respective properties~~ address their comments.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Director of Engineering and Infrastructure

Cc [REDACTED]
Cc [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 November 2014 15:04
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Valley path application

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for meeting with us last week to discuss the Valley path application. I attach a list of action points which we will address and aim to complete in the next two weeks.



St Peter's Valley
Roadside Pat...

Once complete we will submit this information as supplementary information to the existing application. As discussed you will set up a meeting with [REDACTED] for you and I to discuss the issues relating to POA's

Thanks again for your assistance on this application

Best regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Director of Engineering and Infrastructure
Transport and Technical Services
Phone - [REDACTED]
Mobile - [REDACTED]
E- mail [REDACTED]

Safe place to work
Safe place to live
CHOOSE SAFETY GET INVOLVED SPEAK OUT

St Peter's Valley Roadside Path

Meeting with Case Planner [REDACTED] 1/14

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Action Points

Aspect	Issue	Action	Action by
Tree removal adjacent to meadows south of De Quetival Mill	Need to identify mitigation for loss of screening by trees	Identify trees to be lost (and sapling clusters lost) and develop scheme for strategically located replacement trees and hedging.	[REDACTED] to develop tree management plan to cover meadow edges south of De Quetival Mill with illustrative planting sections
Path road edge terminations	Safety features to mark end of path	Road safety auditor's recommendation to be shown on application plans	[REDACTED] to brief [REDACTED]
Fencing style	Rustic style preferred	Provide fencing specification to case planner.	[REDACTED] to obtain National Trust Fencing Specification. [REDACTED] to identify available rustic fencing product specifications. Preferred fencing specification to be provided to planner.
De Quetival Mill path details around mill race	Define race crossing bridge and fencing detail	Contact National Trust to develop detail	[REDACTED] to contact National Trust to develop details.
Leatside safety rail	Rail along leatside edge of path to address risk of falls into leat	Develop rail detail	[REDACTED] to arrange with [REDACTED]
Les Gillettes path link connection	Extension to Les Gillettes be included in application	Revised application drawing	[REDACTED] to arrange with [REDACTED]
Stabilised path meadowside verges	Stabilisation detail needed	Geoweb detail to be provided	[REDACTED] to arrange with [REDACTED]
Mont des Louannes crossing point	Detail of crossing required	Detail showing extent of wall, opening in wall and lane crossing required	[REDACTED] to arrange with [REDACTED]
La Hague Manor	Long and cross section	Develop sections	[REDACTED] to arrange with [REDACTED]

decking bridge over wetland next to Mont du Presbeterie	of bridge required		
Crossing to Mont de L'ecole	Detail of opening through granite wall and roadedge footway on Mont de L'ecole required	Develop detailed plan	█ to arrange with █
Reservoir decking path	Safety concerns	Safety audit	█ to arrange with █ load Safety Auditor and input any recommended improvements
Trees west of La Hague Reservoir	Concern that the trees will need protecting from path construction for longevity	Develop tree protection detail to avoid mounding over of tree trunk	█ to arrange with █
La Dimerie crossing decking approach	2.4m path structure overbearing	Revise decking a 1.8m clear path width	█ to arrange with █
Construction and meadow management phasing	Programme of construction, meadow management and tree planting requires integration	Prepare integrated programme of construction, meadow management and tree planting	█ to prepare

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 April 2015 11:52
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: St Peters Valley Road Safety Comments.doc



St Peters Valley
Road Safety C...

Hi [REDACTED]

As discussed, the attached document contains the independent road safety auditor's comments and the designers responses for the junction at Mont de L'Ecole. This was submitted as part of the application. No. 12 on the documents list.

The path is shown in the correct place at the entrance to St George's School land. This is discussed in the attached document.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ST PETERS VALLEY PATH ROAD SAFETY COMMENTS AND DESIGNER'S RESPONSE Rev A

Prepared by: [REDACTED]

Response by [REDACTED]

8th January 2015

Job No917745E-HHC: 801.2

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This file note provides road safety comments on the elements of the St Peters Valley path proposals at the junctions of La Dimerie and Mont de L'Ecole, and considers the details presented on drawings 91745D-HHC 209 7 and 91745D-HHC 207 6. Both sites were visited by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] together on December 2nd 2014. This is not a formal road safety audit and it is recommended that a stage 2 audit is carried out at detailed design stage, to include signing details.

2.0 Road Safety Comments


91745D-HHC 209 7 – La Dimerie

- 2.1 The main pedestrian and cycle route is between La Dimerie to the west and St Peters Valley Road to the south. The design includes a shared cycle and pedestrian path on the east side, which is kerbed and runs alongside the existing wall, up to a point where the width becomes restrictive, at which point a gap is created in the wall and the path continues on the east side of the wall, with a post and rail fence adjacent to a drop of approximately 2-3m. There is also a proposed kerbed build out area on the west side to the south of the La Dimerie junction.
- 2.2 Dropped kerbs are not shown on the drawing but it is understood that these will be provided on the build-out to provide access from both La Dimerie and St Peters Valley Road, and on the proposed shared path to provide access to cross St Peters Valley Road at La Dimerie, and for cyclists to access the path from the north.
- 2.4 The proposed crossing point with the build out provides adequate visibility in both directions, and the width of the path is sufficient to allow two cyclists to pass while turning at the crossing. **The dropped kerb is not shown on the drawing but should be sufficiently wide to allow for two way accesses, especially as this is a leisure route and may be used by family groups with young children.**
- 2.5 The path narrows toward the point where the wall is broken through, and a 1.4m clear gap is dimensioned on the drawing. This may not provide sufficient room for cyclists to manoeuvre through what is effectively a chicane, if there are others present cycling in the opposite direction, and may also be difficult for maintenance vehicles to negotiate. **It is recommended that a larger gap in the wall is created, so that there are two 1.4m gaps separated by a bollard. This could be achieved by setting the last panel of the fence at 45 degrees.**

- [REDACTED]
- 2.6 It is expected that this facility will be used by ramblers and leisure cyclists, family groups, etc., and that more experienced cyclists approaching from either direction will not use this short link if there are slower users present, particularly given its short length. ***It may be advantageous to provide an additional dropped kerb close to, but not opposite, the proposed gap in the wall, to allow an escape route for faster cyclists that do not wish to continue on the path behind slower users.***
- 2.7 The height of the fence is shown as 1.2m, but is it understood that 1.4m has been considered, as this meets the current UK standard for a cycle path next to a drop. This additional height takes into account the higher centre of gravity of cyclists to ensure that they would not be thrown over the fence if they struck it at speed, but also takes into account the potential risk to cyclists if there is a drop onto a road, railway, or body of water below. In this case, it could be argued that faster cyclists are unlikely to use this section of the path and would be more likely to use the road. Those using the path would therefore have a low risk of striking the fence, and an extremely low risk of being so out of control as to be thrown over the fence. If they are thrown over, they will have a lesser risk of serious injury as they will be falling into a meadow rather than a live carriageway. ***The only section where the risk may be slightly higher could be opposite the proposed gap in the wall where cyclists may approach at speed and misjudge the manoeuvre, and therefore there is a case for maintaining the higher fence over this short length.*** The visual benefits for all users of providing a lower fence at 1.1 or 1.2m could be argued to outweigh the very small safety risk.
- 2.8 ***Where the kerbed edge continues alongside the road adjacent to the new path behind the wall, it is not clear from the drawing how wide this would be, or how it would be surfaced.*** If it is wide enough to walk on, even if this is for only part of the length, it should be treated with a deterrent paving to discourage pedestrians from walking on it, particularly as it appears to be wider at the northern end, and pedestrians walking south would have their backs to traffic and be potentially very close to wing mirrors on lorries.

91745D-HHC 207 6 - Mont de L'Ecole

- 2.9 This drawing shown the path emerging approximately 15m east of the St Peters Valley Road, and users crossing the main road to a path behind the existing wall via a newly created gap. A kerbed path in Mont de L'Ecole, 1m wide is proposed.
- 2.10 ***A 1m wide path is not wide enough for two people to walk alongside each other, or for two to pass comfortably.*** Consequently pedestrians in groups will walk in the road, and cyclists will probably not use it. A wheelchair or a buggy would not have enough space to get up the kerb and turn in this width. In such circumstances, where there is no room to make the path any wider, it would be better to have no path at all, or a virtual footway that would warn drivers approaching from Mont de L'Ecole to stay clear of the wall so that pedestrians and cyclists crossing from the opposite side have space.

- 
- 2.11 There is a tree to be removed where the gap in the wall is being created, and vegetation clearance will provide improved visibility. Where the gap in the wall is being created, the wall height to the south is already lower, and is unclear what the wall height will be adjacent to the gap. ***Reducing the height of the wall to maintain it at the existing lower level would help to maintain visibility.***
- 2.12 The pedestrian barrier should ideally be set back at least 450mm from the edge of the road, but 330mm as a minimum, although it appears to be right on the edge. Normally short lengths of pedestrian barrier are used where footpaths emerge at right angles onto a road, from between buildings or other obstructions where there is no appreciation of the road ahead, to prevent children from running or cycling into the road. This is not the case here, the new path will be reasonably level as it approaches the road and if the wall height is reduced there will be a good appreciation of the road over the last 20m or so. The barrier as shown could create a pinch point for cyclists and for the maintenance vehicle that will be accessing the path. ***It is recommended that this length of guard railing is reconsidered, and if it is still thought to be beneficial, it should be set back an appropriate distance. Alternatively, consider a removable bollard to delineate the end of the track at the junction.***

3.0 Designers Response

91745D-HHC 209 7 – La Dimerie

- 3.1 **Issue 1** - *The dropped kerb is not shown on the drawing but should be sufficiently wide to allow for two way access, especially as this is a leisure route and may be used by family groups with young children. It is recommended that a larger gap in the wall is created, so that there are two 1.4m gaps separated by a bollard. This could be achieved by setting the last panel of the fence at 45 degrees.*

Designer's Response 1 – The recommendations are accepted and the design has been revised. Drawing 209 shows the revised proposed arrangement which provides two 1.4m wide openings, separated by a bollard with a full width dropped kerb.

- 3.2 **Issue 2** - *It may be advantageous to provide an additional dropped kerb close to, but not opposite, the proposed gap in the wall, to allow an escape route for faster cyclists that do not wish to continue on the path behind slower users.*

Designer's Response 2 – The recommendation is accepted: a dropped kerb will be provided as part of the detailed design.

- 3.3 **Issue 3** - *The height of the fence is shown as 1.2m, but is it understood that 1.4m has been considered, as this meets the current UK standard for a cycle path next to a drop. The only section where the risk may be slightly higher could be opposite the proposed gap in the wall where cyclists may approach at speed and misjudge the manoeuvre, and therefore there is a case for maintaining the higher fence over this*

[REDACTED]

short length.

Designer's Response 3- Recommendation accepted; the proposed fence height will be increased to 1.4m over this section.

- 3.4 Issue 4-** *Where the kerbed edge continues alongside the road adjacent to the new path behind the wall, it is not clear from the drawing how wide this would be, or how it would be surfaced. If it is wide enough to walk on, even if this is for only part of the length, it should be treated with a deterrent paving to discourage pedestrians from walking on it, particularly as it appears to be wider at the northern end, and pedestrians walking south would have their backs to traffic and be potentially very close to wing mirrors on lorries*

Designer's Response 4 – The recommendation is accepted and the path arrangement has been amended as requested. The kerb will end adjacent the 'gap' in the wall and the footway will terminate at this point to encourage pedestrians and cyclists to use the path behind the wall.

91745D-HHC 207 6 - Mont de L'Ecole

- 3.5 Issue 5 -** *A 1m wide path is not wide enough for two people to walk alongside each other, or for two to pass comfortably.*

Designer's Response 5 – Recommendation accepted: the footway has been redesigned as a 'virtual' footway to avoid the physical width restriction of a kerb.

- 3.6 Issue 6 -** *Reducing the height of the wall to maintain it at the existing lower level would help to maintain visibility. It is recommended that this length of guard railing is reconsidered, and if it is still thought to be beneficial, it should be set back an appropriate distance. Alternatively, consider a removable bollard to delineate the end of the track at the junction.*

Designer's Response 6 – The path and crossing have been redesigned at this point to address the comments and recommendations. The opening in the existing wall has been moved to provide a larger emergence 'landing' which delivers pedestrians and cyclists at the desired crossing point without the need for guardrailing. The revised arrangement is shown clearly on Drawing 207.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 August 2015 19:13
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection St Peter's Valley footpath P/2015/0579

Dear [REDACTED]

Following on from my initial objection and further consultation with the Applicant [REDACTED] I am submitting these supplementary concerns reflecting on the revised proposal for a single section of the proposed footpath.

Privacy and amenity impact

I acquired a property in a green zone as it afforded me a high degree of privacy and amenity which was unlikely to be impacted by further residential development given its location by a protected water source in an area of natural beauty in the valley. The application to construct a cycle and pedestrian footpath whose current proposed route runs at one section alongside two aspects of my boundary has the potential to destroy any reasonable expectation of, and right to, that privacy. In the letter to you of 20 July 2015 from TTS (the Applicant) this potential for loss of privacy and amenity is accepted.

I am appreciative of the time [REDACTED] has taken to consult further with me on their revised proposal for the section in question. Their latest proposal contains screen belt planting, a 5 year maintenance program and a 1.8 metre close boarded softwood fence as a temporary measure. As a package, if approved in entirety, this goes some way to mitigation of impact. However it should be noted that there will nonetheless be clear and proximate sight lines through proposed access gates and at both bridges crossing the stream.

However a close boarded wooden fence, of whatever type is considered agreeable, is critical to the overall acceptability of this proposal. This fencing is intended to afford privacy and enjoyment of the property in the first years whilst the proposed screen barrier planting establishes itself and matures to a reasonable height and coverage that it will, in time, provide some of the said privacy and negate the requirement for the fence to remain. Over time we would all prefer the barrier to look as natural as possible hence the selection of indigenous species and the informal planting scheme. The report prepared by the TTS appointed landscape consultant states that whilst growth rates of the plants vary, "some will grow to 3 metres in approximately 5 years, others will take longer". This in effect means that over the first 3 to 4 years the specified plants alone would not afford privacy or amenity to any acceptable level from what is not fast moving vehicles but leisure walkers and cyclists.

The transparent green mesh sometimes used to provide short term screening is flimsy and transparent even when doubled over and its fluorescent colour means it is no more sympathetic to the rural aspect than a temporary wooden fence. Moreover such green mesh as we have seen at building sites is intended for very short term use, tends to deteriorate quickly and is easily pulled away or damaged to create a public eyesore. It is unlikely it would last long enough, over several years, to allow the planted screening to reach any amenity height or coverage and fulfill its purpose. Using more mature plants was not recommended by the landscape consultant as apparently they can fail more often to establish.

In [REDACTED] ecology impact report of 10 July 2015 on the new proposals for this section, [REDACTED] is supportive of wooden fencing making the following statement "13. The intention to erect a wooden fence along the boardwalk through this section will prevent public deviation from the path, thus reducing disturbance and compaction to adjacent habitats." [REDACTED] is referring to the boggy section of habitat where environmentally sensitive replanting is proposed. I would again suggest that a flimsy mesh material will not prevent those that wish to stray from the path to explore along the bankside of the stream from doing so. In a separate report the bankside in this particular area was commented on as habitat "worthy of protection."

It should also be noted that one boundary facing the windows of the property currently has seasonal foliage of deciduous trees. In winter these afford no visual screening from the new path. It is proposed to remove them and

replace with further barrier screening which would in time apparently provide year round visual screening. However again without temporary wooden fencing in the early years there will be increased intrusion through the windows into a downstairs cloakroom and living room from pathway walkers .

Ongoing maintenance, cleaning and repair provision

Whilst it may not be part of a Planning remit, it is incumbent on those approving the investment of up to 1.7 million of public funds to develop this footpath to ensure it is not wasted taxpayer money. The existing stretches of valley path developed by a variety of agencies including the States have fallen into disrepair due to poor maintenance. Rubbish plagues this beautiful ,environmentally sensitive valley in the form of cans and bottles along the roadside and fly tipping yet to be resolved by the relevant agency. Encouraging greater use of the valley brings with it greater potential for further littering and we hope that, in the event planning consent is given, reasonable conditions are set for cleaning and maintaining the path and regular rubbish cleaning the length of the valley, the route of the path itself and any afflicted neighbouring land and that the TTS minister [REDACTED] is satisfied there are adequate funds allocated to meet these ongoing obligations .

Health and safety

I note the TTS response to my previous concerns relating to the rue de lecole, rue de la vallee and rue du moulin de la Hague junction. I remain concerned about the safety of this junction for all road users as cyclists and pedestrians will be asked to cross two roads in quick succession at a busy junction. Turning a car down into moulin de la Hague the driver will be dealing with negotiating the junction rather than looking for walkers or cyclists appearing suddenly up the hill and the existing sight lines are poor. Any steps that can be taken as part of the planning of this path to improve this junction could be beneficial to all road users .La rue du moulin de la Hague itself is in a poor state of repair and recently suffered localised flooding from the nearby stream creating additional potential hazards.

Thank you for your consideration of the above. I reserve the right to make additional representation prior to any Hearing.

Yours Sincerely
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 April 2015 21:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application P/2015/059

Relating to the revised section of the "St Peter's valley roadside path "proposed for la rue du moulin de la Hague and the Jersey Waterworks site at La Hague Reservoir .

Dear [REDACTED]

I live at 2 Westward Ho, la rue du moulin de la Hague and I am writing to place my objections to the proposed route onto record as I understand is the appropriate process .As the plans were as you are aware not initially available in St Lawrence parish hall as stated and I am away from tomorrow I have prepared this somewhat in haste and may wish to add or amend it further on my return when I have had a better chance to reflect and review available materials.I do hope that is acceptable.

Loss of privacy and amenity and potential for noise and disturbance(reference picture 3 attached)
My concerns primarily relate to the impact of the path routing over waterworks land and specifically where it is proposed to move the main waterworks gate to and place the pathway route over the stream.The third photograph I have attached shows roughly where this bridge and path is to be routed in the bottom right hand corner. You will see this is less than a mere 5 metres from my boundary and rear garden thus materially impacting my privacy. Under section GD1 p art 3 of the planning laws to which I understand I should refer in placing my objection it states proposals"must not unreasonably harm the amenities of neighbouring users,including the living conditions for nearby residents.....and....not unreasonably affect the level of privacy to buildings and land that occupiers might expect to enjoy. As you are aware I will have no privacy to enjoy as the path will be a matter of feet away from my fence as pictured with no trees or shrubs providing any screening.

If I have understood the proposals correctly and forgive me I am no expert, there is a proposal to move the Waterworks gate from its current location to immediately adjacent to my property and this will cause further noise and disturbance as cars and vans stop to open these gets day and night to allow Waterworks staff to go about their business at the pumps. I appreciate Waterworks wish to restrict public access to their sheds but if the gate were left in its current location and access created for bicycles and pedestrians to one side of this surely this would suffice. The public will not be restrained by mere wooden post fencing should they wish to wander up to the reservoir in any event. I would suggest that the pedestrians are highly likely to make use of their access to walk around both sides of the reservoir .

Inaccurate plans and out of date assessments of impact
The plans upon which TTS have submitted their application do not accurately reflect the footprint of the current dwellings. Nor do the descriptions accurately reflect the current level of privacy afforded by the vegetation which was recently cut down to allow Waterworks to have a sightline to their boundary stone.The proposals show trees and shrubs being left to afford privacy to current occupiers but a new inspection should be made to update this situation.

Environment and security/ maintenance/ land management
The environment report says the banks of the stream are worthy of protection and yet the route traverses these natural banks when further up the existing established pathway there is a concrete walled stream and area of grass of no interest that would both be cheaper to develop and afford my property a better if not ideal level of privacy (reference picture 2).This fulfils cost,impact and environment issues. I would request that this be given due consideration with Waterworks as an alternative minor adjustment to the routing at this stretch.

I am rather surprised Waterworks are in favour of this proposal as it will be I assume their responsibility to police safety and cleanliness of the area? please can responsibilities be made clearer in the proposals so landowners are aware. Waterworks had issues previously with people misusing the site at night which caused them to secure the gates. If misuse reoccurs once this path is well known I assume the landlord will be responsible. Also we were required to hold insurance in case waste from our properties contaminates what was described as a critical water supply. surely the experience at Val de la mar is sufficient for all involved to be concerned about increasing knowledge of and footfall to this area. There is log cutting and a generator shed on the site and further along the reservoir there is a deep mud and danger sign. Would these not be public safety issues if not properly secured?

Cars and traffic

This pathway is I understand not intended as recreational but in parts will lead to recreational use by families. This will in turn increase further traffic in this area and parking along moulin de la Hague which is a narrow parish road as well as other parts of the valley.

The island plan wishes to encourage people out of private cars and onto foot or bicycle. As this path is not suitable for road bikes and there is an inadequate bus service at this top end of the valley I would query how this fulfils these objectives and how this can then be asserted as a pathway intended to improve public safety if the demand is as negligible as asserted in the proposals.

Road safety (reference picture 1)

The first picture attached shows the current junction of the main valley road and rue lecole with moulin de la Hague running off this shortly thereafter. This turning is already dangerous as its a blind corner with traffic coming down the valley and down rue lecole. Creating a pedestrian crossing point here will create in effect a crossroads and prove a lethal mix of road user in particular once the Living Legend site is developed. I appreciate a safety officer has already inspected this but I respectfully suggest a current inspection at rush hour or school pickup might give a more accurate and contemporary picture of the potential for disaster here especially if bicycles and children use the route.

My understanding is the planning law in Jersey is to protect the natural and built environment. This pathway appears to be a substitute for reducing the speed limit for traffic and in particular lorries driving down this part of the valley at 40 mph. Speed restrictions have not been tried to improve the position for everyone with the granite works set to increase heavy vehicles use of this road yet further. Furthermore the speed restrictions further down the valley are not adequately enforced during the granite works development. If this path does not appeal to road bike users and becomes either recreational leading to demands for more parking or worse the investment is not used and therefore is not justified, I would ask if this is the best use of money given its overall impact on areas of natural beauty and environmental interest regardless of whether or not the granite works or the taxpayer ultimately underwrite the costs of the project.

Thank you for your time in considering this matter as I appreciate the scale of the project. Please confirm receipt of this email and photographs and that you will treat it as a postal record as I am unable to add photographs to the website form.

Your sincerely



Picture 1

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@[REDACTED].com>
Sent: 04 May 2015 12:56
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed St Peter's Valley Roadside Pathway

Dear [REDACTED]

Further to the recent site visit to discuss the above I have detailed my concerns around the proposed route to add to those already submitted by [REDACTED]. I hope the comments are clear and I should be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt. Please also confirm whether these need to be submitted via the online system or if this email is sufficient for your purpose.

Many thanks for your time

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Note referred to:

I am writing to express my concerns on several aspects of the proposed "St Peter's valley roadside path" particularly where it crosses from the West of St Peter's valley at the junction with Mont de L'Ecole and then immediately turns into La Rue du Moulin de la Hague.

Traffic Impact

I understand the proposed pathway is intended to reduce pedestrian and cycle traffic using the St Peter's valley route. I feel however that the proposed surface being used on the pathway will not be suitable for road cycles and therefore this traffic will not transfer from the main road. My view is that the path will become a recreational facility rather than a throughway and this will lead to more vehicle traffic as people drive to the area to use the pathway,

There is no safe parking in this area and La Rue du Moulin de la Hague is too narrow to allow for parked vehicles and still allow access to the residential properties on this road.

Road safety

There are a number of concerning issues around road safety:

- The proposal for the pathway to cross directly opposite the junction of Mont de L'Ecole and La Vallee de Saint-Pierre is inherently dangerous. The crossing area is on a blind corner where there are very limited lines of sight both North & South. Traffic flow here is very high at peak times as significant traffic volume flows down from St Mary and is then joined by traffic feeding down Les Routeurs. If you add in the complication of traffic trying to join the main route from Mont de L'Ecole you will have a complicated traffic flow with pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross despite the restricted visibility. The traffic also passes this point at 40 mph which does not give much time for anyone crossing to take appropriate action. I believe an alternative main crossing point needs to be considered.

- There are, I understand no plans to adequately signpost or have road markings clarifying that La Rue de Moulin de la Hague will be used both for the footpath and remain as a normal road. This is a narrow Parish road with no speed restriction and unless sufficiently delineated there is the potential for confusion/conflict between motor traffic and users of the "footpath".
- There are currently no parking restrictions on the road but it is too narrow to allow parking safely without blocking the road. This will need to be addressed to avoid disruption to local residents' access.
- To appreciate the traffic safety point I believe this should be monitored at peak times (7am to 8.30am) when all commuter traffic and scheduled and school buses are using the route.

Proposed route over Jersey Water

Here again there are a number of issues that should be considered further.

- The proposal to leave the entrance to the footpath from La Rue du Moulin de la Hague open to vehicle traffic is flawed. Whilst this is intended to allow Jersey Water access to their plant at the Reservoir it has the capability of other vehicles using the existing rough driveway. This could be avoided by leaving the existing access gate where it is and creating a side entrance (suitable only for pedestrians and cyclists to use).
- I have concerns that people will use the footpath to access the land around the reservoir for recreational use. Whilst I understand the proposed pathway will be fenced along its length the potential for people to access in their vehicles (as above) could see this being misused.
- The proposed route to the footpath where it leaves the existing Jersey Water access road seems to have been poorly thought out. The proposed route cuts directly through an existing small coppice area which contains a large amount of native trees and plants which supports diverse wildlife. If the pathway was to branch off a further 30 metres or so to the North-East along the access road then this area is already cleared of all vegetation and would purely cross grass with no disturbance to existing flora or fauna. Whilst Jersey Water may feel this takes footpath users closer to their workshops a combination of this and leaving the current gate in-situ would ensure it was only foot & cycle traffic in this area. There would be no additional likelihood of people straying onto their land than via the currently proposed route.
- The proposed route also appears to have been based on out of date plans/drawings of the area and does not reflect the current layout of residential properties. As such the proposed route (through the coppice of trees) would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for our neighbour's property (2 Westward Ho). The garden here would be severely overlooked by users of the pathway therefore depriving the owners of acceptable privacy in their garden. There is also the likelihood of additional noise and potential litter.
- The environment report states that the banks of the stream are worthy of protection and yet the proposed route traverses these natural banks. The suggested alternative further up the access road is an area where the stream already has concrete walls controlling the watercourse and therefore there would be no disruption by using this area.

I would hope that the various points raised above will be taken into full consideration before any consent is given to this proposal.



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2015 10:39
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Proposed Roadside footpath, St Peter's Valley

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear [REDACTED]

I appreciate your response to my letter regarding the proposed roadside footpath in St Peter's Valley and I agree that there is an opportunity to redevelop the existing footpaths through the valley for the use of horse riders - subject to approval from the landowners - and that is a project that the Jersey Riding Club will be looking at both in St Peters Valley and island-wide over the coming months.

but I do still find the reasoning behind the proposal confusing.

There is a green lane route from pretty much from St Mary to the Avenue already. This is a safe existing route for cyclists and appears to be a popular route to town. It runs from La Dimerie, briefly along St Peters Valley, up Mont de la Hague, along Rue de la Hague, La Rue de la Fontaine, La Mont des Grupieaux and down into Sandybrook, through the perquage and onto the cycle track on the Avenue.

I encounter many cycling commuters on this route both mornings and evenings (counted 18 yesterday evening) and very few cyclists through St Peters Valley apart from one MAMIL sprinting down the valley as if competing in the Tour de France!

It would seem that provision is being made for cyclists where there is already a safe route into town?

Please be assured I am delighted that folk are being encouraged to cycle more - but it seems a shame to urbanise St Peter Valley with this as an objective.

Kind regards,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, 9 Jul 2015 14:33:13 +0100
Subject: Proposed Roadside footpath, St Peter's Valley

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached for your information a copy of a letter sent to Planning and Environment in response to your letter to the Planning Department of 22 June.

With thanks