

Cycling Strategy Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement March 2016

Prepared under regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Call for Ideas consultation

A 'call for ideas' consultation for the Cycling Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was undertaken during July and August 2015. This was undertaken alongside consultation on two draft Supplementary Planning Documents and a call for ideas on a further four Supplementary Planning Documents, and details were circulated to everyone on the Local Plan mailing list, published on the Council's web site, emailed to those on the Ipswich Direct email service and publicised through a press release and via social media. The Local Plan mailing list consists of specific and general consultation bodies, and private individuals who have expressed an interest in Local Plan matters.

The call for ideas invited comment on the scope and content of the document prior to preparation commencing. Comments were received from a total of eleven organisations and individuals as set out in the table below. The comments are reproduced in the table below together with the officer's response indicating how the points raised have been addressed through the SPD, if appropriate.

As part of the call for ideas consultation an online cycling to school survey was also carried out. This was publicised as part of the consultation process outlined above and also through direct emails to all schools within Ipswich Borough. A summary of the results is provided below the table of comments. The responses have been taken into account in developing the guidance.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
Associated British Ports	ABP is a major stakeholder within Ipswich owning approximately 275 acres of land, including Key Street. This is a very popular route. The route is part of the Sustrans National Cycle Route 51. ABP wishes to actively encourage cycling within areas such as these acknowledging the importance of connecting the town centre, train station and waterfront. It is believed that this route in particular would benefit from clear signage to raise awareness for all road users and also pedestrians.	Improvements to signage have been identified in the SPD as a potential enhancement for cycling across the town.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	With regard to the opening of new routes, ABP must continue to prohibit non port users from the operational port.	The comment regarding prohibiting non port users from using the port is noted.
Historic England	No comments to make.	Noted
Natural England	Does not consider that this SPD poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to their statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted
Private Individual 1	<p>In new developments residential areas should have traditional crosslinked streets, not cul-de-sacs which make cycling access difficult.</p> <p>New main roads separate infrastructure for bikes. Wide cycle lanes preferably with physical barriers between cyclists and traffic. Shared pavements cause conflict with pedestrians and there is a lot of stop start due to side roads.</p> <p>Greatest barrier to cycling is fear caused by proximity to large/fast traffic. Narrow cycle lanes are counter-productive as they annoy drivers and discourage cyclists as they make them feel very vulnerable. Since Ipswich has narrow roads this is a major problem. Possible solution is to remove narrow cycle lanes and designate certain roads/routes as cycle priority routes where through traffic is discouraged and speed limited to 20mph.</p> <p>Cycle parking facilities could be improved and more importantly signposted.</p> <p>There are a number of specific barriers to cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of contraflow cycle lanes in the town, which are 	<p>The guidance has been included regarding through routes for cyclists at the end of cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>The guidance relating to routes states that ideally cyclists should be separated from other users.</p> <p>The guidance relating to routes states that ideally cyclists should be separated from other users. Guidance on the width of cycle lanes has been included. The draft refers to considering the potential for 'cycle priority streets' which would require more detailed consideration of traffic impacts prior to being implemented.</p> <p>This has been included within the draft SPD.</p> <p>The SPD identifies a need for contraflows to be legible to all users, to consider the possibility of using speed bumps which are not</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>scary and dangerous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full width road speed humps which cannot be avoided and are very unpleasant for cyclists • Road damage along cycle routes <p>Use of roads as rat runs can result in safe side roads for cyclists becoming unsafe.</p>	<p>the full road width and identifies specific locations where the surface of the cycle path could be improved.</p> <p>The SPD considers the potential for some roads to be designed with the effect of cyclists having priority whilst through traffic would be encouraged along alternative routes.</p>
Private Individual 2	<p>Measures to encourage cycling in and around new developments are the provision of high quality, well thought out infrastructure that allows people to go where they want to go. Infrastructure should be built in accordance with “Making Space for Cycling” guidance document published by Cambridge Cycling Campaign and the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle-Friendly Design.</p> <p>Good onsite infrastructure must be backed up by good quality infrastructure throughout the town. It is recognised that IBC has little or no control over highways, a Cycling SPD will only have a meaningful impact if the Council is also pressurising SCC to make quality infrastructure changes elsewhere. The Northern Fringe is a good example, with a new neighbourhood 2 miles from the town centre the potential for bike use as a genuine mode of transport is high. The potential will only be realised if those residents can see a safe cycling route through the town centre.</p>	<p>The draft SPD states that routes should take account of key destinations. A list of references has been added to the end of the draft SPD.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the draft SPD identifies a number of potential enhancements to key routes around the town.</p>
Private Individual 3	The following measures should be included in all new developments to encourage cycling: high quality segregated cycle paths; integration	These have been included within the design guidance contained in the SPD.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>with strategic cycle route into town centre and employment areas; all retail developments to include destination cycle parking with signage; safe routes for bikes through car parks.</p> <p>Measures that should be taken to encourage cycling: cycle training for all school children from the age of 5 and deliver Bikeability level 2 by Year 6; schools should be mandated to include cycles in School Travel Plans; provision of secure cycle storage for 20% of pupils; more highly visible destination cycle parking in town; mandatory 20 mph speed limit in town centre; improvements to part of New Cut East; removal of contraflow bike lanes against bus traffic.</p> <p>Particular issues which currently act to discourage cycling in the Borough: the management of the transport strategy by SCC is less than ideal as decisions cannot be made at a more local level; police to enforce pavement cycling, running red lights, parking on cycle paths; there is insufficient secure parking in the town centre.</p>	<p>It is understood that Suffolk County Council offer Bikeability training to schools.</p> <p>Cycle parking for new schools would be required in accordance with the guidance provided in the SPD.</p> <p>Chapter 6 identifies a need for more cycle parking in the town centre as well as other potential enhancements.</p> <p>Chapter 5 states that contraflows should be legible to all users.</p> <p>These comments are noted however the SPD cannot be used to enforce against illegal cycling. Chapter 6 identifies a need for more cycle parking in the town centre.</p>
Private Individual 4	<p>More coherent safe routes through Ipswich to encourage more cycling and walking.</p> <p>Dangerous hotspots are on routes from the waterfront to the hospital or train station. There is no safe through route off-road through town, only busy roads can be used.</p> <p>No traffic along the waterfront, traffic</p>	<p>Chapter 6 aims to enhance routes between key destinations in the Borough.</p> <p>Chapter 6 aims to enhance routes between these places.</p> <p>Chapter 6 states that legible routes</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	to use the road parallel to the waterfront	for cyclists should be created along the waterfront.
Private Individual 5	<p>There are two handbooks released around April 2014, which contain very good direction that should be referenced and used as inspiration: 'Making Space for Cycling' and 'Sustrans Handbook for Cycle-friendly design'</p> <p>Various new items in Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2015 improve things for cyclists and should start making an appearance in Ipswich including low level traffic lights for cyclists, red cycle symbol on cycle signs, "Except Cycles" plates added to existing restrictions, Zig Zags offset up to 2m from the kerb so cyclists do not have to ride over and cycle lanes continue through junctions; cycle streets where cars are guests, flexible traffic wands or armadillos to separate cyclists from traffic.</p> <p>Cambridge Cycling Campaign has an excellent cycle parking guide as do Cambridge City Council.</p> <p>Cycle parking should be signposted and cycle parking should be included within car parks.</p> <p>Conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles should be avoided at all times. At present there are some areas with on and off road infrastructure for cyclists, this should be changed to a single type that all are happy to use.</p> <p>Many of the key main routes into Ipswich do not provide space for protected cycle infrastructure, as an alternative some corridors should</p>	<p>The draft SPD contains a list of documents for further reference, including those mentioned.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The design guidance in chapter 5 includes reference to these points.</p> <p>The guidance in chapters 5 and 6 recommend that routes should be continuous and legible.</p> <p>Chapter 6 promotes the consideration of 'cycle priority routes'.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>become key cycle routes with no through traffic and access only to properties. There would then be quiet links between the corridors that would encourage people to cycle round to those corridor routes.</p> <p>‘Cyclist Dismount’ signs should only be used in extreme circumstances. It is really rare that there is a valid use for them or the cycle infrastructure is not good enough.</p>	<p>The design guidance in chapter 5 states that such signs should be avoided, and that cyclists should be directed to where they can cycle.</p>
Private individual 6	<p>Ipswich has a massive traffic problem. The current cycle infrastructure is a major factor in people not feeling confident to cycle after having spent years in cars. Ipswich needs to link surrounding villages and towns together with a proper cycle investment – direct well-built infrastructure, providing a safe route for cyclists to make cycling into work and town an actual alternative to driving.</p> <p>Closing of some roads which are simply rat runs for cars, making an area pleasant for cycling and living in, especially important where a link to a cycle route is possible.</p> <p>Reduce much of the conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, and cyclists and road users, and to certainly not introduce any further conflicts in new developments.</p> <p>To encourage cycling in and around new development there should be links to existing cycle routes, and should be developed into attractive cycle paths to ensure cycling is a viable method of getting to the town centre, work and train station. Also linking these routes to develop a network of cycle routes which are</p>	<p>Chapter 6 identifies a number of potential enhancements to existing routes.</p> <p>Chapter 6 promotes the consideration of ‘cycle priority routes’.</p> <p>The design guidance in Chapter 5 states that cyclists should be separated from vehicles and pedestrians where possible.</p> <p>The design guidance in Chapter 5 states that new routes should link with the wider network.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>their own form of transport for getting to schools and colleges.</p> <p>Decent availability of cycle parking, see page 5 of the Cycle Parking Guide produced by Cambridge City Council.</p> <p>Review the Making Space for Cycling document.</p> <p>With a decent enough solid infrastructure, it is not just cyclists who will use it to commute but people with other needs, such as disabled and younger cyclists.</p> <p>There should be investment in a linked network starting from and out to the satellite villages, such as Westerfield, Sroughton, Bramford, Claydon and Needham Market – this should not just be signs but a space for cycling.</p> <p>Cycling parking needs to be sign posted and available where people need it around the town.</p> <p>A lack of coherent well-built and linked infrastructure discourages cycling. Also a constant conflict between other road users and pedestrians. Clear/unnecessary signage – such as the overuse of ‘dismount’ or ‘End’ on cycle routes. It is a form of transport reliant on person power. The feeling of suddenly being put out from a cycle lane and into the road is potentially very dangerous.</p> <p>All for sharing roadspace with other traffic but through certain areas this</p>	<p>Guidance on cycle parking is included in the design guidance in Chapter 5.</p> <p>A list of further references is included in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Chapter 5 acknowledges that there are a range of different types of cycle.</p> <p>Chapter 6 recognises that routes within the Borough also extend to locations beyond the Borough, however this is beyond the Council’s direct influence.</p> <p>The design guidance in Chapter 5 identifies a need to signpost cycle parking and chapter 6 identifies that enhance cycle parking in the town centre is needed.</p> <p>Chapter 6 identifies potential enhancements to the wider network whilst Chapter 5 states that ‘end of route’ signs should be avoided where possible and instead the cyclist should be directed to where they can cycle.</p> <p>Due to the historic nature of some roads in the town it is difficult to</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>is just not possible – the Sustrans route along Bramford Lane is a good example.</p> <p>Areas like Rope Walk are good examples of cycling infrastructure in Ipswich.</p>	<p>provide significant enhancements for cyclists.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Private Individual 7	<p>Measures at new developments to encourage cycling:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dutch style home streets, cars only at rear of houses 2. Longer route to exit development for drivers than cyclists 3. Cycle priority traffic lights where cycle routes cross roads 4. Cut motor vehicle speed in and around development 5. Good connecting routes to town centre and other popular destinations 6. Routes to be cycleable by unaccompanied older children without risk from car/vans etc. 7. Full segregation where possible <p>Measures to encourage cycling in the Borough:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enforced speed restriction 2. Cycle priority on roundabouts 3. Cut out all rat runs (filtered permeability) 4. Locked and covered cycle parking provided 5. Universal Bikeability with bombproof routes to schools 6. Cyclists pass behind pedestrian refuges to avoid pinch points 7. Cut emissions in town by introducing zones and congestion charging <p>Factors which discourage cycling in the Borough:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High vehicle speeds and volumes 2. Rat runs 3. Non continuous cycle provision. 4. Too much poorly designed shared use 5. Pinch points at pedestrian 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The guidance differentiates between main routes and quieter routes. 2. The guidance states that where cul-de-sacs are planned there should be a through-route for cyclists. 3. The section on junctions and crossing identifies that priority phases for cyclists may be appropriate in some instances. 4. Speed can be influenced by design, and the draft SPD contains guidance on the design of quieter routes. 5. The draft guidance in chapter 5 states that new routes should link with existing networks and should take account of key destinations. 6. The design guidance states that routes should be designed with less confident cyclists in mind. 7. The draft guidance in Chapter 5 encourages separation of cyclists from other vehicles and pedestrians. <p>Measures to encourage cycling in the Borough:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chapter 6 of the SPD identifies consideration of ‘cycle priority routes’ as a possible enhancement. 2. Chapter 5 and 6 consider potential improvements to roundabouts. 3. Chapter 6 of the SPD identifies consideration of ‘cycle priority

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>6. Fumes at high traffic volume times</p>	<p>routes' as a possible enhancement. It is not realistic to cut out all rat runs.</p> <p>4. Chapter 6 identifies a need for improved cycle parking in the town centre.</p> <p>5. It is understood that Suffolk County Council offer Bikeability training to schools.</p> <p>6. The draft guidance in Chapter 5 promotes the use of bus stop by-passes.</p> <p>7. Emissions will specifically considered through the Low Emissions Supplementary Planning Document which is to be produced during 2016.</p> <p>Factors which discourage cycling are noted and have been taken into account.</p>
<p>Northern Fringe Protection Group</p>	<p>In accordance with the Local Plan Policy CS5, Ipswich Cycling Strategy SPD should aim to work towards the development of an integrated cycle network across the wider Ipswich Area. This should be in accordance with recognised standards.</p> <p>Planning should be made on the basis of clear Business Plans that should be monitored to ensure the outcomes match the predictions. Investment decisions should be phased according to an ongoing cost benefit analysis to ensure value for money for the tax/community charge payer. Success should be measured against specific objectives in achieving modal shift from cars and a corresponding increase in cycling.</p> <p>There should be a clear time-bounded target to increase the</p>	<p>The SPD will set design guidance which will apply to cycling provision in new development.</p> <p>The Borough Council does not invest directly in highways infrastructure, Suffolk County Council is the highways authority. The Core Strategy and Policies development plan document contains indicators which are monitored through the Authority Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy and Policies development plan</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>number of cycling journeys and reduce the amount of vehicular traffic. Through joint working with all relevant authorities, proposals should be developed and implemented to deliver these targets.</p> <p>The wider Ipswich Area cycling network must be effectively maintained and measures agreed and implemented with the responsible authority to ensure this happens.</p> <p>Existing routes need to be upgraded with resurfacing where needed such as the Christchurch Park bridleway. Uneven and dangerous road surfaces on cycle networks need to be eradicated.</p> <p>Using road space for protected cycling space, rather than mixing cyclists and pedestrians on shared pavements, is to be preferred. Main travel routes should, where possible, allow segregated cycling.</p> <p>All new developments should include high quality cycle infrastructure that connects with existing networks, paid for by the developers.</p> <p>In particular, safe and convenient cycle routes to and across Ipswich town centre should be improved.</p> <p>IBC should work with SCC, schools and academies to increase the number of children walking and cycling to school, including delivering infrastructure that is safe for users.</p> <p>Better integration of cycling networks with public transport is required. In particular IBC should work with train</p>	<p>document relates to the Ipswich: Transport fit for the 21st Century target of reducing dependency on the private car by 15% within the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>Maintenance is the responsibility of Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>Chapter 6 identifies where existing routes could benefit from enhancements, however this is not an exhaustive list.</p> <p>The draft design guidance in Chapter 5 states that separating cyclists from other vehicles is preferable.</p> <p>The draft design guidance in Chapter 5 identifies the provision that should be made.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the draft SPD provides guidance on enhancing town centre routes.</p> <p>The guidance in the SPD will relate to provision for cycling around new schools.</p> <p>Noted. The draft SPD identifies that links between the station and the town centre could be enhanced.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	operators to remove the existing constraints on taking bicycles on trains.	
Marine Management Organisation	No comments	Noted
Office of Rail and Road	No comments	Noted
Westerfield Parish Council	No comments	Noted

Cycling to Schools survey – summary of responses

Total respondents: 190 (168 parents and 22 pupils)

Age groups represented:

- Primary, infant or junior – 40 (28%)
- Years 7-9 – 75 (43%)
- Years 10-11 – 40 (23%)
- Sixth Form – 21 (12%)

A large proportion of respondents represent Northgate High School, Sidegate Primary School or St Helens Primary School.

Distance from home to school:

- Less than a mile – 56 (37%)
- 1-2 miles – 65 (43%)
- 2 – 5 miles – 23 (15%)
- Over 5 miles – 6 (4%)

Method of transport currently used (in order of most common):

- Walk – 76 (51%)
- Cycle – 41 (27%)
- Car, as passenger – 21 (14%)
- Car, as driver – 5 (3%)
- Bus – 2 (1%)
- Other (includes scooters) – 5 (3%)

Please note that not all respondents answered every question

Commentary

27% of respondents to this question cycle already, 51% walk already and 1% travel by scooter. Of the 26 (17%) who go by car as passenger or driver, 16 (11%) live within 2 miles of their school. If this is a representative sample, it would suggest that there is a relatively small percentage (11%) who do not cycle but live close enough to do so regularly.

Around half of those who don't cycle to school do cycle at least once a month for other purposes, with a quarter cycling at least once or twice a week. However, in most cases

those who go to school by car who do cycle at other times do this around once a month or less often. Those who cycle more regularly at other times are generally those who walk to school rather than those who go by car.

Only 18% of parents who responded stated that they never cycle, with 40% cycling either every day or a few days per week. There is some correlation between those parents who cycle regularly and pupils who walk or cycle to school (i.e. where the parents cycle regularly, the child(ren) walk or cycle), although there are some pupils who cycle to school whilst the parents do not cycle regularly. In the cases where parents regularly cycle but pupils do not walk or cycle to school, the distance from school is over 2 miles and the pupils are primary / infant / junior school age (i.e. it may not be possible for the children to cycle due to distance).

In answering the question about how more pupils could be encouraged to cycle, traffic free cycle paths / safer cycle routes were the most requested improvement. Secure cycle parking, cheaper equipment, better crossings / junctions, cycle training and parking restrictions around schools were also mentioned a number of times.

In responding to the question asking for general comments about cycling in Ipswich, in addition to the points mentioned above other issues identified include problems negotiating around parked cars and maintenance of cycle lanes.

Consultation on the Draft Cycling Strategy SPD

Consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was held for five weeks between 19th November 2015 and 23rd December 2015.

The consultation documents were placed in each of the libraries in Ipswich, in the Customer Services Centre, in Ipswich Borough Council's offices at Grafton House and in the cycle café on Tower Street. Individuals and organisations on the Planning Policy consultation database were notified directly, and in addition a press advert was placed in the Ipswich Star and the East Anglian Daily Times, a press release was published and posts were made on social media sites.

A total of 13 individuals and organisations responded. The comments received are summarised in the table below along with details of how the comments have been addressed in finalising the SPD.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
Cycle Ipswich	In Chapter 3 it would be useful to note that as of the 2011 census 27.8% of households in Ipswich have no access to a car or van and 45.6% only have access to 1 vehicle in the household. It would be better logistically if people felt they had other alternatives to the private car.	This amendment has been made.
	Teenagers are generally unable to drive, yet should be able to travel independently without significant costs.	An amendment has been made to Chapter 3 to reflect this.
	Paragraph 3.3: it would be useful to also note that there is generally a reduced journey time for short journeys when using a bike, especially at peak times when there are alternative cycle routes which avoid congestion.	This amendment has been made.
	Would it be possible to include figures from SCC Travel to Work Survey for people travelling by bus in paragraph 3.7, as people who travel by bike are more likely to take a bus if their bike is off the road.	This amendment has been made.
	There are several places in the document, including paragraph 3.10, where the historic nature of	It is considered that it is important to get this issue across, however additional text has been added to

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>Ipswich's streets seem to make it difficult to create any significant improvements in the town. Would like a positive spin on this, as most Dutch towns and cities have shown that with a strategic minimisation of motor traffic in town centres it is possible to produce a pleasant environment for walking and cycling, this is also evident in Ipswich town centre.</p>	<p>6.4 to explain that improvements would nevertheless be desirable.</p>
	<p>It should be noted in chapter 4 that some studies have shown that people already using public transport are more likely to start cycling than people who currently drive. People who cycle are more likely to use public transport when the bike is not practical and tend to minimise the use of the car.</p>	<p>Information on bus use has been added to the table in 3.7.</p>
	<p>The final sentence of paragraph 5.4 should be changed to: Within destination routes (such as residential roads, cul-de-sacs, or quiet streets) it may be appropriate for the cyclist to cycle on road with no specific provision, and motor traffic being minimised, whilst still allowing motor vehicle access to properties. – the final part about the minimisation of traffic is key and can usually be implemented very cheaply and even through temporary trials.</p>	<p>The last sentence of 5.4 has been amended to state that measures to minimise or slow motor traffic whilst allowing for access may also be required.</p>
	<p>The minimisation of motor traffic also applies to paragraph 5.9 bullet point 3. The bullet point regarding "cycle streets" should also note that the volume of motor traffic in addition to speed should be reduced. In the Netherlands motor traffic is generally prohibited, with access only, and are often a cul-de-sac for motor traffic, whilst being a through route for cyclists.</p>	<p>An amendment has been made to bullet point 3 and to the bullet point on 'cycle streets'.</p>
	<p>In paragraph 5.9 the photo of Landseer Road cycle lane should note the narrowness of the lane as another issue, as the white line is close to where people should</p>	<p>This amendment has been made.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	cycle, which provides no protection.	
	Paragraph 5.9, the bullet about parked cars, should have the cycle track between the pavement and the parked cars as a strong preference where possible as this is significantly safer compared to a cycle lane between the parked cars and main carriageway. Should also note the requirement that the doors of parked cars should not open into the cycle lane.	This amendment has been made.
	Regarding cycling contraflows, hope that two streets in Ipswich do not prevent further contraflows being implemented (such as Stoke Quay and New Cut West). London has turned all one way streets to two way for cyclists, however these do not have buses running along them. They are also relatively quiet compared to Museum Street and Upper Brook Street. Removing the cycle contraflow would mean that many cyclists would go the wrong way due to the alternative route being too long or busy.	Amendments have been made to the cycle contraflow bullet point to provide a more positive approach whilst maintaining that cycle contraflows should be legible
	On paragraph 5.10, could “or protected cycle tracks” be appended please?	The words ‘or protected cycle tracks’ has been added to the end of the paragraph.
	In paragraph 5.12, could there be a section added about automatically detecting cyclists on the approach to traffic signals to reduce waiting times, and mean that cyclists don’t need to press a button to get a green light.	An additional bullet point has been added, however the suitability would need to be considered in terms of effects on traffic flows.
	The bullet about roundabouts in paragraph 5.12 does not clearly state that there should be a protected cycle track the whole way around the roundabout so that cyclists don’t mix with motor vehicles whilst on the junction, instead they cross perpendicular on the arms around 1 car length away from the roundabout. The central diameter of the	The amendment has been made, and reference has been made to the Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design which contains a number of diagrams.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>roundabouts and the corners that car drivers turn, are also tightened up so that drivers have to take them carefully, and also they only have to concentrate on turning on or off the roundabout or cyclists and pedestrians crossing. Never both at the same time. It would also be useful to have a diagram and/or photo included to illustrate the point. I'd be happy to provide one.</p>	
	<p>Regarding paragraph 5.13, the provision of maps (whether online or roadside) should come first, as this is key to allowing people to know which route to follow, then once they are following a route, the routes need to be easy to follow. (Bullet 1)</p>	<p>Comment noted, however it is considered that the point is covered in a combination of this section and the first bullet point of 5.9.</p>
	<p>Add "cyclists dismount" to the list of signs that should be avoided. (Bullet 4)</p>	<p>The amendment has been made.</p>
	<p>The provision of road side cycle maps also help people not familiar with the area, or familiar with the idea that there is a parallel route, to the one people normally drive in a motor vehicle, which is much more pleasant on a bike. Could this also be noted please? (Bullet 5).</p>	<p>The amendment has been made.</p>
	<p>The photo above right on page 18, could also note that route numbers or destinations can also be painted on the road.</p>	<p>Unless this could be done with limited letters, destinations painted on cycle tracks may be difficult to read at higher speeds.</p>
	<p>In paragraph 5.18, I think it would be useful for clarity to include a photo or diagram example of the lower bar for parking children's bikes. I could foresee some developers misinterpreting this.</p>	<p>This bullet has been amended to refer to provision being required especially at locations where children cycle such as schools along with a description of what children's provision may entail.</p>
	<p>Chapter 6:</p>	
	<p>Several routes could note destinations further afield, as it can be common for some people to cycle commute 10 or 15+ miles. If there were better signage and</p>	<p>Reference to this has been added into the signage bullets in 5.13.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>more protected cycle paths more people would be willing to cycle commute this kind of distance.</p>	
	<p>Yellow route/Ring road should also note that the cycle lane along the route needs to be widened to 1.5 or 2 metres.</p> <p>Also the off road provision needs to avoid shared use with pedestrians, as this creates conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. It also makes some cyclists believe that they can cycle on any pavement.</p>	<p>There may be sections where space does not allow this, however reference to widening cycle lanes where possible has been added.</p> <p>The shared pavement at the Norwich Road/Valley Road/Chevalier Street junction is for a short distance as part of the recent works to the junction. This is a general point and has been added to the bullets on page 28.</p>
	<p>Gipping corridor is a personal favourite where would like the section of the path between Stoke Bridge and the west side of Princes Street to use in part the old railway track to go under Princes Street, thus allowing a wide continuous path. It's also worth noting that there are many people who cycle along the narrow path from Stoke Bridge west, as the alternative routes are rather hostile in comparison, hence the importance of this off road route.</p>	<p>Reference to possible alternatives, rather than just widening the existing path, has been added.</p>
	<p>IP-One area also notes that the historic street patterns make it difficult for cycling, however this should not be the case if through motor traffic is minimised, and people are encouraged to park on the edge of the town centre.</p>	<p>It is considered that it is important to get this issue across, however additional text has been added to 6.4 to explain that improvements would nevertheless be desirable.</p>
	<p>There is also a suggestion of shared use pavements however these should be avoided where there are higher pedestrian flows due to the conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. Shared use can work where pedestrian flows are very low, or the main reason for people to cycle there is as a destination, with cyclists generally dismounting or travelling at walking pace when very busy.</p>	<p>The references to shared use pavements relate to existing ones. A bullet has been added to the text relating to all routes which would support the provision of separated routes where possible.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>It should be noted that the secure cycle parking and cycle hire at the station is aimed at rail users rather than other people nearby.</p> <p>Enhancements around the station could also include the increased need to provide cycle parking where supply is currently outstripping demand, and noting that the usage needs regularly reviewed to see if the demand is being catered for.</p>	<p>Comment noted, it is considered that this is implicit within the text in the SPD.</p> <p>Reference to the ongoing station improvements has been made.</p>
	<p>Stoke Park/ Wherestead Road to station/ Purple route, should note that this route is extremely important for connections to the Shotley Peninsula, including the community path which is in the process of being designed and built.</p>	<p>This amendment has been made.</p>
	<p>Pinewood/Belstead to station and town centre (grey) should also include Hawthorn Drive and Mallard Way as part of this provision with the linkages to the nearby schools, high quality protected cycle tracks between the pavement and parked cars would significantly help to reduce the school run problem in the area.</p>	<p>The arrows on the map are indicative, however reference to Hawthorn Drive has been included in this section.</p>
	<p>North Ipswich to town centre should also note that the barrier on the Bridleway is very difficult to pass on a cargo bike or with a trailer, so improvements should also be looked into.</p>	<p>This amendment has been made.</p>
	<p>South East Ipswich should note that the camber of the path through Holywells Park and especially Landseer Park means that it's very difficult to ride a cargo trike. There are other places in Ipswich where the camber of the road makes the cargo trike about to tip over even at low speed a real possibility.</p>	<p>Reference to ensuring that cambers are appropriate for all types of cycle has been added into section 5.9.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>Appendix 3:</p> <p>5 - The cycle parking outside the library can be overflowing at times, more is needed.</p> <p>7 - These were installed by Sainsburys and are of a poor design. Nearby sign posts can be well used through a combination of the wheel benders being full, and many people avoiding using the wheel bender cycle parking design.</p> <p>More provision for cycle parking is needed closer to the shops, including on the main shopping streets, especially for people shopping in the early morning and late afternoon when cycling is allowed. Often people will use lamp posts instead.</p>	<p>These are the results of a survey which was undertaken, however the comment is noted. The need to address increased provision in the town centre has been added into the bullets under the IP-One area section.</p> <p>Comments noted, however the survey notes that these stands are located on private land.</p> <p>These are the results of a survey which was undertaken, however the comment is noted. The need to address increased provision in the town centre has been added into the bullets under the IP-One area section.</p>
Private Individual	Further cycleway is required to link St Augustines roundabout to Bixley Rd/Foxhall Rd roundabout. If it were to be built on the Broke Hall development side, it could also feature toucan crossings at Foxhall Rd, and the bottom of Bixley Rd; crossing over to the railway side. Continuation to the lights, and another Toucan crossing please, to allow cyclists to route directly from Rands Way to Woodbridge Road East directly. I have cycled daily on this road at the busy school leaving times, and it is very unpleasant to say the least.	This has been added into potential enhancements on the ring road (yellow route). Toucan crossings rather than pedestrian crossings are supported in Chapter 5 where these form part of cycle routes.
Private Individual	<p>Page 17:</p> <p>It appears to me that the caption is incorrect. I believe it should be "off road cycle path taken onto the road where passing a junction".</p> <p>Additionally it would be better to have a solid white line approaching the junction to stop motorists getting in this lane as they turn left. This would provide more protection</p>	<p>Agreed, the caption has been changed.</p> <p>Reference to providing sufficient indication to vehicles that cyclists are diverted on-road has been included.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	for cyclists dropping down onto the road when going straight on at the junction.	
Private Individual	Provision for cyclists within Ipswich is largely through the use of on-road cycle lanes, and the shared use of pavements, there are very few segregated off-road routes. Herein lies one of the core reasons potential cyclists of any age don't venture out on their bikes, whether it be to school, to college or to work.	Comment noted. The SPD supports separated provision for cyclists and pedestrians.
	Cycle routes should be conspicuous, continuous, convenient, convivial, consistent and connect with other routes to give users a choice of destination, but most importantly they should not only be safe, they should inspire confidence in the user. This is most effectively achieved by being separate from the highway, from pedestrians and from cross traffic (stop start cycling).	Comment noted. Section 5.9 addresses routes and supports separation of cyclists from traffic.
	One of the key advantages of cycling is to the health of everybody else. We all know cycling is a healthy pursuit but the cycling strategy is silent on the lack of pollution. Pollution that in certain areas of the town is causing air quality to reach levels of concern - this pollution is not caused by bicycles and it will not increase if cycling increases.	The Council is also producing a Low Emissions Supplementary Planning Document which will focus on reducing emissions. Reference to emissions has been added to paragraph 3.1.
	The attachment (provided with the email) shows a 'No Through Road' sign as used in mainland Europe, the key advantage is that it clearly indicates a 'through' route for cyclists and pedestrians rather than the negative - don't come this way implied by the UK version.	Section 5.13 on signage states that cyclists should be informed of where they can cycle.
	I am pleased to note that the signs 'Cyclists Dismount' (every 50 yards across Ravenswood) have been discontinued.	Comment noted.
	The single greatest possible move to promote Cycling in Ipswich would be a joint Strategy (and working party) between Ipswich	Comment noted. Discussions have been held with Suffolk County Council in the preparation of the SPD.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	Borough Council (Strategic Planning Team) and Suffolk County Council (Highways). No amount of prognostication in the Draft Cycling Strategy Supplementary Planning Document will make any significant difference without changes to the Highway infrastructure.	
Natural England	No comments	Noted
Anglian Water	No comments	Noted
Northern Fringe Protection Group	SPD needs to better consider the major issues cyclists face in the town centre otherwise IBC will be unable to achieve its vision for cycling, its transport strategy and its core strategy. This will be detrimental to Ipswich residents and businesses in terms of congestion and air quality.	The SPD refers to issues in the town centre in Chapter 6. It is not clear which specific issues are being referred to in the comment.
	The Core Strategy is heavily dependent on increasing sustainable travel and the number of cyclists travelling to and across the town centre. Unless cycling across the town centre is improved it will be impossible to achieve the required shift to cycling that will enable the Core Strategy to be successfully delivered, for example, from the Northern Fringe development to the Waterfront. Improving cycling infrastructure should not be at the expense of other road users. Solutions are required that allow all road users to travel safely and efficiently around Ipswich and all decisions should be driven by robust business cases.	The SPD refers to improvements in the town centre in Chapter 6.
	1. The SPD needs to better recognise how dangerous the counter flow cycle land on Northgate Street is with pedestrians frequently stepping out into cycle lanes without looking and buses swinging out of pick-up points.	The SPD states that where contraflows are provided these should be legible to all users.
	2. 3. Cycling on the B1075 between Northgate Street and Turret Lane is also high risk due to	The issue of buses is acknowledged in the 2 nd paragraph under 'current

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	<p>the number of buses and narrow street width which means vehicles in and around the parking bay block cyclists.</p>	<p>provision' in the IP-One area section.</p>
	<p>4. A key issue is how difficult it is to cross the town centre by cycle especially between 10:30 and 16:30. Whilst the cross-town issues are mentioned it fails to recognise the full extent of this issue. The only available cycle routes are the two mentioned above which are incredibly dangerous. This essentially makes the town centre a no-go area for many cyclists during the day time.</p>	<p>Reference to desired enhancements to east-west and north-south routes across the town centre has been added.</p>
	<p>5. Cycling along Crown Street is also dangerous due to the number of buses and taxis accessing the main town centre tank. The bus parking bay near the Cricketers also blocks off cycling space.</p>	<p>Reference to desired enhancements to east-west and north-south routes across the town centre has been added.</p>
	<p>6. The assessment of cycle stands needs to consider safety and security issues. It also needs to consider whether there are sufficient stands, as the existing stands are often full.</p>	<p>The assessment was carried out as part of a separate exercise but has been included for information. The need for additional provision has been added to the bullet points relating to the IP-One area.</p>
	<p>7. Needs to consider the unsuitability of cycling on cobbled surfaces and identify the roads where this is an issue.</p>	<p>This is covered in surfacing under the general enhancements for all routes at the start of chapter 6. It is not considered necessary to refer specifically to cobbles as these may be desirable for other reasons (e.g. heritage and townscape).</p>
	<p>8. New cycle routes are required to the Sproughton Sugar Beet Factory site.</p>	<p>The Gipping Corridor extends to this part of town.</p>
	<p>9. Cycle routes from the proposed Northern Fringe development to the Waterfront are required.</p>	<p>Specific cycle enhancements for the Northern Fringe (now Ipswich Garden Suburb) will be identified as part of the planning application process and routes within the site are identified in the Ipswich Garden Suburb Supplementary Planning Document: Interim Guidance (September 2014). The Cycling Strategy SPD identifies enhancements from north Ipswich</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
		to the centre and reference to desired enhancements to north-south routes across the town centre has been added.
	Paragraph 1.3 is unhelpful as IBC and SCC have a duty to cooperate and should be closely working together to deliver the SPD vision. The SPD would be improved by detailing how IBC and SCC will be working together to do this.	Further reference to the role of the highways authority has been added to 1.3.
	Whilst the SPD is aimed at developers, it would also be helpful if IBC details the actions it will be undertaking to deliver its vision and implement its own proposals. It would be helpful if IBC could outline how it will work with developers and identify its key priorities for each area; as developers could then initially focus on these.	This is covered in 3.11 – 3.14, and reference to the role of pre-application advice for developers/applicants has been added to chapter 7.
Friends of Christchurch Park	Welcome the suggested improvements to the bridleway between Henley Road and Fonnereau Road and would like this to fulfil the need for a north south route to and from the town centre.	Reference to desired enhancements to north-south routes across the town centre has been added.
Friends of Christchurch Park	If there are developments regarding the statement “Consideration of the potential for a north east – south west route through Christchurch Park” – they would like to know more details about exactly where this is. If the intention is to create a cycle path through the centre of the park from Park Road to the bottom of Fonnereau Road (possibly what is being suggested) then this would be to the detriment of the environment of the park which should remain as a place of relaxation and recreation. We believe there would be strong opposition to any increase in the number of permitted cycle routes through the park.	Reference has been added to considering other factors such as the purpose of the park for a range of recreational activities.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
Private Individual	<p>Specifically objects to the proposal for a possible north-east/south-west cycle route through Christchurch Park for the following reasons: the steep and curved path is completely unsuitable for cyclists; the Park was designated as a place for “quiet recreation” – speedy cyclists on the main path will destroy this; the proposal appears to be being made to encourage cycle commuting from the proposed Ipswich Garden Suburb, but to achieve this would require 24 hour Park opening and lighting of the path throughout the Park – both of which will disrupt resident wildlife and destroy the character of one of the town’s finest assets.</p>	<p>Reference has been added to considering other factors such as the purpose of the park for a range of recreational activities.</p>
	<p>Instead, specifically supports the enhancement of the Bridle Path as a north south route. This badly needs repaving (the current surface is almost dangerous for cyclists) and integrating into the current roadscape, but it could be a viable practical alternative that would preserve the tranquillity of Christchurch Park whilst acknowledging the importance of cycling as an important means of transportation for residents.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Enhancements to the bridleway are identified in the SPD.</p>
Private Individual	<p>Main concern is the number of rat run streets in the town. The situation is getting worse as the motor vehicle traffic jams worsen. Neighbours I have spoken to are supportive. E.g. stop my road (Bartholomew Street and also Alexandra Road) having excess non local vehicles by putting a diagonal 'barrier' across Belle Vue/Alexandra/Nottidge to make sure cars have to turn down Nottidge thereby removing any benefit re queue hopping. Block Murray Road at the 1/2 way point to stop speeding and rat-running. These schemes could be trialed very cheaply.</p>	<p>This is covered in 6.4.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
Private Individual	After having read the first SPG from 1997, it's amazing to see how many similarities with environment, sustainability etc - there are mentioned. Your current Draft SPD is much more detailed as it should be, but the figures do support the feeling from myself and many cyclists I know in Ipswich that there have been many lost opportunities in regards to planning and infrastructure in Ipswich to provide a viable choice in changing the way cycling is seen - safety is still a main factor, and the conflict between cyclists & pedestrians & motor vehicles has not really changed much in the past	Comments noted. However, a number of off-road cycle routes are provided throughout Ravenswood and the Ipswich Garden Suburb SPD Interim Guidance promotes cycle facilities as integral to the development.
	18 years since the SPG. This is a sad state of affairs, as cars have been encouraged, transport Ipswich spending on improving junctions rather than sustainable transport as a solution to traffic is the best and most recent reminder.	See IBC response immediately above.
	2.6 - Garden Suburb - the plans should include detail to make the new area a little hub for visitors outside Ipswich i.e. from Henley - and a chance to link up villages surrounding with excellent cycle infrastructure - spreading outside Ipswich provides good links for further leisure activities & keeps money in the local economy	Cycle infrastructure will be provided as part of the development, and this could be used by those from outside the Garden Suburb.
	3.4 - Roads & cars are still seen as the main way to get around Ipswich! This is a chance to change that perception.	Comment noted.
	3.12 - Increased viability of these groups – i.e. a single symbol or project which ties the cycle groups/ places/ shops together!	This is considered to be beyond the scope of the SPD. A single brand was however created for the Suffolk Year of Cycling.
	4.1 - To say this shuts off what I stated above - Ipswich is made up of its surrounding satellite towns & villages - linking these with excellent cycle infrastructure will	The paragraph has been amended to refer to routes which extend beyond the boundary of the Borough.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	encourage visits and trade, boosting access & the local economy - has to be forward thinking!	
	4.2 - Cycling for all - yes - excellent - cargo bikes too - again - a symbol to link shops/ cycle routes/ etc would tie things together	Comment noted. Signage is covered in 5.13 and the need for signage to be consistent has been added.
	5.9 - direct routes are great, but flowing routes with no sharp turns, conflicts, stop & go's or junctions as possible are better.... part of cycling to enjoy the scenery, being away from the main road is preferable - I would take a longer ride if it meant being away from traffic sounds/ congestion/ stop starting.... Confident cyclists use the road as a direct route when they need to, but this is certainly not good for new cyclists.	Reference has been added to the need for routes to 'flow', as far as is possible.
	6 - not forward thinking enough! real advances, no reliance on shared use, but visible safe routes, no second rate start stop at junctions as in Kesgrave Main Road - look at the work done on the Embankment in London for a real change in how traffic is addressed and cycling seen as an alternative.	Reference to 'visible' has been added to 5.9.
	6.4 - lower speed limits are only useful if they are enforced - more pedestrian zebra crossings even out traffic and allow it to slow naturally - Less rat runs! Shutting off many roads halfway down encourages cycling & discourages speeding to get ahead of traffic - the link roads along Bramford Road & Norwich road are notorious for this. Also would make the more narrow roads a route for safer cycling & safer for the residents too.	Reference to traffic calming measures has been added to 6.4.
	6.7 - Reasonable is not good enough.	Comment noted, and the aim of the SPD is to secure good provision. It is considered that the

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
		examples could be referred to as good examples.
	6.11 - Still - you are our voice, so stand strong.	Comment noted.
	Gipping Corridor is a huge chance as a first project to make an amazing link into Ipswich and show how forward thinking Ipswich can be. It could really set a standard to move forwards from. Should be extendable to Hadleigh & satellite villages.	This has been emphasised by moving this sentence to the start of the paragraph.
	Ipswich Station - routes should serve this place to encourage cycling and sustainable transport links.	Enhancements are covered in the IP-One and Gipping Corridor sections.
	Route signs should be clear and visible	Reference to the need for signage to be clear has been added to 5.13.
	Conflict avoided at every opportunity	Reference to avoiding conflicts has been added to 5.9.
	All routes connected, to flow from one to the next.	Reference to routes flowing has been added to 5.9.
	Forward thinking as to a real alternative to car and motor vehicle use i.e. cargo bikes	The objectives refer to cycling for all, and reference is made to other types of cycles, e.g. cargo bikes and children's bikes, in relevant parts of the SPD.
	Good parking where people need to park	Reference to cycle parking needing to be in places which are convenient for people to use has been added to 5.18.
Private Individual	Generally supportive, however in the light of the recent Paris agreement, there is a need to be far more aggressive against carbon-fuel based emissions: fewer motorised vehicles on the roads, and more walking & cycling. The document gives little indication of how this will be achieved. The WHO has pointed out that this is not just an environmental issue, but a health one, with more than 400,000 EU residents dying prematurely because of emissions.	Reference to emissions has been added to 3.1. The Council is also producing a Low Emissions SPD which will identify a number of measures, in addition to cycling, to reduce emissions and the effects of emissions.

Respondent	Summary of comment(s)	IBC Response
	Desperate town centre need for secure cycle parking. Visit Felaw Maltings, as an example: on a normal working day, half the car park is empty, but the cycle storage cage is completely full. Several car parking spaces at Crown Street could be given over to locked cycle cages.	Chapter 6 identifies the need for improved cycle parking in the town centre.
Suffolk County Council	The County Council welcomes the production of this document and the Borough Council's commitment as local planning authority to promoting cycling healthy and sustainable mode of travel.	Comment noted.
	Officers from the County Council offered views during the production of this document and would like to discuss some final minor points of detail in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terminology for different types of road - Principles related to junction design and surface treatments - Signage at route ends - Consistency between this document and the Suffolk Guidance for Parking - Other points of detail. 	A meeting was held with officers from Suffolk County Council on 7 th January 2016. Amendments were agreed as per the list below.
Babergh and Mid-Suffolk District Councils	No comments.	Noted.

Amendments resulting from meeting with Suffolk County Council (highways authority) on 7th January 2016:

Throughout – replace references to ‘cycle path’ to ‘cycle track’.

1.3 – Add reference to Suffolk County Council will consider adopting cycle infrastructure on land within new development as highways maintainable at public expense by agreement with the landowner and developer.

3.10 – Update weblinks

3.14 – Refer to other organisations offering similar facilities

4.1 – Refer to cycling also forming part of longer, multi-modal journeys

5.1 – Number the four questions

5.4 – Add ‘local’ before ‘distributor’

5.9 – Photos of Norwich Rd and Bramford Road – positive is that speed bumps reduce traffic speed. Remove reference to Norwich Rd being a ‘good’ example.

5.9 – Bullet relating to bus stop bypasses – remove photograph as this does not show an ideal example and refer instead to the Sustrans Handbook.

5.9 – Bullet relating to ‘greening’ – clarify what this means i.e. trees / vegetation not green surfacing, and refer to taking care over slip hazards and shading caused by vegetation

5.9 – Bullet relating to lighting – remove reference to low level lighting as these are often vandalised and state that surface mounted may be ‘acceptable’ rather than ‘appropriate’. High level lighting can be more efficient / effective.

5.12 – Bullet relating to toucan crossings – re-word so it relates to situations where a controlled crossing is needed as part of a cycle route and refer to pedestrian crossings as puffin crossings.

5.12 – Bullet relating to roundabouts – refer to Sustrans guidance

5.12 – Bullet relating to junctions – refer to tight radii slowing down traffic which increases safety for cyclists at junctions

5.13 – Bullet relating to maps – these should be referred to as cycle ‘route’ maps and could be located where cycle parking is provided. They can also provide information for pedestrians.

5.13 – Remove photo of ‘end of route’ sign on Chalon Street. Suggest state that use of ‘cyclists rejoin carriageway’ as a good example would be preferable.

5.15 – Table should state ‘visitor/unallocated’ to accurately reflect the Suffolk Guidance for Parking. Refer to Suffolk Guidance for Parking advice on design of visitor / unallocated cycling parking.

5.15 – Communal cycling facilities are not usually popular – reflect this in bullet covering flatted development.

5.16 – Add description of ‘secure’ cycle storage, including that access needs to be overlooked.

5.17 – Add description of ‘secure’ cycle parking, including that access needs to be overlooked.

5.17 – Bullet relating to shower facilities - also state that these will be encouraged in smaller developments.

5.17 – Bullet relating to two-tier parking – state that upper level should be capable of being accessed by all as there may be other mechanisms/technologies.

5.20 – Include reference to electronically assisted bikes which may help in hilly parts of town.

6.4 – It is not necessary to refer to encouraging vehicles to use an alternative route as this is likely to be a consequence rather than a direct action.

6.11 – State that the County Council is dependent on funding from developments and other sources.

6.12 – Clarify that the routes on map 1 show broad directions of travel, and amend map also in this respect.

All routes section – bullet relating to speed bumps – reword to state that traffic calming measures should be design to allow cyclists to pass in comfort.

Clarify that additional infrastructure requires additional maintenance (added to 6.11).

Ring road (yellow route) – Re ‘specific issues to address’, whilst there are not cycle phases there are cycle boxes. The narrow shared use footway is only close to the double roundabout and forms part of the scheme completed under Travel Ipswich, the junction at Renfrew Road / Colchester Road is considered appropriate as cyclists can continue along the road should they wish to.

Gipping Corridor – Note that an alternative route on the land side of the flood defences may be appropriate between Stoke Bridge and Princes Street. Add reference to the desire to enhance St Peter’s Dock for cyclists.

IP-One area – the caption relating to the photo of the Princes Street bridge is incorrect as this is not a shared use facility.

Stoke Park route (purple) – include reference to it forming part of a route to Shotley Peninsula. Bullet relating to Bourne Park – replace ‘suitable’ with ‘good’. Bullet relating to roundabouts on Wherstead Road, one is on Hawes Street.

Pinewood / Belstead (grey route) – Suffolk New Academy is now called Chantry Academy.

East Ipswich (red route) – Include reference to Back Hamlet and Grove Lane.

7.1 – Include reference to the need for proposals to conform to the SPD. Conditions should be avoided as far as possible through the submission of information with the planning application.

7.5 – Travel Plans also need to be reviewed and monitored.

7.6 – Clarify that this would be a summary of the information presented in the Transport Assessment or Design and Access Statement.

Comments were also made on the 2015 Town Centre Cycle Parking Provision Audit contained at Appendix 3 of the SPD, however this was not undertaken as part of the production of the SPD. Clarification is however needed that it related to highways land and not to highways authority land.