

Appendix 2

Consultation responses:

Local Access Forum

Maidenhead Civic Society

East Berks Ramblers

The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Access Forum

Secretariat: Andrew Fletcher, Public Rights of Way Officer
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Town Hall, St. Ives Road, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 1RF
Telephone: 01628 796122 **Email:** prow@rbwm.gov.uk
https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200938/local_access_forums

RBWM Local Access Forum Fast Response Team

Consultation Response: Maidenhead Footpath 12, 16 & 19 diversion proposals

22nd June 2017

Maidenhead Footpath 19 (part)

The Local Access Forum has previously examined the proposal for the diversion of Maidenhead Footpath 19 at its full meeting on the 29th June 2016. The Forum recommended that the diversion be allowed, with the following conditions:

- a. Width of the path should be a minimum of 3 metres to cater for cyclist and walking traffic
- b. The new line of the path should be protected on the Definitive Map
- c. Access to the cycle track should be improved at each end of the footpath, in particular the keyhole barriers in place along the cycleway should be replaced with more accessible structures

Maidenhead Footpaths 12 & 16 (part)

The Local Access Forum (LAF) Fast Response Team have examined the above diversion application and make the following comments on behalf of the Forum:

1. The forum notes the revised application for the diversion of Footpath 19 (with a width of 2.7 metres), as well as the diversion of Maidenhead Footpaths 12 and 16 (part).
2. The forum welcomes the agreement to remove the 5 existing barriers along the paths in this area, to be replaced with 3 K-Barrier installations, however it would like to recommend that the width of the K-Barriers be set to 600mm between the squeeze plates. This is felt to be the best width in order to provide good accessibility to all users whilst still preventing motorcycle access.
3. Subject to the specified barrier width above, the forum has no objection to the proposed diversion order for Maidenhead Footpath 12, 16 (part) and 19 (part).

This letter constitutes formal advice from the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council is required, in accordance with section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to have regard to relevant advice from this forum in carrying out its functions.

Anthony Hurst

Subject: FW: Proposed Footpath Diversions (Summerleaze)

From: Ann Darracott

Sent: 18/06/2017 14:58

To: Anthony Hurst

Subject: RE: Proposed Footpath Diversions (Summerleaze)

Dear Anthony

These proposed diversions were discussed at the recent Civic Society executive committee meeting.

Map 1: Approve of the removal on FP 13 of the existing motor cycle barrier and barred kissing gate and replacement with a K barrier.

We wish to point out that diverting FP12 onto the permitted path/cycleway will mean that on occasion the relocated footpath will be closed due to flooding (see attached image), but on balance it is probably a good idea to move the footpath away from the road.

We reiterate our earlier comment that the edges of a shared use path must be cleared regularly as vegetation over time encroaches.

There have been rumours that Little Farm Nursery is to be developed. Such development will require an access road, the location of which is at present unknown, at least to us. It is likely to impact on FP12 and 16. We strenuously object to the creation of any more roads in this area, that would be likely to cross footpaths and cycleway, endangering walkers and cyclists. There is no point in diverting a footpath away from road traffic only to have the path crossed by it elsewhere.

Map 2: Approve of the diversion of FP19 to the cycleway. We note that the keyhole barrier is to be replaced by a 1m wide gap. Is this sufficient for the manhandling of a cycle through the gap? We are concerned that cyclists will still prefer to use the old footbridge.

Map 3: Approve of the replacement of keyhole barriers on Lutman Lane and Strand Lane with K barriers.

Regards

Ann Darracott

Maidenhead Civic Society

Anthony Hurst

Subject: FW: Proposed Footpath Diversions (Summerleaze)

From: Steve Gillions

Sent: 15/06/2017 12:06

To: Anthony Hurst

Cc: ljhhugo@yahoo.co.uk; David Bailey; Gordon Marrs

Subject: RE: Proposed Footpath Diversions (Summerleaze)

Dear Anthony

Thank you very much for coming back to me on this.

As you say, the proposed changes do take our comments and suggestions on board and EBR think they will result in a substantial improvement to the PROW network in North Maidenhead. We do therefore support the proposal, subject to one qualification as set out below. I would like to express our appreciation of the consultation process undertaken by Jan Molyneux as Summerleaze's consultant, and the input to the process from your team.

I would ask that that the K barrier width between the squeeze plates be set at 620mm in order to allow the passage of most mobility equipment and pushchairs. This accords with the view of Lisa Hughes, who represents disabled users on the LAF, and would match the gap at an existing K barrier in Eton.

Kind regards

Steve

Steve Gillions

Footpath Secretary, East Berks Ramblers.