

## **Two Tunnels Greenway – Public Display on an Access Ramp at Lyncombe Vale – Feedback**

### **OBJECTIONS**

I am concerned about lack of physical measures to prevent motorcycles using the cycleway. Also, it seems that more trees than you have shown to be felled for the access ramp will need to be removed.

Principle concern – 2m cycle access will encourage inappropriate use of path by motorcyclists etc. If objective is as stated and not to open Lyncombe vale as the principal access route into Bath then stepped access would be perfectly adequate and stop such problems of mis-use.

Still concerned about safety for cyclists and parking and aggressive (Paragon School) traffic. Motorbikes using the ramp. Parking at end of road, blocking access.

Would like details please. Particularly concerned about any impact of new groups into Lyncombe Vale, which has little or no spare space.

I consider that it is naïve to assume that the users of the access from Lyncombe Vale Rd will be pedestrians at Midford weekend visits include adults and children arriving by car – with bikes attached THERE IS NO ALLOWANCE for cars! To park. The road is already hazardous. It would be more so with more cars.

More concerns about traffic and parking in Lyncombe Vale Road – cars being left while ..... have a cycle ride into ..... Leading to dir concerns re road safety for cyclists in narrow lanes.

Concern about any extra volume of road users in Lyncombe Vale Rd. Very narrow road between wall at Lyncombe Hall and Paragon School Dark, no pavements. Complicated by unofficial/voluntary one way system.

1. Don't believe the tunnel is wide enough to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. A serious potential danger.
2. Slowing cyclists by a chicane before they join Lyncombe vale road is not the major safety issue, it is the speed they cycle along Lyncombe vale road.
3. Real concern over people driving to Lyncombe vale road, parking then starting their cycle journey.
4. Your literature is inconsistent. 6km path hiking Midford to city centre yet you claim no signage to city centre – either it links or it doesn't.

I am sorry but I am most unhappy about all this! Please keep me informed about what is going to happen because I live so close to the proposed access point.

As residents of Lyncombe Vale we view the proposal with trepidation. The proposed access ramp to Lyncombe Vale Road will greatly increase cyclist traffic onto narrow, busy roads. Inevitably cyclists will use the pedestrian footpaths along Lyncombe Vale with potential problems to residents. The Two Tunnels scheme will undoubtedly be a magnet to cyclists and the influx of these will be a disaster for the local community. My wife and I are totally against the whole scheme.

We do not want a RAMP by the railway arch in Lyncombe Vale. There are other ways onto the line ie. Oldfield Park. There is no-where for cyclists to park and if they do they are taking up residents parking. They will be parked in the Vale for most of the day. Exit out of the Vale into Prior Park Road is not safe. We already have to cope with the Paragon school traffic.

The tunnel entrances should be closed at night to avoid .....parties and other crimes.

As a local resident my concerns are: -

1. Noise – any noise in the valley is amplified to a huge extent and will detrimentally affect local residents.
2. Safety – Lyncombe Vale is narrow and already carries large volumes of school traffic at peak hours. Cyclists will be funneled into the face of this oncoming traffic
3. Anti-social behaviour – There needs to be a clear mechanism for the tunnels and access to be closed at night to prevent noise and anti-social behaviour.
4. Local Access Only – I understand that the route is not to be signposted so that only a few 'locals' will use it – if it becomes the primary access point for the city will the point be closed as it is clearly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic.

I have no problems with the tunnels per se. But I am extremely concerned about access along Lyncombe Vale – could be 'bicycle overload' and problems with parking (ie. residents not able to park).

1. Works appear to impinge on allotment land
2. Egress of ramp onto Lyncombe Vale Rd obstructed by allotment access gate and plothead cars (incl disabled vehicles)
3. 8 ft fence to protect allotment land required
4. Suggest turning ramp towards bridge to alleviate point 2. above
5. Railings to ramp required dependent on earth levels
6. Need for 2 mtr wide ramp?
7. Why not steps and gully as frequently used on Bristol cycle path?

As residents of Lyncombe Vale we view the Sustrans plans to send cyclists through our lane as a bad idea. Parking is already a problem for us let alone cyclists vehicles. The

proposed route from a ramp is a danger to the cyclists. Bikes on pavements/masses of cyclists!!

As both a Lyncombe Vale Road resident and an allotment holder I object to the type of access that is being planned. We have a busy, single track road with no parking and encouraging additional traffic including cars will create safety and logistical problems. I suggested a steps and gully type access.

Whilst I support the two tunnels route I am against the ramp down into Lyncombe Vale Road on safety grounds. The road is narrow with blind bends. When walking one can listen and hear cars approaching and get to the side. Cyclists will not hear the cars and will have difficulty getting to the side. A few cyclists would not be a great problem but Sustrans would not go to the significant cost of the ramp if they did not expect a lot of people using it. Try cycling on Lyncombe Vale when there is a car behind!!

We live on Lyncombe Vale, where parking on street is difficult. At most times the road is quiet but at school pick-up and drop-off times it is busy – I do not think that cyclists themselves on bikes will cause many problems although some drivers go too fast and might cause problems for cyclists. The main concern is that people will arrive with bikes attached to their cars and without a residents parking system parking will be impossible, and people driving around the area with its very steep, narrow roads will add to and create road hazards. When the tunnels were last open, there was a problem with raves, troublesome folk and burglaries in the locality. How will people be stopped from those activities?

We still feel that this scheme will create problems for local residents.

- 1) Parking – already in short supply will be made worse unless 7 day residents parking is put in place.
- 2) Unless locked the tunnels will attract anti-social behaviour at night as they did in the past. Also the people using the tunnels to walk through at night to Odd Down from the city will cause an increase in disruption. These gates should be locked at night as it is unlikely that cyclists will use these tunnels at night.

Many thanks

We're extremely concerned about the increase in vehicles and vehicles prospecting for parking spaces along Lynchcombe Vale, which is already at saturation point – residents, school parents (paragon School) and commuters are already competing for spaces as Lyncombe Vale is the nearest legal parking to the station. It is also a one-lane road. How does Sustrans propose to provide access to wheelchair users (legal obligation) yet prevent motorcycles and allow bikes access to the tunnel. Police will not want to get involved in motorcycle use – the problem needs to be addressed in the design of the entrance/exit from the outset.

If you recall, I was under the impression that this would be 'visually softer' than the black bitumen type surfacing on the already built section west of the Devonshire tunnel. You informed me that although the the surfacing of the proposed Lyncombe Vale access ramp may be 'visually softer' the surface of the cycle path through Lyncombe Vale would be the same as that already laid – i.e. black bitumen. I was sure I'd read that this wasn't going to be the case – but couldn't recall where I'd read it at the time.

It's actually the scheme's proponents' website

<http://www.twotunnels.org.uk/index.html> which was last updated this month and states: "All that tarmac is hideous and makes these paths look like roads" "The planning permission requires a 'Visually softer' surface".

There appears to be a contradiction between what you told me and the information published about the scheme. Could you check this and explain why - if you could point me to the relevant documentation relating to the scheme's planning permission that might help.

## **SUPPORT**

This is a great project and uses some wonderful engineering that is dormant. The parking issue is not too serious as we have the same on match day when Bath play at home. The school traffic is only an issue from 8am until 8.45am. Keep up the good work. Gavin Lewis. Resident of Lyncombe Vale.

Very much support the project as planned.

We are broadly in favour of the 2T project, and do not object to the LVR ramp, provided that the proposed controlled parking zone is extended to the far end of the work (ie. to the ramp).

I find the "nimby" attitude of my neighbours rather pathetic – not least the bizarre notion of the "Lyncombe Residents Association" that the project will increase congestion. I fully support the project and feel that the local residents could do more to embrace the opportunity provided. I do however, have grave concerns regarding safety as many drivers who use the surrounding roads are extremely thoughtless.

Great idea. Totally approve. Cycling in the area will increase which is a good thing. The traffic problems are nothing to do with this development – they are much more deep rooted than that.

Great idea. Well thought out. Can't wait to get on it. Great. Opens up lots more cycling/walking/running routes.

Very good plan. We support it.

I think that any improvement in access to safe, off-road cycling is a fantastic way for us to support people's fitness, getting out for fresh air – health and to tackle pollution. The Two Tunnels will make good use of local resources and be a great asset in the future. If even one family start cycling – the road is 1 or 2 cars less. 100% support from us?

Fully support the proposed access ramp. Look forward to it opening.

Fully in favour. In my back yard, please! Green Lane Walker cyclist!

I am generally in support of these proposals and have great hopes for its success.

We support the Sustrans scheme and look forward to being able to use this access to the Two Tunnels cycle path. It is likely that only people from Widcombe will wish to join the path here. As I am sure you are aware (as reported in the recent Widcombe Association News) there are NO plans to link with any other cycle paths. The National Cycle Network runs from Sydney Gardens to the city centre and not through Widcombe. We really welcome a few more cyclists on our narrow roads. I am not sure why there are questions about road traffic generally. 100+ cars each morning go to the Paragon School. If just one family start to cycle instead of drive that will be good (I know the number of vehicles as I did the recent traffic monitoring). We fully support our cycle access to Midford/Monkton Combe and to Oldfield Park and West Bath and look forward to using it regularly.

## **COMMENTS**

Where ramp joins LVR, a few cycle spaces are used by allotment holders. Consider how the path will join LVR without inhibiting car parking use.

This access point is likely to be welcomed by the Widcombe & Lyncombe Community, and well used to give them the pleasure of use of the TT route. Any local reservations, by the Lyncombe Vale residents, should be considered in this wider context. Signage at end Lyncombe Vale (at its junction with P Park Rd) should indicate NO PARKING available for TT users who are transferring from car to bike. Every effort should be made to minimize loss of nature trees.

As an allotment holder at Lycombe Vale allotments, I would like to know whether there is going to be adequate room for deliveries (eg. mulch, plants, manure, sheds, equipment) at the entrance to the allotments (there is currently)