



Which of the following best describes you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I live in the Royal Borough	93.2%	82
I live outside the Royal Borough	2.3%	2
I represent a business based within the Royal Borough	1.1%	1
I represent a business based outside of the Royal Borough	1.1%	1
I represent a not-for-profit organisation within the Royal Borough	0.0%	0
I represent a not-for-profit organisation based outside of the Royal	0.0%	0
I represent a parish / town council within the Royal Borough	1.1%	1
I represent a parish / town council based outside of the Royal	0.0%	0
I represent a neighbouring unitary authority / borough council /	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)	1.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		0


Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Nov 15, 2016 7:33 PM	visit family in rbwm	



Are you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Male	68.7%	57
Female	31.3%	26
<i>answered question</i>		83
<i>skipped question</i>		5




How old are you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Under 18	2.4%	2
18-24	1.2%	1
25-34	7.2%	6
35-44	32.5%	27
45-54	31.3%	26
55-64	12.0%	10
65-74	12.0%	10
75 or over	1.2%	1
<i>answered question</i>		83
<i>skipped question</i>		5




Do you have a disability or health issue that prevents you from cycling or otherwise limits your personal mobility?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	1.2%	1
No	98.8%	82
<i>answered question</i>		83
<i>skipped question</i>		5




How often have you cycled in the last 12 months?						
Answer Options	Frequently (three times a week or more)	Regularly (once or twice a week)	Occasionally (one to three times a month)	Seldom (a few times)	Never	Response Count
All journey	40	16	16	9	1	82
<i>answered question</i>						82
<i>skipped question</i>						6




How often have you cycled in the last 12 months for the following journey purposes?

Answer Options	Frequently (three times a week or more)	Regularly (once or twice a week)	Occasionally (one to three times a month)	Seldom (a few times)	Never	Response Count
To school/college/university	2	3	1	2	49	57
To work	18	7	11	12	23	71
To connect to public transport	7	5	8	14	31	65
To the shops	6	15	24	18	12	75
To visit people/places	6	15	27	9	18	75
For leisure/health/ fitness	22	22	21	15	2	82
<i>answered question</i>						83
<i>skipped question</i>						5



The vision statement in the Cycling Strategy describes the ideal future situation that we aspire to achieve: "There is an established cycling culture within the Royal Borough

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	46.3%	38
Agree	19.5%	16
Neither agree nor disagree	6.1%	5
Disagree	20.7%	17
Strongly disagree	7.3%	6
Comments		33
<i>answered question</i>		82
<i>skipped question</i>		6




Comments	Proposed Response
This is accepted but doesn't deal with the real issue of safety where cycle routes are broken at critical points	- No change - This is addressed in the objectives
Continued Investment in infrastructure	-
We need a dedicated cycle path from Ascot To Windsor	-
Cycle areas are fragmented - the Royal Park is not available all the time and access is always by busy roads.	- No change - This is addressed in the objectives. The Great Park is now open to cyclists after dark.
There is a cycling culture but not on as wide as scale as there could be. It's not seen as particularly safe which prevents take-up. Kids don't adopt it easily because it's not seen as safe by parents, not encouraged by schools and not seen as trendy by the kids.	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
If only this could happen. There is very little joined up infrastructure to use. Compared the Bracknell Forest, we simply do not have enough to call a working system. Self interested landowners, constantly block any new routes and progress	-
There is no evidence of such vision. Cycling routes are few and do not cater for cycling for fitness or pleasure adequately.	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
We're not there yet, but it's a good objective	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
Not sure this statement is true and can't really see any infrastructure investment apart from the odd cycle lane. Don't feel there is a 'culture' of cycling.	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
On key routes that connect Windsor with nearby towns, there is little specific provision for cyclists. Particularly connecting Windsor with Staines (i.e. along A308 or B376). ▯	- No change - detailed issues are covered in the area profiles.

Ensure that you consult with cycling groups when designing things such as new cycle lanes far too many are not fit for purpose and as such are not used which is a waste of tax payers money for all concerned.	-
I took part in the cycle to work scheme where I could purchase a bike tax free but other than that I haven't seen anything that shows me that Windsor promotes cycling currently. I am definitely in favour of this strategy.	-
Not enough marked cycle lanes and signage. Cars definitely have a perceived priority on the roads.	-
Most people around me would rather drive and do not understand why as a family we would choose to cycle.	-
Cycling in the borough is very dangerous; the RBWM promised to aim for Dutch standards when building new roads. The Stafferton Rd link is a clear example of how not to build in cycling infrastructure .[]	-
We're very far from that vision at present.	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
I agree with the vision. Should not it also include that the facilities are provided to make this happen (e.g. cycle lanes, bike parking, ...	- No change - This is addressed in the objectives and action plan.
Cycling in Windsor is viewed as a dangerous activity since there are a small number of cycle lanes and they tend to be disconnected from each other	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
In my area the roads simply are not safe enough to cycle, they are narrow and winded with no cycle path or pavements.	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
The biggest challenge faced is the word "safe" used in this statement. Too many people I speak to are afraid to use bicycles in this area due to the fact they are forced to endure the busy traffic. Where there are shared paths they are often interrupted by busy junctions or uneven surfaces. Progress is slow and there is a lot of work to be done to bring cycling up to the levels we observe in Europe.	-
Cycling should be limited to recreation in designated areas that do not impede pedestrians or cars.	-
Too polluted with diesel so not healthy	-
This can't happen until a number of issues are addressed. Firstly there are no safe and easy ways to cross the A4. Secondly driver's attitudes towards speeding and careful driving in the borough is some of the worst I've ever seen. I was not brought up in this area and despite living in this area for 7 years, I am still shocked at how little people care for the lives of others on the roads around here. I live on Blackamoor Lane where speeding and reckless driving makes me fear for the safety of me and my son every day.	- No change - This is addressed in the action plan and area profiles.
It is an ideal future but will it ever be a reality? Cycling appears to be an inconvenience in the borough. Cars and lorries always take priority. Cycle lanes are inadequate. The roads are unsafe. My child goes off to school on his bike and I worry that he will get knocked off. I cycle along the Marlow Road in Maidenhead to work and it is like taking your life in your hands every time. I wonder if the councillors really appreciate the need? All the new houses being built, a proportion of developer contribution should be ringfenced to introducing cycle lanes on surrounding roads.	-
As a "vision statement" the tense is not quite right? As a vision "Striving to develop an established cycling culture within the Royal Borough where cycling is seen as a safe, attractive, healthy and normal form of everyday transport for residents, employees and visitors."	- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."
There are some good cycle paths but they do not join strategic locations well enough	- This is addressed in the action plan
Not seen as attractive as too many cycle thefts preventing people who work in town cycling and leaving bike	- This is addressed in the action plan
Vision statements in general are idealalistic.....more is needed to be done to train drivers who have never cycled to be more respectful	- This is addressed in the action plan
Drivers are very aggressive, it is dangerous to cycle on the roads where I am	- This is addressed in the action plan

<p>People like to cycle but I would not say it is SAFE. In Waltham St Lawrence the roads are bendy and there is no safe cycleway or indeed footpath. Further the bus service is abysmal and there is NOT a bus that runs to the nearest station and shops in Twyford.</p>	<p>- Change the start of the vision statement to "There will be..."</p>
<p>I would also add to the statement, that it be seen as a 'desirable means of transport' - avoiding traffic, easier parking, exercise, and reducing CO2</p>	<p>- No change - the vision statement already refers to cycling as an 'attractive' form of transport.</p>
<p>Needs to be more areas to secure bikes while working in Windsor</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>The idea of a "cycling culture" does not sit well with something being normal. I don't believe I've seen references to a "motoring culture" but too many people see driving everywhere as normal.</p>	<p>-</p>

How strongly do you agree with the aims of the strategy?

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
To deliver a safe, direct, convenient, coherent connected cycle route network	67	11	3	0	1	82
To improve integration between cycling and other forms of transport	44	26	10	1	1	82
To ensure that cycling provision is an integral part of the design of new development and is not considered as an afterthought	72	9	0	0	1	82
To ensure that cycling facilities are designed and built in accordance with (and where appropriate exceed) standards specified in	64	17	1	0	0	82
To improve local health outcomes for residents by increasing cycling activity levels	56	19	5	2	0	82
To establish monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that will measure the impact of local cycling investment	45	26	10	0	0	81
Comments						22
<i>answered question</i>						82
<i>skipped question</i>						6




Comments	Proposed Response
Also to educate all road users to co-exist happily.	- No change - this is covered in the action plan.
Please use plain language to say what you mean to do. I only have four degrees (inc. a PhD); so I have to look up "health outcome" and have still to learn what "best practice" REALLY means.	-
People who cycle should be consulted on how to achieve. There's lots of annoying things with existing cycle paths, even new ones. They're not designed from the cyclist perspective.	- No change - this is covered in the action plan.
To get the community on bikes you have to inspire the community and ensure they view bikes differently, perhaps cool or fun, a local closed road family charity ride or a race such as one from the tour series would help http://www.tourseries.co.uk/	- No change - this is covered in the action plan.
Safe cycling routes are limited at the moment so anything to improve them would be marvellous.	-
They're lofty aims considering the money spent on the cyclists death trap with a fountain on it just been spent.	-
To decrease traffic congestion and pollution.	- No change - although a change from car to bike for local journeys may have a net benefit in terms of congestion and pollution, there may be occasions where increasing priority over motor vehicles may lead to increased congestion locally (e.g. a new crossing facility).
How is £75000 sufficient for any new substantial building of cycling infrastructure ; this figure is the annual cycling budget in RBWM	- No change - Section 7 identifies a range of possible funding sources.
Needs to be not to the direct detriment of car users though. E.g. The Great Park is a brilliant place to cycle and there's more than enough space to create a dedicated cycle path adjacent to the road which would improve safety and efficiency for both cyclists and drivers. For journeys where cycling is not appropriate - we still need to be able to get around easily by car.	- No change - the Great Park (including some highway verges) are under the control of the Crown Estate. This strategy seeks to encourage cycling as a means of transport as well as a recreational activity.
Please put extra effort into making cycling safe for ordinary people (as opposed to cycling clubs) in rural areas. We need safe cycle paths that connect to villages. Speed limits need to be reduced and protective areas made for cyclists.	- No change - this is dealt with in the action plan and area profiles
RBWM's strategy statement has always been good - the implementation has however been rather poor	-
Health is dependent on so many other factors and lifestyle choices that I would advise excluding it as a measure to evaluate the success of cycling. To make it safe and easy to access is excellent and good to see it as the first point listed. Making it part of	-
Designated bike paths should be designed in the Great Park so cyclists have somewhere to go without causing congestion and danger on the roads.	- No change - routes through the Great Park are under the control of the Crown Estate. This strategy seeks to encourage cycling as a means of transport as well as a recreational activity.
You must achieve the aims & not water them down eg design and build to best practice takes a lot of money. Ensure route is not cobbled together eg up and down pavements, through areas without right of way (eg private road)	-
Spend a fortnight in the Netherlands using the bike car and public transport and see how it should be done	-
The aims are promising - but I would be more impressed if they included a timescale, otherwise they could be worthy but worthless.	- No change - the aims are supported by a number of SMART objectives.
Improving cycle paths for commuters will aid access to Crossrail. Important to reduce other traffic volume, pollution and improve area. Cycling is one of the best low impact exercises for ageing population.	-

Encourage more businesses to provide secure cycle storage and more importantly shower facilities and kit storage	- No change - this is incorporated into the objective relating to new development.
Strategy is fine but not much commitment behind it	-
But what about people who live in places where there are no new developments - such as Waltham St Lawrence?	- No change - specific actions for individual areas are identified in the Area Profiles.
Shared use paths with the accompanying road signs interspersing their length, conflict between pedestrians, and lack of a continuous and uninterrupted route(cyclists dismount at every junction), are not fit for purpose, and inevitably mean cyclists will use the road.[] A combination of direct to destination quietways (traffic restrictions), speed reductions and traffic calming measures, and ideally protected on road cycle paths should be the minimum, and will well exceed your goals below, and achieve the vision in the true sense.[] Pavements should be kept clear for pedestrians, by making parking on them illegal.	-
Concern that a focus on quality will prevent build of cycling facilities.	-

How strongly do you agree with the strategy's objectives?

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
To achieve a 15% increase in cycling trips between 2015 and 2020	46	23	3	4	4	80
To reduce cyclist casualties by 10% between 2015 and 2020	58	9	4	5	4	80
To increase resident satisfaction score for cycle routes and facilities from a baseline of 49.5% in 2015 to 60% by 2020	48	22	4	3	3	80
Comments						28
<i>answered question</i>						80
<i>skipped question</i>						8




Comments	Proposed Response
Is a 10% reduction in casualties sufficient or a challenging enough target?	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
The targets seem admirable, but I don't have enough info to comment on them.	-
Percentages can be very deceptive, especially if data cannot be captured reliably and interpreted without bias.	-
Think you need to aim higher than your 10% reduction in cyclist casualties.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
Target for reduction in casualties is not high enough.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
I think the strategy's aims of reducing casualties is insulting your aim should be to reduce a far higher number of casualties and support your local police force in undertaking a close pass initiative as has been done in the midlands. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-37384899	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% - TVP has been approached regarding the close pass initiative.

As a cyclist it's difficult not to agree with these aims!	- Adopt a more stretching target of
Cyclist casualties should decrease by more than 10% if cycle paths are implemented properly.[]	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
Is a 10% an under-ambitious target for casualty reduction?	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
The goals have been set very low. If there is only an increase of 15% in cycle trips over a 5 year period I would consider the cycling strategy to have been a failure	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips and reducing cyclist casualties.
The reduction in injuries should be more and the satisfaction higher.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for reducing cyclist casualties. - Previous experience with other satisfaction targets suggests that 60% will be challenging to achieve in 5 years.
To reduce cyclist casualties is good but if there have been none for the last few years then this is a pointless target	-
2020 is an ambitious goal, great to see you have near term objectives.	-
I think your targets are too conservative. Stretch yourselves and make Maidenhead an amazing town for cyclists and not just 'ok'.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips and reducing cyclist casualties.
Targets are way too low and have been set to be easily achievable(to get a tick in the relevant central govt return?)10% reduction in casualties target is shameful.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips and reducing cyclist casualties.
I don't think these go far enough. The council should make cycle lanes and safe cycling a priority and the objectives should be more ambitious - a 30% increase in cycling trips, and reduction in cyclist casualties of 50% and to increase resident satisfaction to 80%	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for reducing cyclist casualties. - Previous experience with other satisfaction targets suggests that 60% will be challenging to achieve in 5 years.
The increase over the 5 year period do not seem very ambitious (except the "satisfaction" which is 20% - a much more ambitious target to strive for! I believe some basic improvements could make a massive difference.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips and reducing cyclist casualties.
Safety for cyclists paramount. Accidents will kill take up in cycle journeys.	-
Good cycle tracks need to be used more too many cyclist still on road,more secure bike parking needed	- No change - these issues are addressed in the action plan.
The objectives are good but RBWM fails to take action against inconsiderate parking on footpaths/cycleways and verges	-
You should aim for well above 60% resident satisfaction score for cycle routes - not 60% its too low. Now is the time of changing the routes to become safe and convenient for both cyclists and all other road users. Now is the time to fully conduct research of what residents believe will bring safety and convenience. Aim to seek out the 50.5% who are unsatisfied with the current offer, they are the ones who hold the key for getting this project right first time round.	- No change - previous experience with other satisfaction targets suggests that 60% will be challenging to achieve in 5 years.
10 percent reduction is not enough it should be 50 percent	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
The first two targets are toooo low	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips and reducing cyclist casualties.
Target for cyclist casualties should be significantly higher than 10%, a figure this small could easily be due to standard variations and not significant.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
Bearing in mind the stated opportunities in Maidenhead particularly amongst women, the increase is far too conservative.[]	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips.
None of these objectives are ambitious enough, particularly the reduction of cyclist casualties. The strategy should set a much higher objective for this & also for cycling trips.	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20% for increasing cycle trips and reducing cyclist casualties.
60% satisfaction is not high enough - suggests that the routes and facilities will be "meh".	- No change - previous experience with other satisfaction targets

A 10% reduction seems low; aiming for a best outcome that casualty levels in 5 years will still be 90% of today's. Not exactly Vision Zero!	- Adopt a more stretching target of 20%
---	---

Cycle routes - please indicate what priority you think should be given to each of these interventions.

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Providing new dedicated cycle routes	59	12	5	76
Improving traffic conditions for cyclist where there is no space for new cycle routes	62	13	2	77
Providing 20 mph speed limits around schools and other areas with significant numbers of cyclists	38	26	14	78
Improving road maintenance regimes to better cater for cyclists	44	29	4	77
Linking to / enhancing the public rights of way network	37	33	7	77
Working with landowners to secure new and improved cycle routes	53	17	8	78
Working with neighbouring authorities to improve cross-boundary routes	44	24	10	78
Comments				24
		<i>answered question</i>		78
		<i>skipped question</i>		10




Comments	Proposed Response
Cycle routes should be well considered and not token efforts. If money is not well spent on a cycle path which benefits users, spend money elsewhere. Also acknowledge that cycle paths won't typically be used by those cycling for sport, but are valuable for family and other local transport uses.	-
Although I live 1 mile from the great park I can't get my kids there safely on their bikes and have to put the bikes on the back of the car and drive there which is such a shame. Living in Sunninghill I can't safely ride bikes with my kids.	-
Hoping that the remark about Working with Landowners include the Royal Park	-
In my area Ascot, it has only 2 small designated cycle paths. Any attempt to extend these is met with stern opposition	-

<p>Need routes which don't involve going on diversions (e.g. Cycle paths which take you around the corner of a roundabout, in the road you would go straight across) what was the point of the ridiculous short "cycle path" at the stafferton way/ oldfield road junction? Yet if you want to turn right into staferton where it is difficult there is no cycle path).paths which means you have to give way regularly at junctions (typically shared use paths).paths which have posts right in he middle of them (e.g the Greenway,and path opposite the train station, making it very narrow for bikes , esp with luggage). Routes which mean you don't have to get off and walk for part of it. Routes which mean you don't have to go around the whole one way system.routes which you don't share with pedestrians. Safe route from Slough to maidenhead.: Junction 7 roundabout , you have to get in right lane early and it is fast traffic which annoys drivers. If you stay left , it's difficult to cross lanes when you need to.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Have you considered a route along the long-walk from the great part to the centre of windsor. This would give a safe route from South of the park all the way to Windsor and would generate a lot of cycling activity and more business for Windsor.</p>	<p>- No change - the Crown Estate is not prepared to grant cycle access to the Long Walk.</p>
<p>Road maintenance and maintenance of cycle lanes are necessary, once constructed they are often forgotten.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Working with the Highway Cide/DVLA to ensure that part of the driving test makes drivers more respectful of cyclists in the Borough. ¶</p>	<p>- No change - this is a matter for Central Government.</p>
<p>I've had to replace tyres and wheels when being forced to ride in the gutters and road quality has been very poor. The resurfacing of a section of Clarence Road has meant that drains are now up to four inches lower than the new road level. Roads are overlaid rather than stripped and resurfaced.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>All schools should be accessible via safe cycle routes for families to cycle to school to decrease school run congestion, improve residents' fitness levels and implement cycling habits in children.</p>	<p>- No change - this is picked up in the area profiles.</p>
<p>These are extremely important but should not be at the detriment of car users.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Thames path Maidenhead to Windsor should become a cycle route.</p>	<p>- No change - sections of the Thames Path are already shared with cyclists. Much of this is within Buckinghamshire rather than the Royal Borough.</p>
<p>The station and shops most used by residents in our village is outside RBWM</p>	<p>- No change - the strategy includes links to neighbouring areas.</p>
<p>One of the greatest dangers to a cyclist is poorly maintained roads. Pot holes force a rider to swerve into the middle of the lane and this increases the risk of the cyclist being hit from behind. Ensuring roads are well maintained will help riders maintain a safe line along the side of the road and would go a long way to increasing overall safety. Where roads are busy or narrow, white lines to help section a small space for riders does aid the flow of traffic and cycles together. Speed limits should be assessed and put in place only where neccessary according to existing guidelines. Avoid putting in additional limits if there is no great need. Good road signage is key to ensuring correct driving behaviour.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Looking at 20mph zones should not be restricted to areas where journeys are largely taken by bicycle. Parts of Blackamoor Lane and Ray Mill road should be 20mph for instance due to sheer number of parked cars and the pedestrians trying to safely cross.</p>	<p>- Amend the bullet point in 6.3 to read "...where there may be significant numbers of cyclists and / or pedestrians."</p>
<p>Why prioritise dedicated 'cycle routes' if you designed and took account of road design the routes would be irrelevant as people would be able to use their bike everywhere.</p>	<p>- No change - all current research shows that cyclists want dedicated cycle routes.</p>
<p>I don't accept that there can be 'no space for new cycle routes' - I guess if you prioritise motorised vehicles, there are stretches of road in which it would be difficult to fit in a new cycle route, but my answer would be to make cyclists the priority. If need be, cyclists should be able to cycle, with care, on the pavements, although they would be expected to be considerate of other pavement users and should give priority to pedestrians.</p>	<p>- No change - unsegregated shared use of busy footways leads to complaints from cyclists and pedestrians.</p>

<p>Some basic improvements could make a big difference. The Jubilee River gives brilliant access to Windsor from Maidenhead but getting to it is a nightmare (only access via A4!). The town (Maidenhead) is crossed by the A4 there is no alternative route to cycle. Many people commute to Slough a very good cycling distance but there is no alternative to the A4 and there is no cycling provision on this road (I am a very confident cyclist and cycle to work every day and it is an intimidating road with no provision for cyclists).</p>	<p>- No change - Buckinghamshire County Council and Slough Borough Council are seeking to develop a cycle route between Maidenhead Bridge and Slough. This is outside of the Royal Borough and therefore does not form part of this strategy.</p>
<p>get the potholes filled in.....matter of urgency is a 10/10</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Cycle paths should not be a shared pavement where the bike has to stop at each side road and mix with pedestrian traffic. The cycle paths to and from Maidenhead station are shocking</p>	<p>- No change - this is addressed in the area profiles.</p>
<p>New routes should be planned with cyclist safety in mind. Painting a row of dotted lines along a busy carriageway should not be considered as a tick in the box, they are a source of problems rather than a cure. Physical separation between motor vehicles and cyclists is the only way to ensure safety.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Speed reductions and traffic calming are an easy way of making the roads safer for cycling. A 40mph ring road which runs through town and past the station is madness. Reduce the speed using speed bumps, and speed limits to 20mph in areas with many people around. Limit and pedestrianise the full length of the town centre and Queen's street.</p>	<p>- Amend the bullet point in 6.3 to read "...where there may be significant numbers of cyclists and / or pedestrians." - Wider town centre issues will be picked up in the emerging Maidenhead Town Centre Access and Movement Strategy.</p>
<p>Please include Segregated cycle lanes.⌋</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Working with landowners will be difficult but can unlock great opportunities.</p>	<p>-</p>

Wayfinding - please indicated what priority you think should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Signs, road markings and roadside maps to help cyclists navigate to their destination	24	38	16	78
Branding key cycle routes to aid end-to-end navigation (e.g. blue route, red route, etc)	29	30	19	78
Regularly updating and reprinting the borough's cycle map leaflet	15	32	30	77
Improving the accuracy of online journey planners (e.g. Google and CycleStreets)	33	34	9	76
Comments				12
<i>answered question</i>				78
<i>skipped question</i>				10




Comments	Proposed Response
Creating neglected cycle paths is worse than none at all. Car drivers often get angry when not cycling in a 'designated' path even if this is unmanaged and unfit for purpose	-
Integrate with Google Maps should be a high priority; i.e. make routes discoverable on line.	-
Although I know my way around the cycle routes in the area I think that clear signage can help the cyclist/driver priority on the road to help promote to drivers that cyclists use an area of road.	-

<p>My opinion is that roads are not built for recreational use and bicycles should be used for functional purposes such as shopping and commuting and journey under 5 miles. Wayfinding is for riders who are not familiar with the route they are taking and I feel that they cause more pollution by holding up traffic than they save if they go down heavily used narrow roads</p>	-
<p>I would avoid relying on printed format and invest a higher proportion into the on-line format. Consider mobile device format as when you are on your bike it is the go-to device to look up a route.</p>	<p>- In paragraph 6.9, remove the word "regularly" from the cycle route leaflet action, so it reads: "Update and reprint the borough's cycle map". Demand could be reviewed after the first reprint to see whether further reprints are needed.</p>
<p>Circular tracks would mean cyclists can drive to the beginning of the route and then drive away once they've completed the amount of laps they want to exercise for. This would reduce the need to cycle to/from the designated cycle paths and get in the way of cars.</p>	<p>- No change - the strategy is primarily focused on promoting cycling as a means of transport rather than a recreational activity.</p>
<p>less street clutter</p>	-
<p>Most people know their way around the town and surrounding area. Visitors who are not familiar might benefit from a map but mobile phone app would be more up to date and likely to be used as well as existing satnav.</p>	-
<p>An App showing routes would be good. Say, someone could type in where they want to go to and the App would show them how to cycle the route.</p>	-
<p>Most cyclists and pedestrians do not know of the paths around the town we have, and how they could use them to get around. Distance markers may also be helpful, along with directions to the riverside and town. National cycleway markers are not useful unless you really understand where they take you, and to many are simply cryptic.</p>	-
<p>None of the above will get more people cycling - "not being able to find a cycle route" isn't something I hear a lot from people who don't cycle. "not being run over" is something I hear more of.</p>	-
<p>Get the routes right first then people with smartphones will find their way. Countries with high cycle use are not that way because of signs!</p>	-

Cycle parking - please indicate what priority you think should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Providing new cycle parking in town and village centres	38	34	6	78
Developing cycle parking standards and design guidance for new development	31	34	13	78
Improving maintenance of existing cycle parking	30	36	10	76
Comments				17
<i>answered question</i>				78
<i>skipped question</i>				10




Comments	Proposed Response
Maidenhead station is hugely under-served with bike parking, especially on the forecourt and Grenfell road passage. There is no alternative here and this is some of the most fundamentally important cycle parking if you want to take cars off the road.	- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.

<p>Need more around town- e,g by tescos- the three there are always full, and queen street area- only one parking area and it's far, considering you could cycle to the shop you're going to, but there's nowhere to put your bike so you never up walking or leaving it unlocked. There's no parking at the a4 parade of shops. There's no cycle parking at stafferton retail park- even at Halfords which has a bike shop! The train station parking makes it impossible to secure your bike in the recommended way as you can only lock the (quick release) wheel. Trying to lock anything through the frame involves contortion due to the lack of space. There's no cycle parking outside Claremont gp surgery!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledge the shortfall of cycle parking, but space constraints make it challenging to provide more cycle parking at Tesco. - No change - cycle parking will be provided as part of The Landing, which would preclude the need for anything on Queen Street - In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.
<p>I would like to see a secure cage I could lock my cycle in, I would be willing to pay for a service such as this and fail to see why they could not be included in car parks. When my bike is locked up on the exposed high street stands the wheels and components can still be removed easily from it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - cycle parking is being incorporated into all new development and the demand for such facilities will reduce over time.
<p>Covered shelters would be a good way of showing that Cyclists are really cared for in the Borough.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - there would be an on-going maintenance liability associated with providing cycle parking shelters, which are prone to vandalism.
<p>Parking is well provided for in Windsor I think. Security is the bigger problem so more cctv and signs advertising it would be good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - cycle parking sites are already situated so as to be covered by CCTV wherever possible.
<p>Equip with functional CCTV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - cycle parking sites are already situated so as to be covered by CCTV wherever possible.
<p>Security is a major concern. I would never leave my cycle at the rail station which is a concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.
<p>I have never had cycle parking problems except for the Stafferton Way, Maidenhead shops</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -
<p>Cycle parking is very important. Though I believe it may be more useful to have small clusters in more locations than increasing the capacity of existing locations. The key to cycling success is point to point commuting. For this reason if there are more locations to park the greater chance there is of having a convenient bike park location.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -
<p>Some of the cycle parking is situated in pedestrian only areas? You need to prioritise introduction of shared streets and effective enforcement against people who choose to ride bikes dangerously in these areas ie too fast and beyond their ability to stop unexpectedly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - enforcement is a matter for Thames Valley Police
<p>There seems to be plenty of cycle parking in Maidenhead - probably because many people are put off from cycling because it feels to be dangerous. If it was safer, we'd need more cycle parking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -
<p>Security of cycle parking is the most important to me. Ensuring CCTV coverage and highlighting the fact an area is actively monitored would help with this.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - cycle parking sites are already situated so as to be covered by CCTV wherever possible.
<p>Needs to be secure I for one no longer cycle to work as no where safe to leave bike</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

<p>Useable CCTV is key as a deterrent to thieves - other forms of crime reduction equipment/techniques would be welcomed including information to residents of how to reduce risk of theft, eg use of chain locks that cannot be cut with bolt-cutters</p>	<p>- No change - cycle parking sites are already situated so as to be covered by CCTV wherever possible. Cycle security campaigns are already covered in 6.38.</p>
<p>You can't cycle to Maidenhead station as by 8.30 there is nowhere to lock your bike</p>	<p>- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.</p>
<p>Maidenhead Station bike parking constantly full and often out of action currently</p>	<p>- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.</p>
<p>Goes hand in hand with more cycling provision - no point in doing one without the other</p>	<p>-</p>

Transport interchanges - please indicate what priority you think should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Working with rail industry partners to improve routes to / from rail stations	43	29	6	78
Working with rail industry partners to provide secure cycle parking at rail stations	58	16	4	78
Working with rail industry partners to ensure adequate capacity for bikes on trains	41	29	8	78
Working with rail industry partners to ensure that station buildings are accessible for cyclists (e.g. lifts)	28	39	11	78
Working with rail industry partners to develop station travel plans	37	31	10	78
Providing cycle parking at bus and coach stops where there is	22	41	14	77
Comments				14
<i>answered question</i>				78
<i>skipped question</i>				10




Comments	Proposed Response
Maidenhead station is hugely under-served with bike parking, especially on the forecourt and Grenfell road passage. There is no alternative here and this is some of the most fundamentally important cycle parking if you want to take cars off the road. Grenfell Road is used by significant numbers of cyclists and yet it is mired by poor road surface, manhole covers, potholes and cars try overtaking cyclists on dangerous bends. Please think about traffic calming as well as catering for bikes.	- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.
South West trains have got worse. Only folding bikes are accommodated on trains with very strict policies on larger bikes	-
"Sustainable travel" = ? Use plain language please.	-
I've put medium not because its not important but because everything can't be high priority and something has to give.	-
Trains are becoming less friendly towards cyclists, that needs to be reversed.	-

Bikes parked at bus interchanges would (at present) be very exposed. At a guess, I would say that there is no need for such interchanges apart from long distance bus services (if you are already on a bike and its not far to go, keep cycling - why go by bus)	- No change - the commitment is only to provide this "where there is demand". Facilities have already been provided at Heatherwood roundabout.
Not only must it be convenient, but it needs to be affordable. I understand this may be out of the hands of the the Royal Borough Council.	-
Space would be better used for more car parking.	-
This is key. The council has approved the building of hundreds of new flats within a few kilometress of the station. Cycling to Maidenhead station will grow hugely between now and the opening of cross rail. Improving anything and everything to do with cycling and commuting via rail should be a priority.	- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.
Obvious CCTV or dummy cameras at these sites would discourage the light fingered.	- No change - cycle parking sites are already situated so as to be covered by CCTV wherever possible.
Maidenhead station seems to offer plenty of cycle parking and there is a lift which makes boarding a train with a bike pretty straightforward.	-
Getting to stations and bus interchanges by bike should be priority for RBWM, not providing room on trains, ease of movement in stations etc.	- No change - this is already included in 6.18.
I hope you include railway stations that are outside the borough but which are very likely to be used by your residents, ie Twyford.	- No change - cross-boundary links are already picked up in 6.3 and the area profiles.
Safe routes to stations, with secure parking are of paramount importance.	- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.

Working with schools - please indicate what priority you think should be given to the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Working with schools to develop, monitor and maintain school travel plans that encourage sustainable travel	55	18	5	78
Creating safer walking and cycling routes to schools	68	8	2	78
Introducing 20 mph speed limits around schools	43	27	8	78
Providing cycle parking at schools	56	18	3	77
Providing Bikeability training for school pupils	60	14	3	77
Developing extra-curricular cycling programmes at schools (e.g. Go Ride and Breeze)	44	22	10	76
Comments			18	18
	<i>answered question</i>			78
	<i>skipped question</i>			10




Comments	Proposed Response
The above only works if there are safe cycle routes for the children	-
We are trying very hard to give Charters School children safe walking and cycling access to the school. Because of opposition from local landowners this is proving impossible.	-
Education is very powerfull	-
Could the Borough offer free/subsidised maintenance checks for young people's bikes?	- No change - children who are doing Bikeability have their bikes safety checked.
Kids need the greatest training as they are at the most risk. Given how I've seen them ride (often obviously dangerously) there needs more learning taking place for them and some adults are no better!	- No change - Bikeability is funded through Central Government and RBWM is already training the maximum number of children possible with the available funding.

Speeding limit zones of 20mph mostly create themselves because of heavy traffic causing traffic to slow. Speed humps (e.g Desborough) and speed cameras (St Mary's Cookham Rd) create zones which are needed for only 3% of the average day, Limiting, if installed, should be for morning and afternoon busy periods Mon to Fri and not in holidays.	-
Get them riding when they are young! It is the key to the long term success of this project.	-
It would be good to have school buses pick up children all around town to reduce the amount of cars having to drop off kids at school.	- No change - this is outside the scope of the Cycling Strategy.
many parents drive children to school because they go straight to work afterwards	-
Encouraging young minds is time well spent and more likely to result in change of attitude and lifelong cycle use.	-
Furze Platt School is a big second school with hundreds of students yet cycling to and from the school is too dangerous - the Marlow Road has many hazards. Many have to cycle on the pavement to avoid putting themselves in danger.	- Add an action in Appendix 8 to 18. provide a new cycle route to Furze Platt School via Nightingale Lane, Cannon Court Road and Switchback Road South
Access to St. Luke's school is very dangerous. Drivers drive too fast and a paths are very narrow.	- No change - it is not possible to provide a safe cycle route to St Luke's due to the limits of available highway land on Cookham Road.
Research shows children who cycle remain adults who cycle.	-
Schoolchildren should be encouraged and incentivised to travel by bike then it becomes a habit. As a teenager I cycled to Denmark and back, and then to Italy and back.	-
I would welcome anyone who wants to join my children and I cycling to school and dicing with death down the pound and school lane in cookham.c the young generation need a change in attitude in drivers to encourage an active lifestyle	- No change - encouraging more considerate driver attitudes can be included within road safety campaigns, which are identified as an action in paragraph 6.38.
Getting the young cycling is key to normalising cycling.¶	-
Parents won't let children cycle on the current road network. You can educate the kids all you like - it won't stop them being run over by a speeding/ dangerous/ inattentive driver. Creating safer routes is the ONLY way	-
The move towards residential roads being 20mph is excellent (pleasant environment, aids pedestrians, etc.) but must not be seen as part of a cycling strategy. In fact it could be a large distraction; if the cycling infra provided in a location is nothing more than a speed limit then it is a failure.	-

Working with businesses - please indicate what priority you think should be given to the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Encouraging businesses to offer incentives that encourage employees to cycle	42	24	12	78
Encouraging businesses to take part in the National Workplace Cycle Challenge	31	26	21	78
Encouraging businesses to adopt workplace travel plans that encourage sustainable travel	43	25	10	78
Providing advice and support to businesses that are looking to provide cycling facilities to their staff	35	26	15	76
If you have any comments about working with businesses, then please write them below:				13
<i>answered question</i>				78
<i>skipped question</i>				10




Comments	Proposed Response
The above only works if there are safe cycle routes for people	-
The more local employees cycling the better. The less we rely on cars for short journeys the better.	-
showers in businesses ☐	- No change - this is covered by the action relating to providing advice and support to businesses.
G	-
Providing car parking is expensive. Therefore businesses could actually save money by offering cash OR a car parking space - this might create problems with commuters parking 2 miles away and cycling the last 2 miles. I am sure you can think of some solution	- No change - this is covered by the action relating to providing advice and support to businesses.

In my opinion businesses are not a high priority. Their objective is for the employee to be available and fit to work. How the employee chooses to get to the office is usually very much a flexible agreement. Some roles in business (salesman) do require an employee to travel. No one rule can be applied and so perhaps it is an area where consultation may be offered but no proactive initiative is required?	- No change - travel to work data suggests that there is significant scope to increase cycling for short commuting journeys.
Money could be better spent encouraging businesses to move into town.	-
It's all about providing secure convenient parking	-
People won't travel to work on their bikes to any significant degree if the roads remain so dangerous and there is no alternative safe cycle route. Businesses will step in to, e.g. provide cycling facilities if there is a demand. The council's focus should not be on this - it would be better to spend the money on cycle routes.	- No change - the range of comments received suggests that other factors are also important.
Showering and changing facilities are in my opinion extremely important in encouraging cycling to work.	- No change - this is covered by the action relating to providing advice and support to businesses.
Again lots of on-line resource available for employers-not highest priority for RBWM	-
really work hard with businesses to get there buy in....offer grants to get better shower facilities	- No change - commercial organisations should be able to fund their own facilities.
Employees rarely know how they would get to the office other than on the roads they use for their cars. Maps from Windsor to Maidenhead, to Cookham or Marlow along with travel times, would enlighten people as to the possibilities. The same applies to any resident, but particularly employees.	- No change - this is dealt with in section on wayfinding in paragraphs 6.3 - 6.5.

Health and wellbeing - please indicate what priority you think should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Training more volunteers to act as ride leaders	17	34	26	77
Delivering cycling taster sessions to encourage more people to get involved in the sport	23	31	23	77
Including cycling within GP lifestyle management referral schemes	32	30	16	78
Comments				14
			<i>answered question</i>	78
			<i>skipped question</i>	10




Comments	Proposed Response
I am willing to help!	-
lifestyle management referral schemes "=? Does it mean "GPs to recommend cycling to fat patients"?	-
I think there are lots of local leaders already with the ex sky ride programme, local groups and maidenhead cycle hub	- Delete the action to train more ride leaders.
Cycling is referred to in one of these questions as a sport not as an alternative form of transport - I think it needs to be promoted throughout all questions as a healthier lifestyle choice which is established as suggested in the vision, not as something that can be taken or left.	- No change - people who take up cycling for sports / recreation often go on to make utility trips by bike.
The thing that would get me out cycling more than anything else is the provision of dedicated cycle paths. I have no interest in cycling alongside traffic - its too stressful.	- No change - cycle routes are covered in paragraphs 6.1 - 6.4.
Safe cycle routes are the starting point, in town and country.	- No change - cycle routes are covered in paragraphs 6.1 - 6.4.
I suspect that cycling is a lifestyle learning thing. I have 3 sons who all cycle. My wife would escort them to primary school. Where convenient they cycled to secondary school and to University. As adults they still cycle (as does my wife and I - out of preference and feeling "green" responsibilities) My parents did not cycle and my wife's parents cycled for pleasure	-
Off-road paths would be great exercise.	-

too nanny state	-
I'm afraid it's usually too late and those people impractical to influence. Physiotherapists might be a useful means of promotion for more receptive cases.	-
Again, cycling can be distinctly unhealthy - my husband nearly got killed when a taxi driver ploughed into him on the Sainsbury's roundabout in Maidenhead. Everybody knows the benefits of cycling as an exercise. Making cycling safer should be the priority.	- No change - cycle routes are covered in paragraphs 6.1 - 6.4.
Whilst these will help, the first thing is to provide facilities that with some encouragement as above, would be perceived as being safe.¶	- No change - cycle routes are covered in paragraphs 6.1 - 6.4.
Sport'? I thought we were talking about utility cycling? I'm all for getting GPs to 'prescribe' fitness though.	-
Cycling being seen as a "sport" only prevents the uptake.	- No change - people who take up cycling for sports / recreation often go on to make utility trips by bike. This is

Recreation and sports cycling - please indicate what priority you think should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Enhancing existing recreational cycling routes / developing new routes to meet local demand	54	18	6	78
Enhancing local elements of the National Cycle Network (NCN) and developing / linking to new NCN Routes	47	26	5	78
Promoting sustainable tourism, including cycle touring	26	32	19	77
Working with local landowners to explore the potential for creating new / improved mountain bike routes	32	31	15	78
Working with local landowners and British Cycling to explore the potential for creating a closed cycling circuit (like at Hillingdon)	28	27	23	78
Working with local clubs wishing to run triathlons, time trials and road races on the public highway, ensuring that these are coordinated with other planned events, and that impacts on residents and other road users are minimised	27	28	22	77
Working with charity bike ride / sportive organisers wishing to organise events on the public highway, ensuring that these are coordinated with other planned events, and that impacts on residents and other road users are minimised	24	32	21	77
Comments				12
<i>answered question</i>				78
<i>skipped question</i>				10




Comments	Proposed Response
I know many families who cycle in the maidenhead area and most commonly they drive somewhere in order to then cycle somewhere safe (ie jubilee river, Route 4 to West of Maidenhead, Dorney Lake). If you want truly sustainable cycling you need to join up the major routes inside AND OUTSIDE the RBWM boundary (esp Jubilee River from Maidenhead). Too many of the proposed cycle routes start and stop in dangerous roads (take mountain biking routes to north of Marlow Road nr Bisham as an example).	- Include a bullet in 6.32 to reflect the need to better link to established recreational cycling facilities.
Closed Windsor track or circuit would be fantastic and a cycling hub	-

It's great to have these events wanting to use the town and gives the town a great personality lift but you got to keep the residents sweet.	-
Only if it results in lower numbers of car journeys. It seems to me non "green" to strap 2 bikes to the roof of your car and drive 200 miles to do a 20 mile cycle ride. But OK if overall reduces car journeys	- Include a bullet in 6.32 to reflect the need to better link to established recreational cycling facilities.
Club time trial event do not have an impact of traffic. Riders are set off at intervals.	-
There are enough road closures as it is and plenty of green space to cycle in to limit cycling to off-road.	- No change - This view is not supported by feedback from local cyclists and existing facilities in neighbouring authorities are over-subscribed (e.g. The Lookout).
Shouldn't be recreation or sport should be alternative to car use.	- No change - The two are inter-linked - recreational cycling if often a pre-cursor to utility cycling.
Sports cycling need not be focus-training for children , commuting and leisure cycling for residents priority	- As above
Closed road cycle circuits would be a fantastic addition	-
It should be encouraged not duckweed and managed due to car driving nimby concerns	-
I would rather see people encouraged to use the road, rather than needing to limit their cycling to a circuit.[]	- No change - The two are inter-linked - recreational cycling if often a pre-cursor to utility cycling.
Recreational cycling isn't going to solve the problem of: traffic, transport pollution, road deaths, inactive lifestyles, etc. Sure, build a new mountain bike trail, but don't take your eye off the ball	- As above

Practical support and training - please indicate what priority you think should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Providing training on how to ride safely in traffic (e.g. adult Bikeability classes)	39	26	12	77
Providing education about how to undertake basic cycle maintenance and repairs	24	30	23	77
Organising Dr Bike sessions (i.e. free bike safety checks)	23	33	21	77
Providing journey planning advice to help cyclists find routes to local destinations	19	32	25	76
Comments				10
<i>answered question</i>				77
<i>skipped question</i>				11




Comments	Proposed Response
Whilst training is important this won't help if there aren't safe cycle routes. The road from ascot to Windsor is an example of a road that is incredibly dangerous to cycle on but as there is no proper cycle path and cyclists can't go down the long walk there are huge numbers of cyclists on this road and frequent incidents.	- No change - a cycle route between Ascot and Windsor was investigated, but was found to be unfeasible and Crown Estate has ruled out use of the Long Walk by cyclists.
Maybe a mentor scheme for getting new commuters off on the right foot! Like a car pool scheme	- No change - this would be largely addressed by the training and journey advice elements.
Publish routes into Google Maps.	- No change - this is picked up under the wayfinding section
I think people should be responsible for taking the initiative with these kind of things, not the council	-
I think you should have to pass a test/gain a certificate to be able to ride a bike on the roads - that way you are valuing all road users.	- No change - this would require changes to primary legislation
Google is great for finding routes via bike so I'd leave that to them and promote that rather than your own service.	- No change - this is picked up under the wayfinding section. There are numerous errors and omissions in Google's cycle

<p>I frequently ask at my tennis club why players do not ride to the club - the usual answer is that they do not feel safe. If training conquers their fear then pursue that line. (However, their answer might not be truthful. It would not surprise me that the true reason for not cycling is image and laziness, and not many would want to admit such traits)</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>There are many thousands of bikes with a picture or other easily rectified fault stored in sheds and garages that don't get used for want of ability to repair.</p>	<p>- No change - these issues would be addressed by bike maintenance education and Dr Bike sessions,</p>
<p>The journey planning advice is a good one and it would be good to put it up on Twitter regularly, to promote it.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>In the grand scheme of things - none of it will increase cycling journeys</p>	<p>- No change - these initiatives have been proven to lead to increased levels of cycling,</p>

Marketing and communications - please indicate what priority should be given to each of the following:

Answer Options	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Response Count
Holding regular meetings of the cycle forum	20	39	18	77
Engaging with existing and potential cyclists via social media	27	38	13	78
Including regular articles in 'Around the Royal Borough'	23	34	21	78
Providing cycling information on the Council's website	36	35	7	78
Delivering cycling safety campaigns (e.g. night time visibility)	30	33	14	77
Cycling security campaigns (e.g. use of bike locks)	20	29	27	76
Promoting national and local events to encourage more people to	28	31	19	78
Comments				6
		<i>answered question</i>		78
		<i>skipped question</i>		10



Comments	Proposed Response
None of this has focused on driver awareness and consideration for vulnerable road users (including cyclists) - the greatest risk to cyclists and increasing cycling uptake is addressing drivers perception of cyclists as obstacles on the road, rather than vulnerable people.	- No change - This could be included as part of the road safety campaigns
Considering that you want to receive people's views I do not understand why cyclists using main hubs such as Maidenhead Station have not been targeted and informed that this strategy consultation is taking place. It is as if cycling is something you have to encourage rather than wanting to encourage.	- No change - the proposed Marketing and Communication actions will seek to engage potential as well as existing cyclists to identify the barriers and issues that they face.
Social media by far cheapest mode of communication	-
I'm not sure people look at the council website.]] Cycle safety campains should be targeted at drivers would be far more appropriate, since it is in less than 20% of the accidents, the cyclists fault.	- No change - promotional messages can be used to link to the Council's website.
Apart from normalising cycling - which might help with the attitude a lot of people have with regards to utility cycling, none of the above will increase cycling journeys	-

Do not recommend any involvement with "cycling safety campaigns" - very high risk of expending effort on victim-blaming helmet-and-hiviz road safety shizzle.


- No change - RBWM will seek to deliver a balanced range of safety campaigns. Encouraging cyclists to be safe and be seen should not be seen as 'victim blaming'.

Are there any other sources of funding in addition to those mentioned in section 7 of the strategy that you think we should use?

Answer Options	Response Count
	19
<i>answered question</i>	19
<i>skipped question</i>	69

Response Text	Proposed Response
No	-
Why don't RBWM start charging more for council tax and directing the funds towards cycling instead of freezing the tax?	-
Perhaps a slight rise in Council Tax	-
Local business sponsorship of routes and events	- Add sponsorship as an option
License use of bikes, increase council tax with concessions for licensed users.	- No change - this would require changes to primary legislation and would be likely to lead to a reduction in cycling.
Look for some sponsorship from local/national businesses (like bike scheme in London) but perhaps have routes or infrastructure updates sponsored.	- Add sponsorship as an option
Lottery? Government grants	- No change - Sport England is already included on the list of potential funding sources - this makes use of small lottery grants to help people get involved in sport
Don't cut anymore money from schools or suggest that schools have to allocate some of this funding from their budgets.	-
Maybe divert funds from vanity projects like the ridiculous fountain on the old Trevelyan roundabout?	-
Part of the highways budget	- No change - this happens already
This survey is aimed at existing cyclists. You need a survey that asks why not questions. e.g. "What reasons to you not cycle to the shops", "What reason to you not cycle to school / let your child cycle to school" etc to uncover the barriers.	- No change - the proposed Marketing and Communication actions will seek to engage potential as well as existing cyclists to identify the barriers and issues that they face.
Funding better spent elsewhere	-
Shell, BP	- Add sponsorship as an option
How about using revenue from parking and speeding contraventions!	- No change - all surplus income from parking goes back into central council funds and is spent according to need, while income from speeding fines is retained by Thames Valley Police.
Developer contributions. Business sponsorship. Charitable trusts.	- Add corporate sponsorship as an option. Developer contributions, Sport England and British Cycling are already on the list.
Traffic fines	- No change - fines for traffic offences are retained by Thames Valley Police.
No	-
Could business not help fund as a help in the community initiative?	- Add sponsorship as an option
What replaced the section 106 contributions? Is there any part-volunteer Big Society option?	- No change - developer contributions are already on the list, and volunteers are already used for led bike rides and other initiatives.


Do you think that the proposed performance indicators and monitoring tools are appropriate?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	83.3%	55
No	16.7%	11
Comments		11
<i>answered question</i>		66
<i>skipped question</i>		22



Comments	Proposed Response
It looks like you previously counted from 7am to 7pm. Rush hour extends beyond these times in this area. Maidenhead Station cycle racks are half full by 7am. You need to consider who the main cyclists are.	- No change - 7am to 7pm is an industry standard count period. It is accepted that there will be a few trips that are missed at the start and end of the survey period. Some bikes remain at Maidenhead Station overnight and are used by arriving passengers for onward travel.
Nothing, as usual for the Ascot area. A backwater of the borough	- No change - the annual counts are undertaken in the main urban areas. There are not sufficient numbers of cycling trips to Ascot to justify an annual count.
License bikes at the point of sale, tag them with RFID tags and install RFID sensors for monitoring bike traffic levels.	- No change - this would require a change to primary legislation.
I don't know if they are appropriate.	-
Survey use of bike park areas. Are they being used?	- No change - there is not sufficient budget to be able to cover all of the main cycle parking areas. However, informal checks are undertaken throughout the year to flag where demand is exceeding capacity.
I have forgotten what the performance indicators were supposed to be. If health - very difficult to monitor and/or prove: approval rating easier; proportion of cyclists to cars during peak hours/out of peak hours- yes good indicators	-


<p>Statistically, if well implemented the number of cycling incidents on the road should reduce. Another factor should be the satisfaction of drivers. I feel that many drivers in recent times get frustrated with cyclists due to conflicting space. If we can ensure cyclists have a dedicated space on the road it will help reduce conflict. I have witnessed an assault on a fellow rider after a driver attempted to overtake him through a traffic calming device. The driver subsequently got out of the car and assaulted the rider involved who had indicated his displeasure at nearly being hit by the car. I have cycled for more than 35 years and it has progressively got worse and particularly after cycling became popular since the success of the British Cycling Olympic Teams.</p>	<p>- No change - cycle routes are covered in paragraphs 6.1 - 6.4.</p>
<p>safety is low and kpi on speed of route should be added otherwise further addition of cycle path pavements will drive for cycling as it takes too long to get anywhere</p>	<p>- No change - it is difficult to get accurate information on cycling speeds / journey times.</p>
<p>The hoped for increases were too low as previously commented.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I would also like to see change in journey times to key destinations as a measure.</p>	<p>- No change - it is difficult to get accurate information on cycling speeds / journey times.</p>
<p>Cycling casualty reduction is low.</p>	<p>-</p>

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Ascot and the Sunnings?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	84.4%	38
No	15.6%	7
Comments		8
<i>answered question</i>		45
<i>skipped question</i>		43




Comments	Proposed Response
It should be made clear to the local population that the crown estate are very unhelpful to any cycling improvements. Also, whilst my son was at Cheapside they did a cycle programme. I take slight offence to encouraging children to cycle in such a badly provided for area	- No change - Crown Estate already provides several cycle routes through the Great Park and has offered to open up existing routes for use by cyclists after sunset.
Can't comment	-
Don't know because I have not read them and this questionnaire (plus reading the profile) is taking up too much time	-
No knowledge	-
no idea	-
I dont know Ascot and Sunnings	-
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
Won't increase cycle trips by 15%	-

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Bisham and Cookham?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	85.7%	36
No	14.3%	6
Comments		7
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		46




Comments	Proposed Response
The proposed mountain bike tracks in the woods nr Bisham are not joined to a safe cycling route.	- Sign a link via existing PRoW (e.g. Malders Lane).
Can't comment	-
no idea	-
Particular attention should be paid to lengthening the existing shared cycle way on switch back into centre of Cookham and Maidenhead as the national cycle route is too rural for use commuting in the winter (too dark and muddy) and children cycling to furze plat school have to travel along a fast and busy section of the road in Cookham Berks the path starts.	- Extending the route to Cookham / Cookham Rise is not possible due to the pinch point at the rail bridge. - Onward links to Maidenhead are challenging due to the narrowness of the main roads and the lack of alternative routes.
I dont know Bisham and Cookham well enough	-
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
Won't increase cycle trips by 15%	-

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Bray?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.1%	37
No	11.9%	5
Comments		6
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		46




Comments	Proposed Response
Where is the joined up thinking to get cyclists from Maidenhead to the Dorney Lake and jubilee river?	- No change - there is an existing link to Dorney Lake via the Monkey Island bridge.
Can't comment	-
no idea	-
I dont know Bray well enough	-
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
Bit more red. However, no provision on the rat-run which is the B3024 - encourage bikability to Braywood C of E all you like, no-one will cycle there. Seeing as you suggest a crossing from the Maidenhead road over to B3024 at that junction I presume you just hope that people will cycle up that road?	- No change - there is insufficient highway land available on the B3024 to be able to accommodate a cycle route. Delivering a route would require compulsory purchase of land, which could not be justified by the relatively low numbers of cyclists.

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Datchet?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.1%	37
No	11.9%	5
Comments		8
<i>answered question</i>		42
<i>skipped question</i>		46




Comments	Proposed Response
Tesco on the Horton Rd should be included as a shopping destination.	- Include this in the list of local destinations.
Can't comment	-
No Knowledge	-
no idea	-
I dont know Datchet well enough	-
Disagree that the earth mound on Majors Farm Road is a problem, it is one of the best features with a safe separation from motor vehicles. The route through Datchet is treacherous during school times and needs a joined up cycle route, not one that switches sides of the road as it currently does. The section from Eton Road/London Road junction to The Myrke desperately needs a cycle route as it is very narrow and dangerous when dark	- Change the wording in the table in Section 7 of Appendix 4 to say "Widen the cycle track behind the earth embankment on the B470. - No change - There is not sufficient highway land to be able to construct a cycle route alongside the B376 within Datchet Village.
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
How does one get to Datchet from the South? Old Windsor/Windsor? Suggest Prince Albert's walk - does the queen need all this to herself? And Sunnymeads? Cycle track along the railway would do that	- No change - the Crown Estate is opposed to any additional routes through the Great Park. - No change - the Council would need to purchase a lot of private land would be needed to run a cycle track parallel to the railway. It is unlikely that there would be sufficient numbers of cyclists to justify the expense of such a scheme.

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Eton and Eton Wick?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	89.7%	35
No	10.3%	4
Comments		5
<i>answered question</i>		39
<i>skipped question</i>		49




Comments	Proposed Response
Can't comment	-
no idea	-
I dont know them well enough	-
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
Won't increase cycle trips by 15% Additional paths for B3022? You have the northern part highlighted in red suggesting a new path - but AFAIK the whole of that road leading up to A332 roundabout is currently a share use path	- No change - the Action Plan explains that the B3022 scheme is an enhancement rather than a new cycle route.

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Horton and Wraysbury?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	86.5%	32
No	13.5%	5
Comments		7
<i>answered question</i>		37
<i>skipped question</i>		51



Comments	Proposed Response
Can't comment	-
No Knowledge	-
no idea	-
This is a very difficult set of roads to cycle on as busy and could really do with cycle paths, I've tried to commute this way and found it very scary. Plan does not really address this.	- No change - there are few options for delivering new cycle routes in the area other than via compulsory purchase of land, which could not be justified by the relatively low numbers of cyclists.
Don't know	-
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
Unsure of location but looks like paths start/end in random places	- No change - there are few options for delivering new cycle routes in the area other than via compulsory purchase of land, which could not be justified by the relatively low numbers of cyclists.

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Hurley and the Walthams?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	87.2%	34
No	12.8%	5
Comments		6
<i>answered question</i>		39
<i>skipped question</i>		49




Comments	Proposed Response
Can't comment	-
No Knowledge	-
no idea	-
Within Waltham St Lawrence there is virtually no provision for safe cycling by amateurs and children. The most likely routes would be to go to the A4 and then onwards or to go to Twyford via the Twyford Rd or to get to the primary school. The knowl hill circular is not suitable for bikes generally, it is very cut up in places with deep cuts and when it rains it bevenes far too boggy to use. We pay our rates and get very little service. If a safe path was available you would be surprised how much use it would get.	- No change - there are few options for delivering new cycle routes in the area other than via compulsory purchase of land, which could not be justified by the relatively low numbers of cyclists.
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-

Unsure of location but looks like paths start/end in random places - what happens when they come across the A404?[]
As for Waltham St. Lawrence....too many fast, rat-running journeys. How do you get out?

- No change - the strategy commits to investigate possible routes to Berkshire College of Agriculture that would provide a safe crossing of the A404.
- No change - there are few options for delivering new cycle routes in the area other than via compulsory purchase of land, which could not be justified by the relatively low numbers of cyclists.


Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Maidenhead and Cox Green?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	85.0%	34
No	15.0%	6
Comments		8
<i>answered question</i>		40
<i>skipped question</i>		48



Comments	Proposed Response
<p>Where is the joined up thinking to get cyclists from Maidenhead to the jubilee river?[]</p> <p>The A4 Bath Road shared pavement is the worst possible cycle lane. Nearly every cyclist uses the road to avoid the side streets, residential drives and shopping parking as well as the badly maintained and bumpy pavement as well as road crossings.</p>	<p>- No change - there is an existing cycle route to Maidenhead Bridge and Bucks are constructing a link along the A4.</p> <p>- No change - there is insufficient width available on the A4 to provide on-carriageway cycle lanes and there is limited potential to provide cyclists with priority across side roads on this route.</p>
<p>We badly need joined up cycling. The areas of Cookham to Furze Platt and then to the rest of Maidenhead need joining up. Many people use the route along Switchback road to join the rest of Maidenhead, but existing routes and proposals do not link them. What about children going to Furze Plat infant and Junior? Cycling provision from the north and east is all but nonexistent at the moment</p>	<p>- Include a new action within Appendix 8 to consider a quiet route via Nightingale Lane and Cannon Court Road.</p> <p>- No change - onward links to Maidenhead are challenging due to the narrowness of the main roads and the lack of alternative / parallel routes.</p>
<p>Can't comment</p>	-
<p>Was the A4 monitored as a commuter route to Slough in the Corden count?</p>	<p>- No change - the A4 is not surveyed as part of the corden count, although links from the A4 are included. Existing levels of cycling on the A4 were surveyed to inform development of the business case for the A4 cycle route.</p>


<p>Review of current shared paths along the station is required as start and end is very unclear and street furniture makes them much too narrow in places particularly if pedestrians are present.</p>	<p>- No change - existing paths will be reviewed as part of the station interchange development.</p>
<p>Dont know well enough</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Lots of red here, good. However, the existing green tracks and the very bad current levels of cycling suggests that adding more of the same probably won't increase trips by 15% Looks like some filtered permeability could be used for a lot of Maidenhead roads.] No paths on Cookham road from Furze Platt to town centre - any reason</p>	<p>- Include an action within Appendix 8 to investigate opportunities for filtered permeability. - No change - cycle routes along Cookham Road are challenging due to the narrowness of the main roads and the lack of alternative / parallel routes.</p>

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Old Windsor?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	89.5%	34
No	10.5%	4
Comments		4
<i>answered question</i>		38
<i>skipped question</i>		50



Comments	Proposed Response
Can't comment	-
Dont know	-
I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.	-
Nothing along Straight Road? - It's a slow (30 mph with cameras) wide road - yet nothing can be added here? Old Windsor to Staines not a popular commute?	- No change - Straight Road narrows considerably to the north and south and there is not sufficient room for on-carriageway or off-carriageway cycle routes along its full length.

Do you broadly agree with the Area Profile for Windsor?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	90.0%	36
No	10.0%	4
Comments		5
<i>answered question</i>		40
<i>skipped question</i>		48



Comments	Proposed Response
<p>Dedworth Middle School isn't mentioned in list of Schools. []</p> <p>The Farm Shop/Cafe is also missing and whilst I know its Old Windsor I regularly cycle to it. []</p> <p>Introduce the cycle hire (Boris Bikes) as in London. []</p> <p>Put cycle parking in the multi-story Car Parks at ground/shop levels (King Edward and Victoria) for easy covered solutions.</p>	<p>- Include destinations as suggested.</p> <p>- No change - cycle hire schemes work best for large, polycentric urban areas and most schemes require significant on-going subsidy (even with sponsorship). Also, any scheme would be in direct competition with established commercial cycle hire businesses in Windsor.</p> <p>- No change - cycle parking should not be provided in multi-storey car parks since these are too far from cyclists' destinations to be attractive and there are better alternative locations.</p>
<p>Legoland is not mentioned! The park should be equipped with a bike park at the bottom of the hill with access from the bottom of the park. If residents with annual passes could do that, the traffic would be cut considerably. Legoland management should be forced to do that as the car traffic is shocking.[]</p> <p>It is pointed out that Windsor Girls pupils only have a handful of cyclists. Maybe the school uniform has something to do with it. Who wants to cycle on a main road wearing a pleated skirt. Maybe girls should be allowed to wear more practical gear, it's 2016 after all!</p>	<p>- No change - these are matters for LEGOLAND and Windsor Girls School to consider.</p>
Dont know	-

<p>I fear that in all of these proposals for all areas, cars are taking priority. As long as there is no shift away from the car ie slowing traffic not just outside schools, traffic calming measures, reallocation of road space, cycling will never become the safe normal activity envisaged. I invite the council to become a forerunner instead of a follower.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Stick in some parking - that's it! No new paths, no mention of traffic control - safe routes to school? Proper Cycle route to Legoland? Park and cycle? No new ideas. This won't get a 1% increase let alone 15!!</p>	<p>- No change - there is limited scope to incorporate new cycle routes in Windsor due to the lack of highway land. - See above for comment re cycle hire scheme.</p>

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Cox Green Parish Council	It has been identified that the route from Cox Green to the train station is fairly poorly lit and would benefit (and encourage greater use) if the lighting could be addressed. Another concern raised is that of the surface condition which is considered to be quite poor in places with smashed glass being a deterrent to greater usage. It is therefore suggested that the final strategy includes adequate maintenance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add an action in Appendix 8 to upgrade the lighting along The gullet. - Maintenance is already addressed as an action in the strategy,
	With regards to cycle park, it is noted that the facility at Wessex Way shopping precinct is missing from the map (it is accepted that this facility could benefit from improvement). Other areas of improvement (or provision) are the Cox Green Centre (which includes the Cox Green Library, Leisure Centre, Police and Parish Council offices as well as Cox Green Community Centre) and Improved provision at Ockwells Park. These locations are places to which cycling should be encouraged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add the existing cycle parking at Wessex Way shops to the map in Appendix 8. - Add an action in Appendix 8 to provide new cycle parking at Cox Green Centre. - Add an action in Appendix 8 to provide new cycle parking at Ockwells Park.
	The Council has looked at the proposals for Cox Green specifically and would like to make the following suggestions (I have also attached a map with the suggestions added - dotted red lines denote deletions, dotted green lines denote additions):	
	- Deletion of the proposed route within the new Ockwells Park Nature Reserve. It is felt that at this stage whilst a cycling provision within the overall facility is welcome, the overall strategy for the Park and Nature Reserve is currently at the embryonic stage therefore more work need to be done to establish (and avoid) potential conflicts of use within the site. For example a new fitness trail has just been installed and the suggested route of the cycle way (as proposed) would put cyclists in conflict with pedestrians and users of the fitness trail. The inclusion of a cycle route in the park can be added into the overall site operation when appropriate and therefore does not need to be part of the Cycling Strategy (save for the route TO Ockwells Park).	- Change the action in Appendix 8 to 'Investigate the potential for a recreational cycle trail at Ockwells Park'.
	- Deletion of that part of the proposed route along Woodlands Park Road and Woodlands Park Avenue. This stretch of Woodlands Park Road is extremely dangerous and accidents (including a fatality) have occurred along This route. Currently there is insufficient space to provide a safe route for cyclists along this stretch which also suffers from a dip and bend in the road which obscures vehicles let alone cyclists and therefore in the interests of cyclist safety This route is regrettably inappropriate.	- Amend the route shown on the map in Appendix 8 to utilise Heynes Green, and make it clear that this is subject to the site coming forward for development.
	- Addition of a section along Waltham Road and Cannon Lane thereby linking the strategy's proposed route with the existing National Cycle Network AND the proposed cycle parking in Woodlands Park (the current proposal appears to provide a cycle parking facility with no route to it !). This particular route also provides an adequate alternative to the above deletion.	- No change - this link cannot be delivered due to the lack of available highway land north of Wilant Close.

	- Addition to extend the proposed route along the entire length of Ockwells Road across the motorway footbridge (which is cyclist friendly) onto Kimbers Lane, Harvest Hill Road joining up with the existing National Cycle Network.	- It is not possible to deliver this link as proposed due to the lack of available highway land on Harvest Hill Road. Also, It is not possible to provide a surface crossing over the A308 at this point. However, an alternative may be possible through the Golf Course development if this comes forward - include as an action in Appendix 8.
	- Addition from Ockwells Road along Cox Green Road north to the existing National Cycle Network.	- There is not sufficient highway land for an off-carriageway facility, but this could be a signed quietway.
	- Addition along Cannon Lane from the existing cycle route on the A4 southwards to the junction of existing cycle route at Altwood Road.	- No change - The link to the south of the A4 would be through National Trust land and it would not be possible to deliver the path without removing many protected trees.
	- Addition along Highfield Lane from the existing cycle route (which currently ends at the Cox Green School), extending across the bridge (which now has improved access) turning into Farmers Way, through Pheasant's Croft into Barley Mead (which already has a cycle path constructed) exiting onto Cannon Lane and joining up with the proposed route at the Ridgeway. This completes a route that was originally intended when Barley Mead was constructed.	- Include a revised version of the route via Farmers Way in Appendix 8. This would be mostly a signed quietway. This would link to the proposed route through the Ridgeway site, which would be subject to the site being redeveloped.
	It is felt by this Council that these amendments would provide a cohesive network that would assist with encouraging greater cycling usage including safer routes to the schools within the parish of Cox Green and beyond.	

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Lucy Marsh (resident)	I am a young female that cycles to work: I commute from Clarence Road, Windsor to Axis Business Park, Langley (via Datchet). I was pleased when I read the report to see that it addresses the important issues that cyclists face. It seems to be well informed and positive, but there are a couple of points that I'd expand on, in case it's of interest, as I'd really like to see more people in the area taking up cycling as their normal form of transport.	
	The first relates to street lighting. The report recognises that fears over safety are a major barrier to getting more people cycling. I cycle the length of the cycle path alongside the B470 Major's Farm Road. As the report notes, this is unlit. This is so dangerous and quite unpleasant to cycle on in the dark (during the day I think this is a great cycle path). This path is used by quite a few cyclists and pedestrians. As a cyclist I cannot see the path in front of me to know where the verge is or if there's ice, for example, or an approaching pedestrian. I had a surprising encounter last week where a car driver had pulled into the layby to pray by the roadside; he was kneeling on the path wearing low visibility clothing, and I very nearly cycled straight into him. The Action Plan doesn't appear to propose a solution to the lack of lighting on this stretch. It is very important that streetlights are installed along this foot and cycle path; primarily for safety, but also to encourage cycling. The report notes that women are far less likely to cycle in Windsor than men, and this could well be a result of the fact that women generally tend to feel more vulnerable than men while out in the dark on their own.	- In Appendix 4, include a commitment to investigate lighting options for this section of route. Although it is technically Green Belt, it is next to the M4 which is already lit. Also, there is lighting at either end and at the footbridge. Furthermore, the presence of the earth bund provides an additional hazard that could justify additional measures.
	I also note another part of my route that I believe should be lit: after passing over the bridge over the Thames on the B470, I continue down this road towards Windsor in total darkness. This stretch of road is popular amongst school children that cycle and also amongst joggers, and it seems very dangerous that there is no street lighting. This stretch is pitch black apart from when a car comes past, and their dipped headlights tend to dazzle cyclists whose eyes have adjusted to the darkness. This stretch of road is not mentioned in the report.	- No change - this is Green Belt and Home Park is listed as a historic garden, so additional street lighting would be contrary to planning policy and would be resisted.
	My second point relates to cycle parking. I strongly agree with the report that "Access to cycle storage should be at least as convenient as access to car parking". While the report suggests many locations that would be great, it doesn't really address the need for parking near people's homes. Many young professionals (who ought to be targeted in the move to encourage cycling) live in flats. When I moved to Windsor I didn't use a bicycle for months because there was nowhere to store one in my block of flats. I now lock it to the railing in my block's private car park, which is not ideal. I would suggest that more consideration go into cycle parking on residential streets that have big flat compounds, as from a practical perspective for many young adults this is the biggest hindrance to cycling.	- Include an action in paragraph 6.13: "• Consider introducing on-street, secure bikehangars in residential streets where there is significant demand, subject to local consultation."

	<p>A final point relates to what the report calls “key pinch points” - the bridges over the Thames. I’m not sure what this phrase means, but if it means points where the road narrows and cyclists become vulnerable, I’d agree. Nothing in the Action Plan addresses these pinch points. The bridge over the Thames on the B470 can feel dangerous when approached from Datchet, particularly in the dark, as cars often overtake cyclists on the blind bend just before the bridge and then have to cut back in when they realise how narrow the bridge is. This is particularly annoying as the bridge has an uneven surface on the edges, where cyclists are positioned, with several bumps that you cannot avoid while there are cars up against you. I wondered if it the Highways & Transport Unit could consider making giving the bridge and approach to it a double white line down the centre to stop dangerous overtaking. Further, along the stretch of road before the bridge, there is no white line marking the edge of the carriageway, so when cars overtake in the dark it is difficult as a cyclist to know whether or not you can pull in further because you cannot see the edge of the road.</p>	<p>- No change - this would be ineffective, since motorists are permitted to cross / straddle double white lines to overtake a pedal cycle (if they are travelling at 10 mph or less),</p>
--	--	--

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Mrs H Cairncross	With reference to the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Cycling Strategy document, I note that your plan for Maidenhead and Cox Green proposes to introduce new cycling routes that will link into Horseguards Drive, part of which is a private section and cul-de-sac. Part of this private section is presently in my ownership and I would request that it is adopted by the council or, alternatively, to use another road as part of this Cycling Strategy document.	- Include an action in Appendix 8: "Seek to adopt the eastern section of Horseguards Drive in order to secure the cycle route to Maidenhead Bridge."

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Buckinghamshire County Council	<p>I don't really have too many specifics, but just wanted to highlight the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are supportive of any links which improve cycling/walking connectivity between RBWM and Bucks. • Whilst Maidenhead Bridge is a constraint, it is positive that more links are proposed on the Maidenhead side, which will link cyclists from the proposed A4 cycleway into Maidenhead centre (the rail station etc.) • It is also positive to see improved connections for the Jubilee River route. 	- No change
	One question - is there no demand for links between Bisham and Marlow?	- No change - there is not sufficient highway land to be able to construct a cycle route along the Marlow Road - additional private land would be required and it is unlikely that the numbers of cyclists would justify the cost..

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
David Lambourne (resident)	Please find my comments on the recent Consultation on Cycling. 1. No comment about the content; it is an ideal wish list.	-
	2. For this to have an impact, the Council needs to allocate sufficient funding	-
	3. A ten year plan would be good, but funding should be planned and allowed for in the RBWM annual budget, not based on perhaps funding such as Section 106.	- No change - the Royal Borough makes provision for cycling facilities within the annual capital programme. This is funded through a combination of developer contributions and council funds. This includes a one-year firm commitment with a two-year provisional allocation. It is not possible to make 10 year funding commitments due to a lack of certainty about funding sources.
	4. I have read that £10 per head of population should be the target to make an effective difference.	- No change - this level of spend is unaffordable with current resources. However, the Council will seek to identify opportunities to secure external funding sources where appropriate.
	5. We need the council to have the political will to encourage cycling and this needs a facility such as the Hillingdon Cycle Circuit. There is nowhere in the Borough for novices and children to learn. The Hillingdon Cycle Circuit is an excellent example of what can be done with political will; many of our own councillors have visited and been impressed, indeed two Conservative councillors visited and said "We must have one of these," but nothing happened. The council is happy to spend £250,000 on astro surfaced football pitches. An example of political will is that Hillingdon Council have indicated they would help with the funding of an open air velodrome in the middle of the cycle circuit, interesting because the 0.9mile circuit is in a Country Park. Training for all is important because cyclists must have confidence to ride on the road not every route can be covered by riding on pavements.	- No change - the strategy already makes a commitment to 'work with local landowners and British Cycling to explore the potential for creating a closed cycling circuit in the borough.
	The main benefits if political will were to provide meaningful funding are: a) reduce car use and pollution b) improve health. It has been reported £1 spent on cycling facilities gives a £2 health benefit. c) reduces car congestion.	- No change - the costs and benefits of individual schemes vary considerably and the Royal Borough must consider schemes on their individual merits.
	This is a chicken and egg situation if you measure current use and interest to determine spend then you will not get enough new facilities to have an impact. The Council needs to be forward looking otherwise a consultation becomes useless.	- No change - the council seeks to engage with potential as well as existing cycling.

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Local Access Forum	<p>The Forum supported the RBWM cycling strategy in principle, and recommended the following:</p> <p>1. The strategy should seek to generate partnership working to develop multi-user routes and create links to fill gaps in the network.</p>	- Include 1. as an action in paragraph 6.3
	<p>2. The strategy should ensure that the Council take advantage of development opportunities to create new links and improve the network, including ensuring that the cycling strategy is included as far as possible in the Local Plans.</p>	- Include an action in paragraph 6.3: "Ensure that provision for cyclists is incorporated in the Borough Local Plan and associated documents such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan."
	<p>3. The strategy should include goals to encourage more responsible cycling in the Borough.</p>	- Amend the action in 6.38: "• Deliver road safety campaigns, supporting the national 'THINK!' campaigns, supplemented by local campaigns to encourage safe and responsible behaviours by cyclists and other road users."

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Maidenhead Cycle Hub and Maidenhead & Cox Green Neighbourhood Plan Group	We thank RBWM Highways and Transport Unit for the comprehensive and well considered Strategy document. We have the following comments and proposals for the Maidenhead area, all in respect to Appendix 8 - Area Profile - Maidenhead and Cox Green.	
	1) South East Maidenhead routes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional route 1 - Any potential development of Braywick Park should incorporate the cycle route through the park to connect to the greenway existing cycle route and the proposed cross Maidenhead Golf Club cycle path. Meets stated cycling strategy aims. 	- Include an action in Appendix 8 to create an outer radial route via Hibbert Road, Braywick Park and a new route through the proposed golf course development, subject to the site coming forward for development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional route 2 - Slight extension to improve connectivity for residents wishing to reach Braywick Road along Hibbert Road. Key for Maidenhead connectivity, for example heading to or from Windsor. 	- No change - there is insufficient highway land to be able to provide a cycle link along Hibbert Road. If a link is achieved through Braywick then this would provide an acceptable alternative.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key new cycling crossing - Reviewing the Maidenhead cycling connectivity clearly identifies the difficulties of crossing the Braywick Road as a clear blockage of interconnectivity and the ability for residents to cross south east/south west. In addition, the potential development of Braywick Park for additional leisure activities and the development of Maidenhead golf course would further increase the necessity for a safe crossing of this road without the need to go via the town centre. We appreciate the difficulties with this crossing and potential cost, but believe it is essential that any development of either Maidenhead Golf Club or Braywick Park must include this crossing as part of the plan. Without this it would clearly fail to support the stated objectives of the cycling strategy. 	- No change - this will be considered as part of the proposed east-west route through the Golf Course development.
	2) North Maidenhead routes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New interconnection around the outskirts of Furze Platt Senior School to link the cycle paths at Oaken Grove and the A308. The cycling strategy includes stated aims of improving cycling to school. The current cycle routes to Oaken Road fail to reach Furze Platt senior school, one of the largest in the town. The suggested solution circumnavigates the school to provide easy and safe cycle accessibility to this school. It will also be a key part of connectivity for routes entering leaving Maidenhead from the North and the cycle routes joining at Oaken Grove. 	- No change - Pupils currently have a right of access on foot, but creating a cycle route would require surfacing within the site. The school is an academy and therefore funded by central government rather than RBWM. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for RBWM to fund a cycle route within their grounds. It would not be possible to make the route open to the public for safeguarding reasons.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of the cycle path entering Maidenhead along Cannon Court Road to link this cycle path to the A308. Cycle routes joining north Maidenhead currently reach dead ends before reaching the internal Maidenhead cycle routes, where onward access to leisure facilities and the town centre is possible. The extension to these routes and the improvement of the crossing would enable this onward access. Similarly, it facilitates access north of town for Maidenhead residents. 	- Include an action in Appendix 8 to provide a new cycle route to Furze Platt School via Nightingale Lane, Cannon Court Road and Switchback Road South

	<p>3) Central Maidenhead routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route 1 - Current cycle routes fail to provide West/East town centre access for cyclists. We appreciate the route is through the West Street development area, however we feel this is a key route to enable West Maidenhead residents to reach the town centre, and future Maidenhead Waterways. Incorporate the suggested access to town through use of the Subway. This would also provide easy connectivity to the proposed “inner ring” route, highlighted with the blue line showing the existing proposal (Action 12) within the strategy for extension through Kings Street and onward connectivity through Kidwells Park. 	<p>- Include an action in Appendix 8 to consider this route in the event that the area is redeveloped as part of town centre regeneration.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route 2 (Extension to current suggested contraflow) - This extension to cycle routes would be contra flow, and therefore must be off road or individually separated from traffic. Currently the footpaths and road width would clearly provide space for such a route, and as part of the needed road refurbishment post construction works should keep any costs to a minimum. 	<p>- Include an action in Appendix 8 to consider a route in the event that the area is redeveloped as part of town centre regeneration.</p>
	<p>4) Comments Re Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing action: One key issue identified is “there are no cross boundary routes to Buckinghamshire...”. All actions detailed in the scheme fail to attempt to address this key issue. We feel that this is a key issue and would like a proposal to address this key issue. 	<p>- No change - any route into Buckinghamshire would be dependent upon widening existing bridges / constructing new bridges across the Thames. There would not be a strong enough business case to do this solely for cyclists, so it would have to be considered as part of a larger scheme.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing action: We appreciate that shared use paths are a practical solution to enabling cost effective cycle routes to be included. One key risk with these is the right of way for the cyclist when crossing a road turning, for example the Homebase car park on Stafferton Way (we can provide a list of examples if required). Cars entering/exiting can pull in/out in front of the cyclist. In London key cycle paths are granted right of way in these example to ensure safe access and minimising the need to stop/dismount at these pinch points. We would like the strategy to include introducing these cycle rights of way at specific high risk, high traffic points, for example on Stafferton Way. We appreciate this would not be appropriate in all cases. 	<p>- No change - there is already a commitment to provide cyclists with priority across side roads and accesses where appropriate.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 2: The detailed audit of key routes should incorporate a timeframe, for example within 12 months of adoption the key routes must be identified. 	<p>- Amend action to include the proposed timescale.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 9: Use of Subway at Sainsbury's - There are a number of other subways (such as Bad Godesburg Way and High Town Road). We would like further commitment to the extension of granting cyclist permission to cycle through these following a successful trial of the Sainsbury's cycle route. In Appendix 8 under existing cycling activity, the strategy states "It should also be noted that there is significant illegal use of the subways at Bad Godesburg Way, High Town Road and Sainsbury's", indicating proven demand for these routes. It is our opinion that these subways are sufficiently wide to allow the shared use of both pedestrian and cyclists as a safe and efficient means to cross these major roads. We have knowledge of a number of cases in London where similar schemes have been successfully implemented and would be happy to provide further examples to aid planning for the trial/implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - the Sainsbury's subway is the widest in the town centre. Higher quality surface or bridge level crossings should be pursued in preference to encouraging cyclists and pedestrians to share sub-standard facilities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 10: Cycle safety scheme at A308/ Shopperhangers road roundabout - We would welcome the extension of this review westwards to include the connectivity of route 4 from the cycle path via Ludlow road through to Stafferton Way. The current route requires cyclists to join the main carriageway at the intersection of Ludlow Road and Shopperhangers Road. As a consequence this requires dismount to cross the current A308 layout, and must be incorporated within any review of this section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include an action in Appendix 8 to improve the Ludlow Road / Shopperhangers Road junction.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 13: cycle route between Furze Platt and Cranbrook drive - This short extension has ££ marked alongside the scheme, which seems disproportionately high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - the ££ sign reflects schemes that are likely to be in the £10,000 to £99,000 range.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing action: An action should be included to ensure all new developments of leisure/shopping facilities and schools include sufficient cycle parking. A number of the key issues identified listed insufficient parking at local shop/leisure facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - this is already dealt with in the Cycle Parking section of the strategy (paragraph 6.13).

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
Steven Shepherd	<p>I have responded to the consultation via the surveymonkey but I wanted to also email my thoughts directly.</p> <p>I have attended a cycle forum (I would love to have gone to more but Childcare commitments have prevented this) so I missed the October forum where this was presented. I would have liked to have been there to offer my feedback and hear what others had said.</p>	-
	Onto the Strategy. It is well written and obviously a lot of work and research has gone into writing it. It starts off very well, it ticks all the right boxes, certainly the Vision and Aims in section 5 are exactly what I believe. I think the Objectives could be a bit more ambitious but I guess you want to make it achievable. Unfortunately, I don't think the Action Plan (Section 6 onward) quite lives up to the Vision.	- Revise the objective for increasing cycling trips to 20% and revise the objective for reducing cyclist casualties to 20%.
	The plan begins by stating that fears over safety are a major barrier - 100% agree. Cycle routes should be safe, continuous, direct - 100% agree.	-
	<p>It then goes on to say that you will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop routes suitable for cycling which connect residential areas with key destinations Give cyclists priority where possible Improve traffic conditions Introduce 20mph zones. <p>I'm in, you've got me hooked.</p>	-
	But then I read the action plans for each area, and I don't see this. In addition to new routes, existing routes are used. There is no mention of upgrading these (in line with those improvements listed above). The new routes don't say anything about segregation (or none that I can see). With the exception of suggesting bikability training (more of the same) to schools, you don't suggest 20mph zones. Hardly any of the areas listed have routes to/from schools. There is no mention of filtered permeability - what else would 'improve traffic conditions' mean? Speed bumps - no thank you.	- Include actions within the Windsor and Maidenhead & Cox Green Area Profiles to investigate opportunities for filtered permeability.
	I live in Windsor so I obviously have a bias towards that area. The action plan consists of adding some additional parking and a couple of new crossings. That's it. How exactly will this increase cycle trips by 15%?	- No change - Windsor represents a challenging environment in which to deliver new cycle routes due to the lack of highway land and limited number of through routes. The plan will be reviewed annually, so if new schemes are identified, then they can be added later.

	<p>I don't get it, you know what to do (you even write it in your Vision). You know how to achieve this (look at Holland/Denmark). So why not implement it? All I can assume is that in reality, when push comes to shove, politics takes over. Which politician would have the nerve to say they are serious about this and that means re-allocating space from cars? None. They'd never get elected in the first place. They are paying lip-service to these strategies but really they just hope that technology will help (electric and driverless cars). Either that or they are just burying their head in the sand...</p>	-
	<p>Why do I say this? Look at the recent news about parking - RBWM are actively promoting car journeys to Maidenhead and Windsor town centres. You want more parking. More car journeys - not less. It's only temporary they say - until what? What exactly are you hoping is going to happen?</p>	-
	<p>Please don't think I am being overly negative, I would love for this to be a success. I just can't see how it will be with the measures outlined in the strategy.</p>	-
	<p>Just a quick thought on 'schemes' - and how I would like things to work in Windsor. See the map I've linked to for a few thoughts. https://drive.google.com/open?id=10w2gfUdYE68NrInPwE4AQzIJHLI&usp=sharing</p> <p>This includes some bigger schemes but obviously a broader network is what is required. I haven't included all roads and ideas on this yet</p> <p>My thought processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools would be on 20 mph roads (they might already be covered by the blanket coverage - more on that later) • Those roads with schools on should have segregation of some sorts - either soft (like armadillos or planters) or proper kerb style if the road will have more traffic • All residential roads will be 20 mph • Where possible (I have identified some) there should not be residential through roads (unless impossible). Filtered permeability, gates, bollards - whatever method should be used to slow down cars, and encourage cycling/walking for residents (not ran-runners) • When required (40 mph and above) there should be total segregation (Windsor to Ascot and Maidenhead routes) • It goes without saying that priority should be given to bikes over side roads <p>None of the above includes share use - I don't like it but it could be used sparingly</p>	<p>- No change - Nearly all schools in Windsor are already covered by permanent 20 mph speed limits or advisory 20 mph limits that apply at the start and end of the school day.</p> <p>- No change - armadillos cannot be used where there are side accesses or on-street parking and the carriageway needs to be a minimum of 9m wide, which precludes the majority of roads in Windsor.</p> <p>- No change - there are no plans for blanket 20 mph in residential areas at this time.</p> <p>- Include actions within the Windsor and Maidenhead & Cox Green Area Profiles to investigate opportunities for filtered permeability.</p> <p>- No change - there is not sufficient space to be able to achieve full segregation on the Windsor to Maidenhead route and the Ascot to Windsor route is not achievable within the constraints of available highway land.</p> <p>- No change - the strategy already commits to providing priority over side roads where it is safe to do so.</p>
	<p>I haven't mentioned bike parking/bike sharing/public transport links/park and ride(or cycle) - all that goes hand in hand also.</p>	-

	<p>Windsor to Ascot route through the park (A332) - I propose we call it the Queen Elizabeth II cycleway</p> <p>The other Windsor to Ascot route (B3022) - This could be called the Lego expressway</p> <p>Maidenhead to Windsor route - The Dudley highspeed cycleway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change - there is no scope to provide cycle routes alongside the A332 since the verges are Crown Estate land. - No change - a route cannot be delivered through the Great Park alongside the B3022, since it would require Crown Estate Land and there are safety issues that cannot be satisfactorily be addressed. - No change - the Maidenhead to Windsor route cannot be widened due to a lack of available highway land.
	<p>I know what I'm asking for is going to be difficult (near impossible) but I want to aim high. As previously mentioned in other emails. None of what is currently happening in RBWM is actually encouraging active travel. If we really want to get people cycling, walking and more active. If we want to reduce our CO2 emissions. If we want to stop killing people with dirty air. There isn't really a choice - we've got to make the alternatives to using a car more attractive and subsequently using a car less attractive. It's that simple.</p>	<p>-</p>

Name	Comments	Proposed Response
David and Barbara Layzell (residents)	High traffic speed together with regular breaking of speed limits by drivers is the biggest deterrent to cycling.	- No change - the strategy already includes actions to introduce 20 mph speed limits around schools and areas where there are large numbers of cyclists.
	<p>Introduction of enforced 20 mph speed limits on all urban roads other than A roads and motorways will encourage more cyclists and reduce the need for RBWM to spend limited capital on offroad cycle paths.</p> <p>During the day the worst traffic and congestion is the afternoon school pick up time when parents wait in cars near the schools. Suggestions to avoid this are no vehicle waiting times anywhere near schools. Also more pupils cycling to and from school. More provision of secure cycle parking at all schools.</p>	<p>- No change - there are no plans for blanket 20 mph in residential areas at this time.</p> <p>- No change - school keep clear markings are already provided to help keep school entrances clear. Wider parking restrictions around schools are considered on a case-by-case basis taking account of the particular needs of all stakeholders, including local residents.</p> <p>- No change - paragraph 6.13 includes an action to provide cycle parking at schools.</p>
	More and more train passengers are using cycles to the station due to the cost and availability of car parking. When Crossrail is introduced considerably more secure cycle parking at Maidenhead station will be needed.	<p>- In Appendix 8, acknowledge the shortfall in parking at the station in Section 11 and add an action to provide a secure cycle parking hub at Maidenhead Station to Section 13 - this will be subject to securing funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the Station Interchange scheme.</p>
	In order to reduce vehicular traffic in the borough more provision is needed for utility cycling - travel to work, the shops and leisure activities. The provision should include reducing vehicle speeds, providing some off road cycle paths together with adequate secure cycle parking in workplaces, town centres near shops and in leisure areas.	- No change - these are all identified as actions within the strategy.
	On cycle routes using shared use footways, hedges should be regularly cut well back to maximise width and improve safety particularly for younger cyclists.	- No change - paragraph 6.3 includes an action to review and develop maintenance regimes to better consider the needs of cyclists.
	Typical dangerous roads for cyclists with excessive vehicle speeds include All Saints Avenue Maidenhead and Henley Road Maidenhead from A4 roundabout to the A404. As a matter of interest, we saw the results of an accident to a group of cyclists on the Henley Road attended by police and an ambulance at lunchtime on Sunday 13th November.	- No change - there is an existing shared use path on All Saints Avenue. Henley Road is a long, straight road with little in the way of frontage development. As such, the national speed limit applies. This is considered to be appropriate for the conditions. Enforcement of speed limits is a matter for Thames Valley Police.