

## Appendix A – Full Member and Officer responses to HCC GTP.

<b>Three Rivers specialist team responses</b>
Economic & Sustainable Development Service (Local Plans section)
<p data-bbox="188 331 448 360">Package 2: Maylands</p> <p data-bbox="188 360 1406 607">Package 2 includes a series of cycling improvements to improve the connectivity of Maylands (LP3). The route from Abbots Langley and Kings Langley to Maylands is both of short distances, but currently there is no safe cycle route between the two destinations. Package 2 should account for this and make use of the short distance between Abbots Langley and Kings Langley to Maylands. This would make the option of cycling to work much more attractive to residents of Kings Langley and Abbots Langley who also work in Maylands, cutting down short-distance commutes by car. Including the two settlements in Package 2 would further support its aim of improved access to Maylands from within and outside of Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p data-bbox="188 636 655 665">Package 4: St Albans-Watford Corridor</p> <p data-bbox="188 665 1406 911">We are supportive of the A405 off-road cycleway linking St Albans and Bricket Wood to Garston and Leavesden; we note that an off-road cycleway already exists along a section of the A405 between Bricket Wood and Garston (from Coates Way to M25 J21 slip road). The potential of the Abbey Line could also be maximised by improving access routes and local connectivity to the stations from residential areas along the St Albans-Watford Corridor, such as Garston and Bricket Wood. Pedestrian routes to these two stations are currently poor and there are no cycle routes – enhancements to these access routes would help to take advantage of existing facilities and increase use of the Abbey Line.</p> <p data-bbox="188 940 1406 1155">It is unlikely that the Park and Rail hub would be widely used by motorists along the A405 corridor towards its northern end (i.e. Bricket Wood, Garston, North Watford). Residents of settlements which are located towards the northern end of the Abbey Line are unlikely to benefit from the proposed Park and Rail hub due to its location in southern St Albans. There would likely be reluctance from people who live locally to train stations along the Abbey Line to drive to the proposed location of the Park and Rail hub in Park Street, to then make use of the Abbey Line from stations which are less local to their homes.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1184 1406 1460">SM16b proposes for additional slip roads at M1 J6a/M25a and a major downgrade of the A405 to reallocate one lane to buses only. As is the case in the current SM16b, we feel that this intervention should only proceed if both schemes are taken forward. If the downgrade of the A405 was to proceed in isolation, it is likely that vehicular traffic would only be exacerbated. The other interventions of PK4 would not be sufficient in addressing vehicular congestion issues along the A405 due to their focus on pedestrian, cycle and rail modes of travel. Therefore, the issue would likely still exist despite the reallocation of one lane to buses only. However, additional slip roads at M1 J6a/M25a would reduce congestion at this section of the A405, therefore making the option of downgrading the A405 more feasible.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1489 863 1518">Package 5: Western Gateway (Route to Business Parks)</p> <p data-bbox="188 1518 1406 1765">We support the provision of a southern access to the Business Parks. Access by car would relieve traffic pressures to the north of the Business Parks on Watford Road and Rickmansworth Road; however it is understood that this would further result in a priority of journeys by car, which would perform less well against plan's objectives. We agree that SM28 would complement the South Oxhey-Holywell cycle and bus link, which we are also supportive of. Package 5 focuses on access to Watford Business Park, with limited mention of the adjoining Croxley Park. Given the proximity of the two parks, it should be ensured that bus and cycle routes into the area should serve both business parks, in order to maximise the potential of these services.</p> <p data-bbox="188 1794 762 1823">Package 6: Watford-Hemel Hempstead Corridor</p> <p data-bbox="188 1823 1406 2013">We are supportive of SM1 of capacity improvements to the M25/J20 and M25/J19 roundabouts; improvements would impact on nearby settlements located in Three Rivers so we reserve the right to comment on plans if or as they progress. The Park and Ride facility is encouraged subject to the capacity of motor access to Kings Langley station being sufficient enough to deal with an influx of cars as a result – journeys by car to the Park and Ride facility would be inevitable and therefore it is vital that there is an appropriate access route for cars to the facility. Given that the proposed location of the</p>

facility is near to Kings Langley station, is expected that the Park and Ride facility would also be widely used by commuters travelling southwards to London by rail. It should be recognised that SM19a would not only be promoting journeys along the Watford-Hemel Hempstead corridor. We are supportive of SM31 in that it would increase bus connectivity along the Watford-Hemel Hempstead Corridor, including Abbots Langley, Leavesden and the Business Parks.

#### Package 8: Watford South

We are supportive of the projects under LP7, which aim to address the fragmented and constrained linkages between South Oxhey and Carpenders Park and are in alignment with Objective C of the plan. The road link over the railway line currently experiences congestion so improvements to this are welcomed (PR40). PR103 focuses on the area of Delta Gain; this includes 'measures to manage on-street parking' at Delta Gain. Further information on what is meant by this will be necessary if/when the project progresses.

#### Package 9: Rickmansworth

We support PR81; Church Street is short in distance and subsequently, the introduction of a 20mph zone is not expected to slow down traffic flow to any considerable extent whilst it would also improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists given the narrow, curved nature of the street and road. Improvements to the wayfinding of and access to the Ebury Way (PR80) is also welcomed and we are in agreement that PR81 would work in joint support of this. LP13 proposes small-scale pedestrian and cycle changes to Rickmansworth, particularly surrounding the train station, which we are in support of.

We support the provision of a southern access to the Business Parks. Access by car would relieve traffic pressures to the north of the Business Parks on Watford Road and Rickmansworth Road; however it is understood that this would further result in a priority of journeys by car, which would perform less well against plan's objectives.

#### SM3b: Closure of Kings Langley station

Although SM3 has been identified as performing poorly in the assessment, the potential impacts of this intervention, if implemented, require attention. Kings Langley is a Secondary Centre in the Three Rivers District and the existing train station provides an accessible and sustainable facility for its residents. For development pressures and needs for housing and employment to be met (needs which are higher than those planned for in the GTP), sustainable and accessible locations are essential – the loss of any transport facilities should be prevented. Sites have been put forward across all settlements in the Three Rivers District and are currently are all under consideration as potential sites for development – sustainable and accessible locations are a vital consideration for sites to be allocated and subsequently, for development needs to be met. The closure of Kings Langley is quoted at a cost range of £2.5-5m in Appendix A; future funding should not be directed towards the loss of existing facilities but instead should be used to enhance them in all circumstances.

#### Further Comments:

Throughout the GTP, the settlements of Chorleywood is not mentioned other than in the context of Package 9. In addition, the village settlements of Bedmond and Sarratt are not given any attention in the document other than in the context of existing transport routes.

The projects and interventions proposed which would impact on settlements in Three Rivers are small-scale in comparison to other areas of South West Herts. As a result of this and of high development needs being met in Three Rivers, we strongly support the requirement for a periodic update to the GTP in the future. As individual Local Plans in the South West Herts area progress to a stage where site allocations and indicative development capacities are clearer, it is expected that transport challenges will only intensify (particularly in comparison to those estimated by the model used in the current GTP). An update will also be required as the SW Herts Joint Strategic Plan develops.

#### Community Services

#### Community Partnerships

The SM12b / 28a proposals are key to support in terms of improving access to employment opportunities for South Oxhey.

It is difficult to comment on other issues regarding transport requirements other than we would

support improvements to active transport options from a public health perspective.

I have also reviewed the equality impact assessment and feel there are some failings in the assessment in relation to hate crime and use of public transport

-The EqiA says there is no relevance to gender reassignment or sexual orientation for the policy. Use of public transport and walking in public spaces still remains an issue for homophobic and trans phobic hate crime hate crime – especially in areas of night time economy. The government has published a national survey of findings that the policy should consider.

- I would also suggest that gender/sex is relevant in relation to feeling safe on public transport and active transport options especially in relation to travel in the evenings and the risk of attack.

-Similarly for disabled people – public transport can be a risk for disablist hate crime.

-For race – again a further risk of hate crime

-For religion – a further risk of hate crime

The level of security offered on public transport is key to making it accessible – and any proposals for transport hubs need to provide security to ensure that vulnerable groups feel safe enough to use these.

Whilst the policy document recognises improving safety and perception of security – this does not appear to have been captured from an equalities perspective.

### Community Services

We do feel that it is imperative the journeys of the potential users should be taken into consideration in the decision-making process of all future developments whether housing, shopping centres or schools. The strategy needs to continue to look into/ and promote physical activity through active travel to encourage a healthier, more physically active community. Walking and cycling offer effective routes of active travel, but to shift the attitude from the car as a dominant form of travel will require more than modifications to the physical environment alone; which will not significantly increase impact unless supported by other measures such as behaviour change interventions. Evidence from health research shows that these interventions are likely to be more effective in a supportive social environment therefore it is important not to overlook local Cycle Hubs and operators within the Community.

There is a large overlap between the health agenda to increase physical activity and the transport agenda to encourage more sustainable travel, therefore working in partnership will be vital to the successful service delivery, particularly in times of financial constraint.

Therefore a new transport strategy should also consider/include:

- Provision of road safety education and training for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages.
- Partnership working with health services, undertake local promotional and marketing campaigns and events to encourage people to walk and cycle more.
- Ensure active travel and smarter travel information is widely available to the public
- Promote and support the development of local business encouraging cycle to work initiatives.
- Increase provision of secure and sufficient cycle parking in the town/village centres, at or within easy reach of public buildings.
- Develop a high quality cycling network to eliminate gaps, ensure continuity and increase access to the Rights of Way network, essential services, employment opportunities, green spaces and leisure services.
- Improve and update walking and cycling route signing and information.
- Improve the Highway network to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

### Leisure Services (Tree and Landscape section)

Comments relate to links for pedestrians and cyclists particularly off road routes etc. where they may link and utilise parks and open spaces and other green areas (where possible separate to existing roads).

There are comments in the seven objectives relating to improving health, developing a sense of place, improving links to footways and cycle routes, providing safe and attractive alternatives to using the car and improving air quality. There is little reference to how green infrastructure and trees may relate to these proposals and my belief is that they could have a significant beneficial impact on the

success of any scheme.

Green Infrastructure needs to be considered as a significant and crucial part of any proposals to improve transport. Some serious thought needs to be given to how GI links to population/housing with workplace and education. Understanding how this can work is crucial to the development of urban regeneration to secure a successful future of towns and the transport system that serves them.

Of crucial significance to the success of any Transport Plan are trees; and I understand that HCC are part way through the process of drawing up a new agency agreement. Trees would be a crucial part of any such agreement and so should be given appropriate consideration.

#### Regulatory Services (Transport & Parking section)

The GTP does not refer to the relevant TRDC strategies (Parking Management Plan (emergent), Cycling Strategy (2008) and Better Buses) although it does take into account those of Watford and Dacorum. The revised GTP should include references to these, particularly as some proposed GTP schemes overlap or conflict with schemes proposed by TRDC. TRDC has not been formally consulted as the local Parking Authority on this GTP.

Many of the proposed schemes relating to Cycling in the district are duplicated from existing strategies, the Three Rivers Cycling Strategy in particular, so are supported by the District Council's Strategy. Some such as the Ebury Way signing proposals have been implemented already by HCC with TRDC (2013-15) while others (conversion of part of Way to bus route) would affect land owned by Three Rivers; these, not being in the control of HCC, should be removed until a full assessment has been carried out.

It is considered that the lack of spatial awareness and understanding of locations throughout the Plan reduces the credibility of the Plan. The Three Rivers District, although referred to very quietly throughout the GTP, with many District locations wrongly referenced (such as the Croxley Business Park or Moor Park, which is an estate within Eastbury); and with only two short paragraphs in the introduction relative to the multi-page entries for Watford and Hemel Hempstead, is nevertheless integral to the success of the Plan as it links all the urban areas (all four corridors are partly in TRD).

It is noted that AECOM appear to repeatedly reference district locations as within other Districts (such as the Croxley Business Park which is labelled Watford; or Abbots Langley and Kings Langley, which are described as North Watford, while Carpenders Park and South Oxhey are included in, and described as, South Watford); this lack of spatial awareness reduces the credibility of the Plan.

#### Comments from Three Rivers Local Ward Councillors

Oxhey Hall & Hayling

Cllr 1:

My comments regarding Package 5 of the GTP relate to the proposal to introduce a new bus and cycle- only link across the River Colne linking South Oxhey and the Business parks Area.

1) The maps provided are impossible to interpret in any detail being diagrammatic so I can't work out the exact route proposed.

2) The upgrade of Ebury Way from Tolpits Lane to the Electricity Transmission Station and past the Bushey cricket Club could work well for a cycle route and pedestrian way as this is already used by cyclists and walkers but it would be totally unsuitable for a road to carry buses and eventually all types of motor vehicles, due partly to the effects on two leisure amenities: Bushey Cricket Club and King Georges playing fields. Also the area adjacent to the Electricity Station and all along the River Colne is a flood plain used to collect water for the aquifers supplying water via Affinity Water to local areas and nearby farmland would also be affected.

3) I am not happy with the 'Buses only' phrase as a road which is suitable for buses to travel on can so easily become a normal route for all vehicles and this would completely devalue the 'sustainable' claims for this proposal. How can HCC prevent cars, motorbikes, vans etc. from using such a road? This seems like a ploy to build a road at any cost.

In summary, I would not be happy for this proposal to go ahead and don't believe that it would

persuade people travelling from South Oxhey to the Business Parks to leave their cars at home. Please improve the cycle and pedestrian route but don't build a road across the River Colne for motorised traffic.

Cllr 2:  
Package 5 SM12b

I stated that I supported efforts to improve cycle connectivity but was confused due to the brevity of information on bus connectivity. I am totally opposed to the same [new?] route being used by buses and cyclists to the Business parks. The information on this was very brief and vague. No mention is made of pedestrians.

At present there is a route from Hampermill Lane that pedestrians and cyclists use to travel to and from the business parks along Ebury Way [and on to Rickmansworth]

I criticised the terminology used such as Western Gateway as it seemed to focus on southern access which may be interpreted as South Oxhey only? This estate has areas where there are no bus services and this is not mentioned in the survey of opinion. I was also critical of the diagrammatic map, and it was only by us looking at Ordinance maps that we were able to understand this Package 5 route .

I made no mention of being a District Cllr, flood plan around the River Colne here, Bushey Cricket Club ground impact, a utility company owning the route from Hampermill Lane to Ebury Way as well as farmland that is also an aquifer.

Cllr. 3:

My additional points are as follows:

a) Timing of consultation: this has been done primarily over the summer holiday. That is an impediment to being able to effectively consult residents. I recently met with the Chair of a local residents' association, who understandably wants to consult members. That is simply not possible over the summer holiday period and I therefore view this process as both flawed and undemocratic. One of the issues it prevents is allowing residents to propose additional or other measures that they may deem important, given that they live here;

b) Viability of bus route from South Oxhey to Watford Business Park: we have had a good deal of contact with Arriva over the existing, substandard W8 bus serving South Oxhey. Arriva has made the point that despite this being the sole bus route taking passengers from South Oxhey to Watford town centre it is not profitable. We are desperate to keep and improve this route, and that should form part of any transport plan for the area;

If it is not commercially viable to run a bus to and from the centre of Watford, where so many locals shop, work and socialise, it is difficult to see how money could be made running one on the route set out in the consultation paper. We would fully support a bus running from South Oxhey on existing roads to the Business Park and would like to have seen this included in the consultation. Even if the route set out in the consultation paper was fully subsidised out of the public purse it would surely cost a fraction to run a bus on existing roads, rather than building a new one. The alternative may be to see the new "bus only" road sitting idle as no bus operator wants to run a loss-making service.

Moor Park and Eastbury

Cllr 1:

**SUMMARY: Despite broad agreement with the objectives, and concrete agreement with most of the measures proposed in PK4, PK5 and PK9, this Councillor would contest any moves to build on the Green Belt with the greatest animation – specifically PK5 SM12b (see details below), and would reject any parcel of initiatives of which this was part.**

**1) Do we agree or disagree with objectives?**

**In short, yes but there is conflict, and we prefer the lower-cost, lower-development, lower-intervention objectives which prioritise local people. Car alternatives need to**

**work and need to facilitate interchange between different modes of transport to be viable.**

**The top objective has to be improving quality of life, ahead of growth, because if growth leads to a reduction in the quality of life what is the point of it?**

We agree with the objectives, but the issue is what the objectives imply but don't say. Pretty much anything you do is going to meet some of the objectives, but they have of course the **potential to conflict between them**, and the question becomes which you prioritise. For example 'more sense of place', 'reduced congestion' and 'improved quality of life' all imply less moving about on the part of the general population between places, whereas 'better connectivity between places' and 'better accessibility to key locations' clearly imply more of it. So which takes precedence?

For the record, where there is conflict this Councillor will **generally fall on the side of preferring less moving about to more of it**. The good news is that less moving about and less facilitation of moving about is the cheaper, greener option and annoys far fewer people. Of course, when one needs to go somewhere it is better that this should be quick and easy. But that is a subsidiary point and is no argument in favour of large-scale road-building, for example, because they swiftly create yet more congestion in the place of green space which is permanently lost for no gain; and the loss of green areas, or business facilities in favour of housing, means that more people need to spend more time on the roads for leisure or work. In ever more crowded south-eastern Britain, less movement is definitely more quality of life. **So the best Growth and Transport plan would be one that limited growth and demand for transport.**

**It also does not say for whom.** To take a base example, the quality of life of delivery truck drivers would clearly be improved by concreting over one end of the county to the other, but most Hertfordshire residents would see this as a backward step. This Councillor sees our duty as primarily to meet the needs of the voters who elected us, rather than accommodating motorists from outside the County, or incomers who have not voted for any of the current parties in the different levels of government. **Local government should prioritise local people.**

With respect to the objective of better choice of alternatives to the car – it would be well to clarify that these should be **proven, workable alternatives to the car**, not pie-in-the-sky, like electric cars for example (which cannot drive two hours without needing to be recharged). I have also attended a meeting in which it was proposed that mothers do the school run on bicycles. I am a mother who frequently cycles – but whilst there may be some mothers out there whose children all go to the same school somewhere close by, accessible by quiet roads, who are old enough to cycle safely but not old enough to need to carry their cellos and cricket gear to school and can therefore get all their projects and equipment on to a bike, and don't mind getting wet, early and late, in long British winters...I am inclined to think they would be in a minority.

Finally, I think it would be good to **add an Objective about facilitating interchange between modes of transport**. Making it easy to get from cars to other modes makes it more, not less likely, that people will use them. The counterexample I have in mind concerns new London Tube stations where there is nowhere to pull up a car and let somebody out without a long walk to the station – so obviously anyone with small children, mobility problems or carrying anything heavy, which is all residents all the time who don't have cars, will paradoxically be asking their friends for a lift for the whole of their journey and not just to the Tube station.

#### **Feedback - generalities**

In terms of concrete feedback below, we have chosen to focus as requested on our area (Rickmansworth) but have also glanced at neighbouring Watford and South Oxhey. In general terms though **we support aims to improve rail connections, notably the Abbey Line, and connections across Watford.**

### **Feedback – specifics: PK4, PK5 and PK9**

**PK4:** Having visited the **Warner Bros Studio at Leavesden** (the biggest and best in Europe) and understood something of the current visitor and worker numbers, as well as the future potential of this advanced, high value-added, green industry for our County and indeed the whole country after Brexit, **we would support energetically any plan to furnish it with a train station on the London Northwestern Railway** (which passes underneath the Studio site) or any revised plan to extend the Tube network to it (whether on the Met line or the Watford Overground tube line which historically used to be the Bakerloo). **This is not mentioned in the current plan** and may be beyond its scope but I believe it should be.

**SM20:** Broadly we support moves to improve cycling routes, with the caveat that **major existing roads should not be sacrificed to create cycle paths**: obviously that increases congestion, but also (speaking as a regular cyclist) most cyclists strongly prefer to avoid busy, dangerous, noisy, polluted roads where at all possible, and do not use their bicycles for the kind of heavy-duty long-distance high-speed excursion that traffic on the A405 is used for. If you need to go to B&Q in a neighbouring town, or commute to see a friend, **you will not pedal along a highway on your bike**. You use your bike for local errands down lanes and alleys, or out-of-town along cycling paths to see the countryside; neither of which can be accomplished on a major road. The route for SM20 is not clear but if it is planned to be along the side of the A405, I think the money and effort could better and more usefully be invested elsewhere – perhaps upgrading towpaths for cyclists.

With respect to **Watford bus networks**, these do need attention. It currently takes me 40 minutes to get from the Watford Met tube to the High Street and Intu centre on foot, by taxi or bus, though it is barely five minutes by car – so I never go, preferring Oxford St instead.

**PK5: The proposed building of a road across Green Belt land means we cannot support this measure in any degree, notwithstanding our support for other aspects of the package.**

**SM12b: WE OPPOSE IN THE STRONGEST TERMS BUILDING A NEW ROAD** (whether as currently proposed only for buses or not) **ACROSS GREEN BELT LAND.**

- This is **despite the fact** that as a resident of Moor Park, whose own, private, road (Sandy Lodge Road) is commonly used as an illicit rat-run, **I could expect my own home to be quieter, my own road to be safer and my maintenance fees for the road less**, if the projected 'Brookdene extension' were to be built.
- I have requested figures to show how much the road would cost; **how many buses per day would be expected on it;**
- **How many South Oxhey residents currently work in Tolpits Lane**, and on what basis (full- or part-time, regularly or irregularly), in what capacity,
- **At what salaries and added-value to the local economy?** How many Tolpits Lane workers actually live in Oxhey, or would benefit from the road?  
To exaggerate in order to make a point: It is not worth building a road and destroying an invaluable amenity at a cost of tens of millions, in order to shave 20 minutes off the commuting times of 50 cleaners. The taxes they pay are likely to take decades, if not centuries, to cover the cost.
- What is being done to improve the usage of already-existing roads which might help the congestion around Bushey Arches? In particular, **what is the usage of Wiggshall Road/Wiggshall Link Road/Deacons' Hill?** Could this be made more useful?
- Tolpits Lane in particular and Three Rivers District in general is rightly or wrongly coming **under increasing pressure to convert business premises to residential**, in absolute terms and compared to other Hertfordshire districts, from developers and because of the difference between government funding for houses and business rates. The risk is that, by the time any road were built, the businesses could have moved on, and we would be left with a pointless road (there being nothing else of

interest at Tolpits Lane) connecting residential areas, just at the moment that the new residents would most benefit from the leisure opportunities offered by untarnished Green Belt.

- As a local resident my suspicion is that **most of the Bushey congestion** is not people trying to get to Tolpits Lane industrial estate or Croxley, which are not huge areas and do not contain businesses employing huge numbers of people (Croxcley in particular has many car show-rooms with a handful of employees in large buildings; businesses like Camelot, Tolpits' most famous resident, do not usually employ more than a small staff). My sense is that most people in cars blocking Hampermill Lane are **trying to get over to the Watford retail parks** (several of them), **to the M1 or M25, or to the train stations going into London.**
- They would be therefore better served by sorting something out at **Bushey Arches: an underpass** perhaps.
- My own canvassing in the Hayling and South Oxhey area indicates that **residents there are more concerned about the preservation of the Green Belt** than about traffic congestion (which has not been brought up to me once).
- It is shockingly disingenuous to talk about upgrading the Ebury Way, since it **doesn't need upgrading** for cyclists or walkers (except for perhaps making the gates designed to keep out motorbikes a little wider so they don't equally keep out cycles as they did to me, and another parent with a child seat on her bike, yesterday).
- By putting a bus on it you would effectively be abolishing the Ebury Way which is a huge and incomparable local asset resource, and **neither walkers nor cyclists would use it once opened to traffic.** As a mother who takes my children cycling frequently, my first care is to get them off roads with busy or frequent traffic and on to towpaths or the Ebury Way. Roads in this crowded part of the country drive out cyclists, they do not facilitate them.
- **It beggars belief that the road, once built, would only be used by buses** and not by other traffic; or that the land around the road would long resist the depredations of developers. The path itself is particularly verdant, tree-lined and shaded, and the land around gorgeous farmland of high quality, notwithstanding the electricity station and the attractive Bushey sports ground.
- This is a **threat to endangered birds and animals**, given the close proximity of Croxley Common Moor and Withey Beds.

#### Other PK5 points:

**SM21:** This seems like a good move, with a small caveat about getting bicycles off busy roads such as the A412 for the reasons given above under SM20.

**SM22:** We support moves to increase the integration of Watford and Croxley Industrial areas by bus, which are at the moment very difficult to reach. A regular bus connection with Croxley or Watford Tubes would be particularly useful.

**SM28:** Broadly this seems like a good idea as the Tolpits Lane/Dwight Road area is particularly bad for cycling and walking (speaking as one who canvassed on foot and bike there in the recent election); but with the strong caveat that we could not support anything which compromised the quality of wildlife protection on Croxley Common Moor.

#### PK9:

**LP12 PR80:** Improving the interchange between the Ebury Way and Church Street might be helpful but is not critical. The signage is sufficiently clear and the Way sufficiently well-known.

**LP12 PR81:** Slowing down traffic on Church Street, speaking as somebody who routinely commutes along it by bicycle, would be helpful. Anyone in a hurry can go around on the A412/A404. Anyone driving around a small town like Rickmansworth does not need to go much faster.

**LP13 PR82: This should be a priority.** Anyone shopping at Waitrose, and trying to get to the railway station to go home with their heavy shopping, as I routinely do, has no very clear route

to do it, owing to the street furniture (including unsightly metal fences which are being removed in much of London) and awkward placing of crossings and bus-stop. This may be outside the scope of the current project, but I am never at Waitrose without being annoyed by the **singular lack of intelligence in the design of the overpass** coming across the railway line to Waitrose, and the stairs going down the outside of the carpark on to Homestead Road and the station. The problem is that the overpass and the stairs, though they pass within centimetres of each other, do not link, except by exiting at different levels of the Waitrose carpark and doing a big loop. That means that nobody can cross the railway line then go to the station, and nobody climbing the stairs can use the overpass to cross Park Road. They need at small cost to be linked.

The stairs on the far side of the Waitrose railway overpass could benefit from having a narrow ramp for taking bikes up what are currently steep and awkward stairs.

**LP13 PR83:** I have no particular personal experience of this crossing, but would tend to be in favour as I am generally against underpasses and overpasses, which usually scare off pedestrians and make the town look unfriendly, and in favour of street-level crossings, which are much more convenient and accessible and make the town more open and convivial.

**LP13 PR86:** Cautiously in favour of this. Easing traffic entering the recycling facility would definitely be a step forward and cycling links around this roundabout are currently poor – I cycle through several times a week and usually (and reluctantly) am forced on to the pavements to avoid very busy traffic in a narrow space. That said, the traffic does generally move fairly smoothly around the roundabout and one would not want to impede that.

**LP13 PR87:** I am not clear what is envisaged here – I crossed this crossing on a cycle with my children a few days ago and other than the awkwardness of having to fit on the traffic island because the lane crossings are offset rather than opposite each other, do not remember anything particularly untoward. As a generality, crossings which funnel people away from the centre back down the roads are more dangerous because they take people away from where they want to go (generally across the centre) and take longer, and thus provoke more jay-walking.

**SM28A:** Unless this hides some horror with greater than usual dexterity, in contrast with SM12b above this does not appear objectionable, provided that the Ebury Way is protected and not turned into a road and wildlife on Croxley Common Moor is not threatened. Better cycling links from Tolpits Lane toward Croxley centre could be a benefit. Clearer walking links around Tolpits Lane industrial estate would be a benefit – having canvassed there recently I can attest to its being not very clearly laid out and feeling a bit unwelcoming.

Abbots Langley Ward

I would like us to seriously consider supporting opening a full road link into the south of the Croxley/Watford business parks from Tolpits Lane. It seems to me this has the potential to significantly relieve the Watford Road through Croxley; and I cannot see any obvious major downside.