

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<p><b>Overall agreement</b></p> <p>Total of 233 responses to online and paper questionnaire. Slim majority (108) agree/strongly agree with path proposal over those (100) who disagree/strongly disagree. More Lockleaze respondents support principle than do not support it.</p>	<p>The public consultation results show a slim majority support the principle of the path proposal. Considering the local view, a majority of Lockleaze respondents support the principle.</p> <p>The principle of the project is consistent with the Stoke Park Conservation Management Plan.</p> <p>The principle is consistent with supporting new Lockleaze housing.</p> <p>The principle is consistent with improving access in, within and through Stoke Park.</p> <p>The principle is consistent with addressing equality issues.</p>	<p>Provide path to support new housing. Link between Lockleaze and East Bristol and improving access within park remain project objectives.</p>	<p><b>Proceed with path proposal</b></p>

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<p><b>Route options</b></p> <p>96 responses selected Option 1.  49 responses selected Option 1A.  70 responses selected 1D.  92 responses selected 'None of the above', which is likely a mix of being against the principle or suggesting an alternative alignment.</p>	<p>There is a majority of responses in favour of some element of the suggested alignment. The largest response group selected Option 1. There was support for extending the path along 1D, so a final decision is likely to be based on delivery criteria, such as technical, timescale and budget.</p> <p>There was some support for Option 1A but less than Option 1, suggesting a route through Barn Wood is not as acceptable. There were some suggested alternative routes that need to be considered.</p>	<p>After considering the alternative alignment suggestions, it is considered the Option 1 alignment is the best placed to meet project objectives, obtain consents and be delivered.</p> <p>Whilst Option 1A would keep the path within Stoke Park, it is accepted it would have a greater impact on vegetation, trees, landscape and historic setting than the east end of Option 1.</p> <p>Hence, it is recommended Option 1A be dropped.</p> <p>There is merit in Option 1D. Bu there are budget implications, as 1D would add to the overall cost. With the WECA funding being capped and the need to ensure sufficient budget, including contingency, for delivery of both the path and Muller Road improvements, it is considered Option 1D currently creates a delivery risk to LSTI within the £4.3m.</p> <p>It is sensible to continue development work on Option 1D, as it form part of the CMP proposals. Its alignment has still to be 100% finalised, together with agreeing solutions for diverting around the AAC monument and some supporting info is still outstanding. It is recommended design work continue on 1D, with objective of including in the planning application, subject to timescales. Option 1D needs input from Parks &amp; PROW Team and agreement with Historic England.</p>	<p><b>Reject Option 1A</b>  <b>Proceed with Option 1 alignment</b>  <b>Proceed with development work on Option 1D</b></p>

Public Consultation Feedback	BCC Review	Proposed BCC position post-consultation	Decision
<p>Alternative No. 1 Replace proposed north spur with different alignment running north-south adjacent to west side of Long Wood.</p>	<p>(i) Will have steeper gradient than diagonal, calculated to be 1:10 in places, so not as attractive for equality.(ii) Although it would help some users from Long Wood, this depends on their destination. Importantly, it does not link directly with new housing development path network – many new residents likely to use diagonal route anyhow, as more direct, so would be off the natural desire line for them. (iii) Running close to trees could require more expensive 'no dig' construction or impact on Long Wood tree root structure, path would be affected by leave fall, requiring more maintenance, potential safety/security issue having path close to trees. (iv) Access via wooded area results in loss of more vegetation and some trees, than diagonal.Historic England have indicated they prefer this route although it could have adverse impact on the root structure on Long wood trees. Whilst the alignment could be moved away from the trees, it would still have a steeper gradient.</p>	<p>Whilst Alternative No. 1 is not such an open route, overall is considered not as attractive as original spur alignment, especially in terms of path gradient. It is acknowledged the preferred spur alignment does have some impact on character of the park but alignment follows an existing mown path and will connect better with new housing. 28/11 - discussed with Historic England. BCC subsequently provided further information/justification for proposed spur alignment. Consider design options.</p>	<p><b>Reject option</b></p>

Public Consultation Feedback	BCC Review	Proposed BCC position post-consultation	Decision
<p>Alternative No. 2 - Route to north of BCC alignment. Follows south &amp; west side of Hermitage Wood, then south and west edge of Long Wood. Extends westward to exit at same point as BCC north spur. Possible extension along north boundary towards west side of The Vench and Romney Avenue. 24 responses mentioned this alternative.</p>	<p>(i) links to woods were initially deemed outwith remit of project but as CMP proposes a network of improved wood paths, scheme may consider link spurs, subject to discussions with statutory consultees and funding. WECA funding allows HLF to be used to help deliver this additional priority, so consider it phasing.</p> <p>(ii) North-south section would have a steeper gradient than proposed north spur, calculated to be 1:10 in places.</p> <p>(iii) Would be closer to tree line - impact on roots, so need more expensive 'no dig' construction or impact on tree root structure. Would suffer from dropped leaves, so need more sweeping and maintenance. Security issue - not such an open aspect and potential for person to hide in woods.</p> <p>(iv) existing route provides good viewing route and is the main east-west desire line. Top section provides better views - more seating to enjoy it in a quiet setting?</p> <p>(v) whilst cyclists would need to negotiate corners, with lower speeds, potential to cut corners. One potential blind corner that may cause conflict.</p> <p>(vi) route is not direct, so many users may continue to use the existing route as more direct. The CMP proposes to upgrade the historic trackway, so alternative is not consistent with it and would result in parallel routes. More maintenance needed for two paths. Historic England has voiced concern at having two routes.</p> <p>(vii) not clear if consents would be obtained for such a route, as it is not consistent with the CMP, so creates delivery risk.</p> <p>(viii) The CMP proposes to surface the historic trackway and this is supported by HE, NE and SGC. CMP has been subject to consultation and is now an approved Council document, setting out management of Stoke Park. Much of the historic nature has been lost and improved accessibility is considered a greater priority.</p> <p>(ix) Council preferred scheme does not go through Barn Wood but</p>	<p>Whilst Alternative No. 2 has some points of merit, it is considered it does not have sufficient benefits that are better than original proposal. Consider there is a significant risk it would not obtain necessary consent, as inconsistent with CMP and difficult to argue for a change.</p>	<p><b>Reject option</b></p>

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
	<p>uses existing vehicular track to north. Option 1A included in consultation to assess public and stakeholder support on potential alternative route through woods.</p>		

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Alternative No. 3 - direct north-south from Cheswick to M32 Underpass	A similar direct north-south route considered as part of initial option appraisal. Runs through woods. Has some very steep sections. Would require significant zig-zag layout to achieve path gradients suitable for a range of users, with a higher cost. Significant loss of vegetation and trees and impact on roots of many remaining trees. Detrimental visual impact on the landscape, with path highly visible. Unlikely to obtain planning consent. Similar option was previously rejected.	Similar issues as rejected Council north-south option, which are relevant.	<b>Reject option</b>
Alternative No. 4 - direct north-south from Romney Avenue to M32 Underpass	Route considered as part of initial option appraisal. Runs through woods. Has some very steep sections. Would require significant zig-zag layout to achieve path gradients suitable for a range of users, with a higher cost. Significant loss of vegetation and trees and impact on roots of many remaining trees. Detrimental visual impact on the landscape, with path highly visible. Unlikely to obtain planning consent. Option was previously rejected.	Same issues as before remain.	<b>Reject option</b>
Alternative No. 5 - adjacent to M32, from Stoke Lane to M32 Underpass	Not clear if stated as alternative or in addition. Alignment would not provide link between Lockleaze and M32 Underpass, which is a key objective, to support new housing. The existing route from Jellicoe Avenue provides a similar alignment. The CMP does not propose a path along such an alignment, which would be a material consideration for planning consent.	Does not meet project objective of linking Lockleaze with East Bristol area.	<b>Reject option</b>

Public Consultation Feedback	BCC Review	Proposed BCC position post-consultation	Decision
<p><b>Width</b></p> <p>A significant majority (64%) of respondents considered 3.0m acceptable. 12% opted for a wider path. 24% did not answer (it is assumed the majority of these did not support the path, although some will have preferred a narrower path)</p>	<p>3.0m is considered to be the recommended minimum width for a shared use path. This is why no option for a narrower path was given. A wider path would provide more space for users but would have a greater visual impact and cost more to build, without significant extra benefits at this location. There is a clear majority of responses supporting 3.0m.</p>	<p>3.0 metre wide</p>	<p><b>Proceed with 3.0m</b></p>

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<p><b>Lighting</b></p> <p>22% of responses suggested the path should be lit. 23% of responses suggested just the entrances should be lit. 38% of responses said there should be no lighting. 9% of responses were unsure and 7% of responses did not answer.</p>	<p>There is no clear majority on the lighting question. It could be argued that no lighting and just entrance lighting can be combined to suggest 61% of responses were against path lighting. It could also be argued that path lighting and entrance lighting can be combined to suggest 45% of responses support some element of lighting. It is acknowledged lighting will have impacts on wildlife and the visual setting but would assist in safety and security, encouraging more use during hours of darkness. However, the bat report recommends no lighting within the wooded area and some other stakeholders have also raised concerns about the impact of lighting. Lighting of entrances should be of benefit to users but may generate some objections from adjacent properties. As improvements would be within the highway, it would be permitted development and there is no requirement to seek planning consent.</p>	<p>Whilst lighting would encourage more use, impact on wildlife and the landscape setting need to be considered as issues that take priority at this location. Merit in investigating opportunities of improving lighting at some entrance locations but consider any impact on wildlife. No need to include within planning application.</p>	<p><b>Drop lighting element along path</b> <b>Investigate any entrance lighting opportunities</b></p>

Public Consultation Feedback	BCC Review	Proposed BCC position post-consultation	Decision
<p><b>Surfacing</b></p> <p>127 responses selected an all-weather surface.42 responses selected a gravel surface.31 responses were not sure.33 responses did not answer (assumed to mainly against the path proposal)</p>	<p>The public consultation gave a majority wanting an all-weather surface. The are pros and cons with different types of surface, including cost and maintenance.The CMP proposes a gravel surface and Historic England also prefers a gravel surface. However, engineering judgement considers an all-weather surface will provide a more robust surface for shared use, requiring less annual maintenance or less detrimental impact from wet conditions.It is now also considered more likely that WECA will consider an all-weather path more appropriate for an active travel transport facility.But there are risks in not selecting gravel, in terms of obtaining planning consent that need to be considered and investigated.Colour is an important factor. Black is not considered appropriate across the open grassland. The consultation has suggested a buff colour, as this is frequently used within historic landscape settings but other colours could be considered, such as green. Some internal feedback recommends black tarmac along the east existing vehicular access as being more appropriate for that section and there are pro's and con's for this. The suggested length to use black tarmac is sloping land running adjacent to Barn Wood will more susceptible to wear and tear and therefore need for frequency of repairs and black tarmac would help with both capital and repair costs.</p>	<p>On balance, it is considered an all-weather surface is the best option for this path project and will help meet project objectives.It is suggested a form of buff colour is proposed, subject to further discussion. This seems best colour to fit in with the environment .It is suggested further internal discussion held if black tarmac is used along the existing east vehicular access (commencing well within the wooded area) or if whole route better as single colour. 28/11 - surfacing discussed with Historic England. HE of opinion bound gravel is only appropriate surfacing for historic carriage drive and will not agree to buff SMA and object to its use. This creates a risk that planning consent might not be obtained or application referred to Secretary of State for a decision.</p>	<p><b>BCC preference would be to proceed with an all-weather surface and use buff SMA.However, given HE position, significant risk that SMA/application could be rejected at planning stage. Hence, take forward bound gravel surface option for whole length of path.</b></p>

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<p><b>Improving access barriers</b></p> <p>65% of responses want improved access.  25% of responses do not want improved access.  10% of responses were either no sure or did not answer.</p>	<p>There is a clear majority of consultation responses that want the existing access barriers improved. A number of stakeholders also considered improvement a good idea.</p> <p>Improving barrier access will allow more people with mobility impairments to access the park, which is to be encouraged. Improvement also helps address equality issues.</p> <p>It is noted the livestock fencing gates are to be self-closing. These will require cyclists to slow down, which can help address some speeding concerns.</p> <p>Internal feedback recommends both Jellicoe Avenue and Romney Avenue include leaf gates to allow vehicle access for sweeping, maintenance, agricultural and emergency vehicles - it is noted Jellicoe Avenue access already has vehicular gates.</p> <p>It may be desirable to widen both footpaths leading to the park at the Romney Avenue access.</p>	<p>Improve some of existing access barriers to assist people with mobility impairments.</p>	<p><b>Improve some access locations</b></p>

<b>Public Consultation Feedback</b>	<b>BCC Review</b>	<b>Proposed BCC position post-consultation</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<p><b>Additional amenities</b></p> <p>The majority of responses wanted some type of additional amenity. 144 people want seating. 94 people want signage. 89 people want information boards. Free text comments also mentioned bins quite frequently. 59 people did not answer (assumed to either not want any items or disagree with path proposal).</p>	<p>There is a significant majority of consultation responses that would like to see some additional amenities within Stoke Park. The provision of seating, signage, information boards and other facilities, such as bins, make be considered desirable but are not essential elements of the path proposal. Seating is desirable for some people with limited mobility to stop and rest. However, it should be possible to include some of these items, as they will help enhance the experience of using the path and the park. But final decision on what is provided should rest with Parks. Internal feedback suggests minimising the amount of signage and information boards to avoid cluttering the site. The signage should be limited to directing people at both ends. Seating could be linked with S106 agreement proposals.</p>	<p>No preference on any additional items but consider consultation feedback should be considered. Path project can fund some items and be coordinated with S106 proposals. Final decision should rest with Parks.</p>	<p><b>Discuss any requirements with Parks. Include some budget allowance.</b></p>