

## Appendix 2 – Cycling and Walking Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Framework

The implementation of the Strategy’s recommendations is key to ensuring that local communities have access to high quality cycle and walking infrastructure. There are many different ways to deliver and fund the Strategy’s recommendations, and this Infrastructure Delivery Framework (IDF) outlines which delivery and funding methods could be most appropriate for specific recommendations.

This IDF is heavily related to and must be read in conjunction with the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan IDF, Waveney Local Plan IDF, and the East Suffolk Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS). The IDFs appended to the two Local Plans identify and prioritise infrastructure needed to support the planned development set out in the Local Plans. This C&WS IDF builds on the infrastructure needs set out in the Local Plans’ IDFs in respect of cycling and walking infrastructure. The IFS reports on the developer contributions (Community Infrastructure Levy and s106) that ESC has received, spent and plans to spend on infrastructure in support of planned development. This C&WS IDF provides up to date estimated costs for cycling and walking infrastructure as set out in the Strategy’s recommendations, which can then be used as evidence for the annual review of the IFS. Taken together the IDFs and IFS provide a transparent suite of documents that help local communities and developers understand the infrastructure required to support planned development, how developer contributions have been spent and what future funds will be spent on.

The priorities identified for each infrastructure requirement set out in the Local Plans’ IDFs are defined as follows

- Critical – Infrastructure needed to unlock development sites (i.e. development cannot take place until this project is delivered)
- Essential – Infrastructure necessary to support development and mitigate impacts. Without this the developments’ sustainability would be undermined
- Desirable – Infrastructure that could support development and make it more sustainable, but development would be sustainable without it

As the C&WS identifies cycling and walking infrastructure recommendations across East Suffolk and is not confined to the identification of infrastructure that would support planned development, a new priority category (beneficial) has been identified and is defined as follows

- Beneficial – Infrastructure that would not support planned development but would improve the sustainability of existing and future communities.

**It should be noted that simply because a recommendation is identified as ‘beneficial’, and therefore would not be specifically needed to support or facilitate planned development across East Suffolk, it does not mean the infrastructure improvement is unimportant.**

In addition to the priority categories identified above, other forms of prioritisation have already been included within the Strategy such as the Key Corridors that have been attributed priority categories that provide a separate yet no less valuable function. The Key Corridors operate as networks of cycling and walking infrastructure and while each recommendation has its own benefits, there will inevitably be situations where a number of recommendations provide similar benefits to the overarching cycling and walking network. In order to differentiate between key corridor recommendations and highlight their relative importance, each recommendation has been ranked as either medium, high or very high priority. In determining the priority of a particular recommendation the following principles were considered

- The importance of the recommendation within the context of the wider Key Corridor,
- Whether the recommendation is an alternative to a more important recommendation, and
- The likely potential for delivery.

This IDF incorporates all of the Strategy’s recommendations except the Leisure Routes. The large scale and ambitious Leisure Routes identified in the Strategy could be brought forward through a number of means and designed in a number of ways, which makes it challenging to identify the specific infrastructure needed for each Leisure Route and therefore the costs of such infrastructure are highly uncertain. However, the implementation of Leisure Routes, as well as all other Strategy recommendations, will be monitored and further prioritised through the ongoing Prioritisation Methodology, about which more information can be found here.

The following table provides an explanation for each of the columns that form the Strategy’s IDF.

C&WS Recommendation	C&WS Priority	Approximate Cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
Refers to the specific C&WS recommendation.	Outlines whether the recommendation forms part of a key corridor and if so, the priority category (medium, high, or very high) attributed to the key corridor recommendation.	<p>Gives a broad cost estimate. The cost is an estimate only and should not be viewed as a complete or detailed costing. A standard cost was applied per linear metre. Please note the costs only factor the construction costs.</p> <p>Where the current standard cost does not apply the estimated cost is given as 'Unknown'</p>	<p>Outlines the organisations which may provide funding opportunities. It is important to note where a public sector organisation is referenced it relates to that organisation's ability to potentially access a funding pot and does not refer to the organisation's capital budgets.</p> <p>Abbreviations:-  ESC - East Suffolk Council  SCC - Suffolk County Council  DFT - Department for Transport  CIL - Community Infrastructure Levy  NH - National Highways  TC/PC - Town Council/Parish Council</p>	<p>Outlines specific funding mechanism/s that could be used should they be known.</p> <p>Abbreviations:-  SCC - Suffolk County Council  CIL - Community Infrastructure Levy  DFT - Department for Transport  S106 - Section 106  S278 - Section 278  NH - National Highways  TC/PC - Town Council/Parish Council</p>	Shows the relationship between recommendations identified in the Strategy and projects detailed in the Suffolk Coastal and Waveney Local Plans' Infrastructure Delivery Frameworks, if a correlation between the two frameworks exists.	Shows the priority (critical, essential, desirable) of projects as identified in the Suffolk Coastal and Waveney Local Plans' Infrastructure Delivery Frameworks as well as the new priority category (beneficial) identified for recommendations that do not relate to planned development.

# Key Corridors

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
IM1	PROW59/66	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM2	Woodbridge Road	High	£650,000-£700,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM3	PROW57	High	£150,000-£200,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM4	Long Strops Bridleway	Very High	£750,000-£800,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM5	Main Road	High	£1,900,000-£2,000,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM7	Grange Farm cycleway	High	£2,000,000-£2,100,000	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, DFT, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM8	Main Road	High	£900,000-£950,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM9	Suffolk Police HQ	High	£150,000-£200,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, junction, cycle and footway improvements at Suffolk Police HQ	Essential/Critical
IM10	Dobbs Lane / Felixstowe Road	Very High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, DFT, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM11	Eagle Way / Betts Avenue	Very High	£700,000-£750,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
IM12	Martlesham Woods / Brightwell Lakes	Medium	£1,400,000-£1,500,000	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, DFT, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM13	Barrack Square/Gloster Road	Very High	£300,000-£350,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
IM14	Footpaths/Felixstowe Road	Very High	£150,000-£200,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM15	Main Road/Woodbridge Town Football Club site	Very High	£300,000-£350,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM16	Sandy Lane	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM17	Outer Woodbridge route	High	£3,500,000-£4,000,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	Access and junction improvements at Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club	Essential/Critical
IM18	Ipswich Road - Woodbridge Train Station	Very High	£750,000-£800,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
IM20	Thoroughfare/Melton Road	High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Desirable/Essential
IM22	Bredfield Road/Melton Road	High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM23	Melton Train Station/Melton Park	High	£350,000-£400,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM25	A12/Bridleway 31/18/32/51	Medium	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
IM26	Brightwell/Bucklesham	High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM27	Portal Avenue - Eagle Way	Very High	£350,000-£400,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, junction, cycle and footway improvements at Suffolk Police HQ	Essential/Critical
IM28	Felixstowe Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, DFT, CIL	N/A	Essential
IM29	Peterhouse Crescent-Ipswich Road	High	£500,000-£550,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IM30	Sutton Hoo	High	Unknown	SCC, NE	SCC, NE	N/A	Beneficial
IM31	Brightwell Lakes	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	N/A	Essential
IM32	Long Strops - Brightwell Lakes	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	N/A	Essential
IF1	Felixstowe Road 'west' (A1156) existing shared path, Warren Heath	High	£300,000-£350,000	SCC, NH, Developer, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.20)	Critical
IF2	Ransomes Way (A1189)/Felixstowe Road 'west' (A1156) roundabout	Very High	£350,000-£400,000	SCC, NH, Developer, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.20)	Critical

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
IF3	The section of Felixstowe Road (A1156) 'west' between Ransomes Way (A1189)/Felixstowe Road 'west' roundabout and the Trinity Park roundabout	Very High	£800,000-£850,000	SCC, NH, Developer, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.20)	Critical
IF4	Trinity Park roundabout (southern side)	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, NH,	SCC, NH, CIL	Significant access	Critical
IF5	Murrills Road	Medium	£700,000-£750,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Significant access	Desirable/Essential
IF36	Trinity Park roundabout (northern arms)	Very High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IF7	Felixstowe Road 'west' - Trinity Park to A14 bridge	Very High	£2,000,000-£2,500,000	Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	Footway improvements at Ransomes, Nacton Heath (Policy SCLP12.21)	Essential
IF10	Straight Road	Medium	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, NH,	SCC, NH, CIL	Significant access	Critical
IF11	Felixstowe Road 'west' A14 bridge to Felixstowe Road 'east'	Very High	£400,000-£450,000	SCC, NH, Developer, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.20) and Footway improvements at Ransomes, Nacton Heath (Policy SCLP12.21)	Critical
IF13	Felixstowe Road 'east'	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	Developer, SCC, NH, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.21)	Critical
IF14	Levington Lane to Main Road, Bucklesham	Medium	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, DFT, CIL	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.20)	Desirable/Essential
IF18	Morston Hall Road	Very High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
IF20	High Road, Trimley St Martin	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
IF21	High Road, Trimley St Martin	Very High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
IF22	Field edge, north of Trimley St Martin	Very High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F1	High Road (Section 1)	Very High	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, NH, Developer, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F2	High Road via Trimley St Mary Primary School	High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F4	Walton High Street/High Road West	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F5	High Road West	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developers, CIL, TC	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F6	High Road East	Very High	£500,000-£550,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Pedestrian and cycle Enhancements at Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F7	Cliff Road	Very High	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Pedestrian and cycle Enhancements at Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F9	Trimley Marshes Nature Reserve circular route	Medium	£1,700,000-£1,800,000	SCC, AONB, DFT	SCC, AONB, DFT	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F10	Grimston Lane to bridleway bridge via Footpath 32	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F11	Land between PROW 32 and the Land Adjacent to Reeve Lodge site's western boundary/Footpath 31	Very High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F13	Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Road, Trimley St Martin - Primary route	Medium	£100,000-£150,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	N/A	Essential
F14	Gun Lane to bridleway bridge	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	N/A	Essential
F137	SCLP12.65 Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Road, Trimley St Martin - Connection to Gun Lane	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	N/A	Essential
F15	South-western most point of Grimston Lane	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F16	The Howlett Way/High Road/Land Adjacent to Reeve Lodge access road roundabout	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way	Essential/Critical
F17	Howlett Way	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way	Essential/Critical
F18	Footpath 4	Medium	£50,000-£100,000	Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL	N/A	Essential/Critical
F22	Bridleway 5 (east to west section)	Very High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way	Essential/Critical
F24	PROW Footpath 26 (southern half)	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way	Essential/Critical

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F25	Bridleway 5 (north to south section)	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way	Essential/Critical
F26	Thurmans Lane	Very High	Unknown	SCC, NH	SCC, NH	N/A	Beneficial
F27	Thurmans Lane green space	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F28	Faulkeners Way	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F29	Faulkeners Way	Medium	£750,000-£800,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F30	PROW 9	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F31	Abbey Walk	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access and connectivity improvements at Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close	Essential/Critical
F32	Gosling's Farm track down to Grimston Lane	Very High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F33	Land between Cliff Road and Roman Way	Medium	£50,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F34	Land adjacent to Cliff Road	Medium	£50,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F35	Bridleway bridge	Very High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
F36	Grimston Hall to Cordy's Lane via Keeper's Lane	Very High	£350,000-£400,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F37	PROW Bridleways 12 and 14	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, CIL, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
F38	PROW Footpath 30	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
F39	Nicholas Road and Parker Avenue	Very High	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
F40	Fagbury Road from junction with Parker Avenue to Dock Gate 2 roundabout	Very High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
F41	Dock Gate 2 roundabout	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F42	Ferry Lane (Option 1) OR Trinity Avenue/Blofield Road (Option 2)	Very High	£350,000-£400,000 (option 1)	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F43	PROW Footpath 32B to Rendlesham Road and Hintlesham Drive	Very High	£150,000-£200,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F44	Kirton Road to Gulpher Road via new track and Candlet Track	Very High	£750,000-£800,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
F46	Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood / Footpath 28	Very High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
F47	Land North of Walton High Street	Very High	£500,000-£550,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
F48	Walton Hall Drive / Footpath 31 / Railway bridge / Runnacles Way / Footpath 43 / Maidstone Road	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F49	Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood	Medium	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F50	Land between Western Avenue and Cliff Road	High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F51	Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood	Very High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
F52	Gulpher Road to Back Lane (Falkenham)	Medium	£500,000-£550,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F54	Colneis Road	Very High	£800,000-£850,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
F55	Hyem's Lane, Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
F56	PROW 12 and PROW 13	Very High	£150,000-£200,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F57	Ferry Road and Church Road	Very High	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F58	Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
F59	Runnacles Way, Grange Farm Avenue/Wesel Avenue to Ferry Lane and Grange Road	Very High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F60	Railway bridge between Runnacles Way and Hawkes Lane	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F61	Grange Farm Avenue	High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F62	Maidstone Road/Grange Road	High	£650,000-£700,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F63	Mill Lane	Very High	£350,000-£400,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F65	Cavendish Park	Medium	Unknown	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F68	Coronation Drive to Garrison Lane 'south'	High	£500,000-£550,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F69	Garrison Lane 'north' and the Garrison Lane / Candlet Road / Grove Road / Cowpasture Allotments access roundabout	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F70	Garrison Lane 'north' connection into Fairfield Avenue	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F71	Garrison Lane/High Road cross roads	Medium	Unknown	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F72	Land to the south of High Road West, between Garrison Lane and Railway Approach (for Felixstowe railway station)	High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe and Access improvements to rail stations	Essential
F75	Mill Lane/Garrison Lane crossroads	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe and Access improvements to rail stations	Essential
F76	Chaucer Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe and Access improvements to rail stations	Essential
F77	Undercliff Road West	Medium	£50,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F78	Langer Road	Very High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F79	Langer Road (East side, Port bound)	Very High	£300,000-£350,000 (option C)	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F80	Langer Road (West side, centre bound)	Very High	£650,000-£700,000 (option A)	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F81	Langer Park	Medium	Unknown	ESC	ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F82	Langer Road Junction	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F83	Beach Station Road ('west')	Very High	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F84	Beach Station Road ('west')/Walton Avenue	Very High	£300,000-£350,000	SCC, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F86	Walton Avenue	Very High	£500,000-£550,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F87	Undercliff Road West (Spa Pavilion Theatre/Promenade) (cycle parking)	Medium	Unknown	ESC	ESC	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F138	The Promenade (Cycle parking)	Medium	Unknown	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F89	Sea Road (cycle parking)	Medium	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F91	Beatrice Avenue	High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F92	High Road West / High Road East / Hamilton Road / Beatrice Avenue roundabout	Medium	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F93	Railway Approach/High Road West (for Felixstowe railway station)	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F139	Great Eastern Square	Medium	Unknown	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F98	The Triangle	Medium	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F100	Crescent Road	Very High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F102	Rosemary Avenue	Medium	£250,000-£300,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F105	Elmcroft Lane / Footpath 8 (West)	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F106	Westmorland Road	Medium	£300,000-£350,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F109	Golf Road (cycle parking)	Medium	Unknown	ESC	ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F111	Cliff Road (cycle parking)	Medium	Unknown	ESC	ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F112	Undercliff Road East (cycle parking)	Medium	Unknown	ESC	ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F113	Circular leisure route - bridleways 24, 25, 26, 18, 16, 37	Medium	£750,000-£800,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
F115	The Dip to Felixstowe Ferry via PROW Footpath 62	High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
F116	Gap in the sea wall (east of Martello Lane)	High	Unknown	ESC	ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F117	Manor Terrace and Promenade	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F118	Manor Terrace	Medium	£250,000-£300,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F119	Landguard Nature Reserve / Landguard Point	High	£400,000-£450,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F121	Maidstone Road	Medium	Unknown	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F140	Longcroft to Maidstone Road	Medium	Unknown	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F123	Maidstone Road roundabout	Medium	Unknown	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F124	Seaton Road	High	£300,000-£350,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Access improvements at Bridge Road and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F126	Land between Recreation Lane and Plymouth Road	Medium	£50,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F128	PROW32	Medium	£50,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F131	Howlett Way to Church Lane/Bridleway 5	Very High	£150,000-£200,000	Developer	S106, S278	Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential/Critical
F134	Mill Lane (Railway bridge)	Very High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F135	Mill Lane (East)	Very High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
F136	Brackenbury Sports Centre	High	£100,000-£150,000	Developer	S106, S278	Pedestrian and cycle enhancements at Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
F141	Trimley St Martin Play Area, off Goslings Way	Medium	Unknown			N/A	Essential
F142	Gunn Lane to High Road	High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L1	Millennium Way / Peto Way	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
L2	Corton Long Lane	High	£7500,000-£800,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L3	Old Lane/Gunton Park (Lowestoft and Yarmouth Rugby Club site)	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Critical
L4	Bentley Drive	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L5	A47 (to Gunton Church Lane)	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, NH, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate to the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)?	Potentially Critical
L6	A47 Outside Ormiston Denes Academy	Very High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, NH	SCC, NH, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
L7	Former Railway Line	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L8	Oulton Road	High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L9	Oulton Road-Church Lane to St Margaret's Academy	High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L10	Denmark Road	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
L11	Station Square/Bascul Bridge	Very High	Unknown	SCC, DFT, NH, CIL	SCC, DFT, NH, CIL	Removal of pinch points across Lowestoft	Desirable/Essential
L12	Pier Terrace/Belvedere Road	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Removal of pinch points across Lowestoft	Desirable/Essential
L13	Kirkley Waterfront and Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood (WLP2.4)	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, ESC	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Brooke Peninsula Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge and Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
L14	Third River Crossing ('Gull Wing' crossing)	Very High	Being Built	SCC	SCC	Third Crossing over Lake Lothing	Essential
L15	Kirkley Rise	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L16	Tom Crisp Way to path behind Kimberley Road	Very High	£10,000-£50,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
L17	Victoria Road/Dell Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Essential
L19	Bridge Road/Saltwater Way	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Removal of pinch points across Lowestoft	Desirable/Essential
L57	Cotmer Road/Elm Tree Road	High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L20	Bridge Road/Commodore Road/Harbour Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC, ESC, PC, CIL	SCC, ESC, PC, CIL	Normanston Park Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
L21	Normanston Drive	High	£700,000-£750,000	ESC, SCC	ESC, SCC	N/A	Essential
L22	Normanston Park	Very High	£300,000-£350,000	ESC, TC	ESC, TC, CIL	N/A	Beneficial
L23	Peto Way	Very High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
L24	Tom Crisp Way	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
L25	Long Road (west of Elm Tree Road)	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L26	Castleton Avenue	High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L27	Castleton Avenue	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
L28	Chapel Road/Church Lane	Medium	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L29	Dorley Dale, Gratton Dale and Thixendale	Medium	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L30	Land South of the Street (WLP12.16)	Medium	Unknown	Developer	S106, S278	N/A	Essential
L31	Corton Road/Links Road	High	£1,900,000-£2,000,000	ESC, DFT	ESC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
L32	Gunton Cliff	Medium	£650,000-£700,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L33	Coastal Path	Very High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Desirable/Essential
L34	Yarmouth Road	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, NH	SCC, NH	N/A	Beneficial
L35	Jubilee Way	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L36	High Street	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L37	London Road North	Very High	Unknown	SCC, ESC, TC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
L38	PowerPark	High	Unknown	SCC, ESC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, ESC	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
L39	Coastal Path (continuation)	Medium	Unknown	SCC, ESC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, ESC	N/A	Essential
L40	Wilde Street – Rant Score	Medium	£300,000-£350,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
L41	Battery Green Road	High	Unknown	SCC, CIL, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L42	South Beach	High	Unknown	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Beneficial
L43	The Cliffs	High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Beneficial
L44	Bloodmoor Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, ESC	Improvements to Bloodmoor Roundabout, Lowestoft	Essential
L45	London Road	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, DFT, CIL	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
L46	Beccles Road	High	£350,000-£400,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L47	Behind Beccles Road	High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L48	Holly Road	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L49	Bonds Meadow	High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Beneficial

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
L50	Gorleston Road	High	£950,000-£1,000,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
L51	Sands Lane	High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
L52	Lime Avenue	High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
L53	Mendip Road	Medium	£150,000-£200,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
L54	Woods Loke West	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
L55	Woods Meadow Development/Hall Lane	High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Extensions to footpaths along Hall Lane and Union Lane, Oulton	Essential
L56	WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, Oulton and and WLP2.15 Land Between Hall Lane and Union Lane, Oulton	High	£400,000-£450,000	SCC, Developer	S106, S278, SCC	N/A	Essential
LH1	WLP2.13 North of Lowestoft Garden Village	Very High	Unknown	Developer	S278, S106	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential
LH2	A47 (adjacent)	High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	NH, SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton and Potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Potentially Critical
LH3	Sewage Treatment Works	High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential
LH4	WLP2.13 North of Lowestoft Garden Village	High	£150,000-£200,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential
LH5	Off-road route (line indicative)	Very High	£700,000-£750,000	SCC, CIL	CIL, SCC, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton and potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Essential
LH6	Stirrups Lane	High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	CIL, SCC, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential
LH7	Coast Road	High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential
LH8	A47 (north of Stirrups Lane)	Medium	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, ESC, NH, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton and potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
LK1	A12 (between Tower Road and London Road)	Very High	£550,000-£600,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LK2	London Road	Very High	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, DFT	N/A	Essential
LK3	Kessingland Neighbourhood Plan Allocations (SA1 Former Ashely Nurseries site, SA2 Land at Laurel Farm West and South and SA3 Land at Laurel Farm East)	Very High	£300,000-£350,000	Developer	S278, S106	N/A	Essential
LK4	Clare Road	High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
LK5	London Road – High Street	Medium	£250,000-£300,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
LB1	Beccles Road (A146)	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000 (cycle infrastructure only not highway)	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, CIL, DFT	N/A	Essential
LB2	Swan Lane	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB3	Mutford Wood	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
LB4	Mutford Wood Lane	High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential
LB5	Bridleway 12, 6, 4, 8 and 24	Medium	£600,000-£650,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
LB6	New Road	Very High	£200,000-£250,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB7	Church Road/Hulver Road	Very High	£250,000-£300,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB8	North Cove	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB9	Lowestoft Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB10	Benacre Road	Very High	£1,500,000-£1,600,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, DFT	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
LB39	Sandpit Lane	Medium	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB11	Copland Way	High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
LB12	Lowestoft Road	High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
LB40	Ellough Road	Medium	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB13	Hillside Avenue	Medium	£200,000-£250,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB14	NCR (various) Part 1	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
LB15	Cedar Drive/Rowan Way	High	£300,000-£350,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB16	Adjacent Ellough Road	Very High	£400,000-£450,000	Developer	S278, S106	N/A	Essential
LB17	Beccles Southern Bypass	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH	Improvements to local infrastructure to assist in access and use of Enterprise Zones	Essential
LB18	NCR (various) Part 2	High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
LB19	Rigbourne Hill	Very High	£650,000-£700,000	SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential

Reference (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	Location (copied from Word 2022-08-04)	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
LB20	WLP3.3 Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood	Very High	Unknown	SCC, Developer	SCC, S278, S106	N/A	Essential
LB21	NCR (various) Part 3	Very High	£300,000-£350,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S278, S106, SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB22	Wash Lane	Very High	Unknown	Developer, SCC, CIL	S278, S106, SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
LB23	Ballygate or Puddingmoor	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB24	Common Lane	High	Unknown	SCC, TC	SCC, TC	N/A	Beneficial
LB25	Beccles to Shipmeadow	Very High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
LB26	Ringsfield Road north	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB27	Ringsfield Road (south)	High	£50,000-£100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB28	Bridleways between Ringsfield Road and Church Road	High	£350,000-£400,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB29	Ringsfield	High	£100,000-£150,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	Extensions to footpaths along School Road, Ringsfield	Essential
LB30	Bridleway 8	Medium	£300,000-£350,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB31	Bridleways 6 to 16	High	£600,000-£650,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB32	Ilketshall St Andrew	High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB33	Hall Lane, Footpaths 11 and 17	Medium	£350,000-£400,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB34	Clarke's Lane, Byways 5, 16 and 17	Medium	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB35	Low Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB36	Castle Road/Annis Hill	High	£1,500,000-£1,600,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB37	Bridleway 1 and 8	Medium	£400,000-£450,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
LB38	Hillside Road East	High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Desirable/Essential
MF1	A14 Pedestrian Bridge	Very High	Unknown	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
MF2	Kirton Road/Trimley Road/Bucklesham Road	Very High	Unknown	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
MF3	Bucklesham to Brightwell Lakes	High	Unknown	SCC, Developer,	S278, S106, CIL, SCC	N/A	Desirable/Essential

# Community Recommendations

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
22	Lowestoft	B1532 (Marine Parade) in Lowestoft	This route is part of the Suffolk County Council Lowestoft Cycle route and designated a On-Road signed cycle route and approx 2km in length. Unfortunately due to lack of upgrading or maintenance around 80% of the white lines separating vehicles from cyclists have faded into the tarmac and now indistinguishable for motorists and cyclists. The only short parts of the cycle route which have been painted are those where the highways agency have completed recent road repairs see attached photo's.	Paint the white lines please along the length of Marine Parade which will link Pakefield in the South to Lowestoft town centre in the North.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
23	Lowestoft	From Arbor Lane to Pakefield Rd along the current cliff top footpath	Link Pakefield (Arbor Lane) to Pakefield Road along the scenic cliff top and waterfront, with some will and a little modification to existing pedestrian infrastructure along a 1km section we could have a continuous 3km cycling route linking up to the traffic free sea-front and onto Lowestoft town centre, that is a winner for all.	Currently as you can see in the attached photographs this 1km section is narrow along parts of the route and even passing pedestrians have to step off the footpath which is also a popular route for cyclists especially school children cycling to local schools, yes I know cyclists are supposed to dismount and walk this 1km section but lets move on and grasp the nettle and make it a harmonious link for both pedestrians and cyclists from Pakefield and into Lowestoft, a win-win for all especially school children.	High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	Beneficial
24	Walpole Robbie	Forge Cottage, Walpole, IP19 9AZ	Walking from one village to another is extremely dangerous especially where there are bends and hills with high banks and no escape for pedestrians. Some drivers exceed the 30 mph speed limit and others drive into the winter sun unable to see the road at all, Other rural roads that are NSL are narrow and should be 20 or 30 mph. Walking and cycling should be encouraged. We have no 'bus service to our nearest shops which are over 2 miles away, as are schools, pubs and active churches.	Walking and cycling, especially between towns and villages should be made safer. Narrow roads should be 20 or 30 mph. Attention should be given to improving the visibility of cyclists and pedestrians especially on hills and bends and where there are high banks. New footpaths at such points through adjacent fields would reduce the risks. Banks could be cut back at key points.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
25	Trimley St Mary	High Road , Trimley.	Cars parked on cycle lane, necessitating cyclists moving out and in from main road repeatedly. Cycle lane disjointed with many short sections.	Ban parking in cycle lane. Have one continuous cycle lane. Similar problem exists in many other areas in Felixstowe with disjointed cycle lanes.	Very High	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, NH, Developer, CIL	SCC, NH, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
29	Kesgrave	Main road kesgrave	Cycle track not fit for purpose, especially around Windrush Road where potholes on road are dangerous. Very uneven and old cycle track surface, many cyclists forced to use Road.	Resurface section from police station to Kesgrave fisheries.	Medium	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
31	Lowestoft	Roundabout A47 and Corton Long Lane - to Suffolk Border before Hopton!	Cycle path ends with no path from this roundabout to the Suffolk Border above Hopton. Where on the Norfolk side there is from Gt Yarmouth a cycle path from Gorleston to Hopton and this is where it ends.	A12 upgrade to A47 never improved the cycle ways infrastructure.	High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	NH, SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton and potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Essential

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
35	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Martin	6 pathways leading to open countryside have been closed across the railway line. This hardly promotes improved walking and cycling access.	Reinstate those crossings where there is still only one track to cross so not making the pathways any less safe than before.	Not assessed for IDF.					
37	Reydon	Road from A12 Blythburgh to Southwold. and most Suffolk B roads.	Country roads not suitable for cyclists. Long hold ups behind cyclists who cannot be safely overtaken on narrow winding roads with or without opposing traffic. Put simply the increase in leisure cycling is a menace to other traffic on our local roads, causing traffic jams , prolonged journey times and inefficient use of fuel when stuck in low gears behind cyclists ,and should not be encouraged. People living in the country need to get about by car. We do not need people 'playing' on our roads,	Separate cycle ways BUT not along existing footpaths. The Sustrans cycle path along Halesworth Millenium Meadow is a classic example of pedestrians and cyclists not mixing. . Cyclists all too often approach walkers(often with dogs) from behind at great speed and give no warning as they hurtle past nearly injuring pedestrians and their pets. It became so bad at one stage that we stopped walking there.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
39	Saxmundham	B1121 main road linking Benhall, Saxmundham, Kelsale	Lack of safe pedestrian/cycling route between Benhall, Saxmundham, Kelsale, Lack of cycling infrastructure (signs, secure parking.cycle lanes)  East Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council Highways Dept, Planning Dept do not seem to communicate with each other - a perfect example of this is the new train station in Saxmundham has no provision for secure bicycle parking.	The 3 Communities Link project report was completed in 2017 - it detailed a safe route between Benhall, Saxmundham, Kelsale for pedestrians and cyclists. It also linked to the local schools and Saxmundham railway station. The report is currently sitting with Suffolk County Council and has been included in their list of 100 cycling projects to be delivered in the next 5 years (see EADT article.)  The report has been ratified and costed by SCC/Highways and is still awaiting funding. It is an "oven-ready" solution to the transport infrastructure issues in and around Saxmundham  I am the author of the report file:///media/fuse/drivefs-234088169dc1f109c9a130868367d4ad/root/THE%203%20COMMUNITIES%20LINK%20Impact%20Audit%20&%20Report.pdf  Our FB page: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/SaxTCCFocusGroup">https://www.facebook.com/SaxTCCFocusGroup</a>	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT		
44	Martlesham	Re-route NCN1 to avoid retail park in Martlesham	The area around Gloster Road has become much busier since NCN1 was planned as has Felixstowe Road.	It would now be safer, shorter and more pleasant to route NCN1 straight on at the point shown on the map, along Main Road under the junction of A12/A1214 to rejoin the existing route at the junction of A1214 and Deben Avenue.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
47	Stratton Hall	Between Nacton and Trimley	Lack of safe walk routes between Nacton and Trimley	use 1/2 of the Felixstowe road as a cycle track and walkway	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	Developer, SCC, NH, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.21)	Critical

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
51	Aldringham Cum Thorpe	the entire A1094 from Friday street to Aldeburgh but especially the stretch between Frisyon and Alfeburgh.	fast road with cars doing 60mph, having to brake heavily when coming upon bikes. road is often busy both ways and insulates meaning it becomes difficult to pass the cyclists safely.with the increase in hgvs traffic expected for the wind farm installation something needs to be done to protect the cyclists	I have no solution but as a motorist I'm petrified of slow moving cyclists going up.hill and meeting them before I've been able to brake sufficiently.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
52	Felixstowe	Old Felixstowe, walk to Felixstowe Ferry	The pathway by the sea down to Felixstowe Ferry is hard core or gravel, which makes walking difficult and renders it almost impossible for wheelchair users or buggies to complete the walk to the ferry and the cafes at Felixstowe Ferry.	To replace the rough walking surface with a smooth surface to encourage walkers to reach Felixstowe Ferry.	High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
53	<Null>	The old river crossing ,north gate, Beccles	May not be East Suffolk, but there is a disused railway line goes from the old railway river crossing in Beccles, to Gillingham, geldeston, ellingham, bungay .  I tried to cycle a small section recently, impossible, very overgrown... But as in Derbyshire, a reclaimed railway line are brilliant for traffic free walking and cycling	Talk to the land owner / set up a charity work party	Largely outside East Suffolk so has not been assessed for IDF.					
57	Martlesham	The whole of Sandy Lane from old Martlesham to Woodbridge	There is currently no safe pedestrian access from Old Martlesham to Woodbridge. Would strongly recommend installing a footpath full length of Sandy Lane from Top Street Martlesham to Ipswich Rd Woodbridge.	There is currently no safe pedestrian access from Old Martlesham to Woodbridge. Would strongly recommend installing a footpath full length of Sandy Lane from Top Street Martlesham to Ipswich Rd Woodbridge.	Very High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Desirable
58	<Null>	many places	on narrow FOOTPATHS cycles and buggy(go carts) creep up on walkers or ride at speed towards and fail to give warning before speeding up from behind. cyclists along the sea front seem to prefer to ride on the footpath rather than the designated cycle path never dismount at the pier - ride like hooligans on the bascular bridge regardless of pedestrians  social distancing is more important now than ever	keep bikes and walkers separate in well defined areas  in the last 10 years I have walked 77million steps mainly in the Lowestoft oulton broad area footpaths need to be safe for us walkers	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
60	Lowestoft	Gorleston Road (as an example)	The cycle lanes throughout Lowestoft all need repainting.	Paint plus workers	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
62	Aldeburgh	Thorpe Rd Aldeburgh, the full length of this road between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness.	Many cyclists use this road as it is difficult to cycle all the way to Thorpeness along the beach/foreshore, both because of the terrain and the number of people using the footpath. This road has a 60mph speed limit and because it is straight many people drive fast. It is therefore a dangerous road for cyclists and families to use.  It should also be noted that this road runs along side a nature reserve and the risk to wildlife is significant. Deer are also a danger to drivers.	Get the speed limit reduced to 30mph so that it becomes safer and links the 30mph limits in Aldeburgh and Thorpeness together.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
63	Kesgrave	Main road Kesgrave from Martlesham to Ipswich hospital	You talk about cycling strategies to improve access- I have reported this many times over the years about the poor state of the cycle path and poor condition potholed surface on Kesgrave to Ipswich main road cycle path. It's simple- improve cycling numbers by providing Dutch style standard surfaces to cycle on. No more cycle repairs due to rubbish poorly maintained cycle paths like this one!!!!	I've mentioned this as above	High	£1,900,000-£2,000,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
64	Felixstowe	Footpath leading to steps to the beach at the end of Martello Lane, Felixstowe. Known as Jacobs Ladder I believe	The footpath is overgrown. You need to weave your way along avoiding weeds, plants, dead foliage etc along with overhanging branches from neighbouring houses	The footpath is overgrown. You need to weave your way along avoiding weeds, plants, dead foliage etc along with overhanging branches from neighbouring houses	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
65	Barnby	New Road	A general issue that reports of road problems which affect cyclists are not taken seriously by the highways department. At this location there is a big dip in the road where the telegraph line crosses the road. It is a downhill stretch and if you do not know about it then it could lead to a cyclist being dismounted or coming off the road (this has happened).	The highways department to take cycling issues seriously and fix accordingly.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
66	Martlesham	Broomfield to Eagle way,	The path is too narrow to safely support both cyclists and walkers due to a very tight bent. . There have been collisions in the past at this point.	Cyclists should be re routed via Broomfield to Eagle Way	Not assessed for IDF.					
67	Kesgrave	Grange Farm Cycle way	Very poorly maintained and by end of summer is badly overgrown. Additionally people enter the combined Cycle / walkway from hidden junctions.	Need a better maintenance and clearance so its possible to see people entering the cycle track.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
68	Martlesham	Path alongside the A12	By mid summer the path becomes overgrown reducing it to single file.	If you cannot cut during bird nesting you should really cut back hard at the beginning of the summer or clear the vegetation altogether	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
69	Hollesley	road from hollesley village (rectory road) , moors farm corner to shingle street.	The road to Shingle Street from Moors farm, which is a minor road, has 5 very dangerous blind corners, yet it is sign posted at national speed limit. This road has become very busy with walkers and cyclists (including many children), horse riders and dog walkers, tourists including campervans, 'boy racers' and large heavy vehicles. It also includes a national cycle way and is used as a Duke of Edinburgh Award walk.  Further information on request as I have lived on this road for 35 years.	Reduce speed limit to 30 or less and please look at the corners before their is fatalities	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
71	Reydon	Jermyns road, entire length	Jermyns road is a road with Reydon primary school just off it, it is very dangerous with fast traffic. My son rides his bike to school but I am fearful of the traffic and would appreciate some traffic calming measures, as in most areas with a school on/near the road	Traffic calming, 20 mph limit	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
73	Martlesham	Sandy lane, Martlesham	This lane is the connection between the cycle lanes of Martlesham/Kesgrave and Woodbridge. It is used as a short cut for traffic to and from Woodbridge and is national speed limit which creates dangerous conditions for all cyclists particularly those who don't know the road well and children.	20 or 30 MPH limit. Access only for motorised vehicles?	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
74	Woodbridge	Ipswich Road, Woodbridge	Very dangerous for cyclists on the route into Woodbridge	Dedicated cycle lane, possibly two way alongside/incorporating the wide footpath, as far as the Cherry tree road junction. Provide some quality bike parking in Woodbridge.	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	Access and junction improvements at Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club	Essential/Critical

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
75 <Null>		County wide	The issue for cyclists is a lack of dedicated infrastructure along with having to cycle on fast, dangerous small roads alongside drivers who assume entitlement.	<p>We have a vast network of ancient lanes and byways, many of which are not heavily used by motorised vehicles but do not necessarily join up to go anywhere safely. Some of these lanes could be connected with new sections built to join settlements as needed.</p> <p>Possible rules along these routes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No through traffic</li> <li>2. A new speed limit of 25mph for all other traffic requiring access.</li> <li>3. A change in insurance liability similar to the Dutch article 185 of road law along these routes, thus deterring traffic further and encouraging family use.</li> </ol> <p>As most of the roads already exist, it could be a cost effective solution with major impact.</p> <p>Such routes, if well planned, may well serve to encourage family cycling holidays, such as are seen in other countries, and if a few campsites or cheap lodgings were encouraged along the way, would likely boost tourism substantially.</p>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
87 <Null>		Ipswich to villages (this issue also applies to every town in Suffolk)	There are no safe cycle routes between Ipswich and villages within a 15 miles radius. Where they exist few drivers keep to the 30mph limits and there are far too many stretches with just the National Speed Limit. On relatively narrow roads this leaves cyclists and pedestrians very close to vehicles doing up to 70mph. Safety concerns are a major reason that more people do not cycle or walk.	Create dedicated cycle and pedestrian routes to link villages with Ipswich. Where possible these routes should exclude vehicles except for access or have enforced speed limits. The routes should also have the sort of cycling safety features that Holland has introduced	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
88 Melton		Woodbridge to villages (this issue also applies to every town in Suffolk)	There are no safe cycle routes between Woodbridge and villages within a 15 miles radius. Where they exist few drivers keep to the 30mph limits and there are far too many stretches with just the National Speed Limit. On relatively narrow roads this leaves cyclists and pedestrians very close to vehicles doing up to 70mph. Safety concerns are a major reason that more people do not cycle or walk.	Create dedicated cycle and pedestrian routes to link villages with Ipswich. Where possible these routes should exclude vehicles except for access or have enforced speed limits. The routes should also have the sort of cycling safety features that Holland has introduced	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
89	Tuddenham St Martin	westerfield lane and high street tuddenham st martin	this lane is used as a rat run throughout the day and quite often speeding motorists, HGVs petrol tankers brewery lorries. This is a single track lane and during lockdown it was very pleasant to cycle, walk down this lane as then you didnt have to dive for cover when an annoyed motorist would want you to jump out their way asap. Which is quite dangerous at times....little lane has pull ins and these are being made bigger by the heavy traffic that tries and push forward, so ruining the verges	make this lane a QUIET LANE and NO access to HGV's only for local traffic ..... its even worse when orwell bridge is shut as its like the M25 !!!! with alot of near misses	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
90	Martlesham	From Felixstowe Road junction with Mill Lane (track to the RSPCA) to just before Crown Point	Cars passing cyclists on 2 blind bends and having to cut back in across the path of the cyclist as a car comes the other way round the bend. I have personally had several 'near misses'. The area is a serious accident waiting to happen.	Increasingly busy as a 'rat run', the cars need to be slowed down. Suggest 2 speed humps: one by the Mill Lane/RSPCA junction and one further down near Crown Point to slow cars in both directions where the blind bends are.	Traffic management not assessed by IDF.					
93	Otley	The road between Otley and Crettingham	There are safe and pleasant routes for pleasure cycling around Monewden and Framdsen. The only way to access these routes from Otley is via Chapel Rd towards Crettingham. This road is narrow and has no speed limit. Vehicles drive very fast on this road. This road is a major reasons that families and children cannot cycle in safety around Otley	Add cycle lanes, reduce the speed limit, add warning signs	N/A	£2,500,000-£3,000,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
94	Swilland	Junction Gibraltar Rd and B1078	This is on route from Otley to Swilland and towards Ipswich. The B1078 is fast and straight with only NSL. Crossing on foot or bike from Otley is very dangerous. I do it by myself but would not risk it with a group especially if it included inexperienced cyclists or children	Better signage, speed limit, central reservation	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
95	Martlesham	In and around Martlesham/Martlesham Heath and Woodbridge	Few, if any, footpaths are accessible for wheelchair users, which means that I cannot accompany my friends and family when they go for walks. Shared footpaths with cyclists are a problem because often I can't hear cyclists coming from behind me, and they ride too close.	Make more footpaths accessible for wheelchair users (and parents with prams/buggies) especially in local beauty spots Separate pedestrians from cyclists, or provide a barrier so that cyclists can't ride so close.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
96	Martlesham	Sandy Lane between The Street and its junction with California north of the railway bridge	This is a derestricted section connecting two 30mph areas. It's part of the National Cycle Network serving commuters and businesses on Sandy Lane south of the railway. The Parish council has been asking for several years to have this made 30mph on safety grounds. Nothing has happened. To encourage sustainable transport this key part of the only viable cycle route between Woodbridge and Martlesham need be improved, as does the Old Felixstowe Road.	Make the section of Sandy Lane between The Street and California a 30mph area.  The attached satellite view gives a good impression of the number of business along that road.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
101	Mettingham	Cycle route between Bungay and Beccles	Not currently a safe direct cycle route to Beccles from Bungay. The main road is very fast and cars often overtake on hills and blind corners, the smaller roads are equally fast with blind corners and generally poor road condition.	Cycle path along the B1062 road	N/A	£4,000,000-£4,500,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
102	South Cove	b1127	I agree that the B1127 is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. It would also be great to have a cycle route from Reydon to Kessingland, rather than crossing the A12	Make the Coastal path suitable for mountain bikes?	Not assessed for IDF.					
103	Reydon	southwold and reydon main roads	Congestion in the tourist season makes it difficult for cyclists.	More cycle lanes.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
105	Leiston Cum Sizewell	On the shared use cycle path along Lovers Lane towards Sizewell.	The cycle path is great but in a few places there are bollards on the pavement which encroach on the space and make it impossible for a cyclist to pass a pedestrian or other cycle on the path. This shared use path is well used by walkers and cyclists but we repeatedly have to join the road here as it is not possible to pass others. It is particularly awkward as this is really well used by families and children.	The bollards just need removing! I am not sure why they are there. Also, perhaps a guide line on the path for pedestrians/cyclists half of the path?	Not assessed for IDF.					
106	Beccles	Between Suffolk town centre of Beccles and Suffolk town centre of Bungay (in partnership with Norfolk).	Having no direct route between the Suffolk towns and having the old railway route unused.	Between Suffolk town of Beccles and Suffolk town of Bungay (in partnership with Norfolk). Reconnect the town's by making use of the old railway route as a new cycle path. This would be away from roads, existing infrastructure (bridges, embankments and cuttings), minimal / no gradients, countryside views, direct route between town centres and for the majority of their route likely to be unused and already furnished with trees, hedges and the odd bit of history along the way.	Largely outside East Suffolk so has not been assessed for IDF.					
107	Shipmeadow	Between Low Road and Puddingmore / Ballygate	Busy road between Beccles and Bungay with no cycleway and only a broken bit of pavement could see a combined cycle/foot path added (as long as it doesn't destroy hedgerows / trees)	Low Road is an ideal and pleasant route into Bungay that avoids the hills and much of the main road from Beccles. However, to get to Low Road from Beccles there is no cycle path and only a patchy / unsuitable pedestrian path.	Very High	£1,600,000-£1,700,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
108	Darsham	A 12 cycle path from Kelsale to Hinton is not maintained and is largely therefore unsafe to use.	Both the surface and surrounding hedgerows etc are not maintained and the cycle path in many places isn't usable, so you have to cycle on the A12, which is often quite unpleasant on a bike among fast, heavy traffic	Maintain the cycle paths	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
110	Snape	A1094 This is the only link between Woodbridge/Snape to Knodishall/Leiston.	The traffic is fast and frequent. The undulating road means people take risks when overtaking. Riding a bike feels unsafe and you have to cross both lanes of traffic.	Half a mile of cycleway beside the carriage way.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
111	Hollesley	Sutton Hoo to Hollesley Village (Melton Road/Heath Road)	Road is unsafe for cyclists due to large volume of fast traffic. As the road is straight it gives the impression that you can drive fast. It is undulating and very narrow. Alternative routes to Hollesley or Hollesley Common are a long way round.	A separate lane for cyclists. Maybe through the forest or making use of bridleways across Sutton Common (with surface for normal bikes).	N/A	£1,600,000-£1,700,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
113	Friston	Snape to Aldeburgh	The A1094 is too busy and there is no other way of cycling to Aldeburgh.	Use of the coastal path for cyclists as well as walkers. Surfacing in some places, fencing of livestock and extending from Hazlewood Common into Aldeburgh.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	Access and junction improvements at Land rear of Rose Hill	Essential/Critical
114	South Cove	The B1127 between Wrentham and Reydon	It is extremely unfriendly for walkers and cyclists. In spite of it being a minor road with double bends and poor visibility cars come at speed making it very unsafe.	There should be speed restriction and a cycle lane	N/A	£3,000,000-£3,500,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
115	Trimley St Mary	Trinket high road	Cycle lane markings are virtually invisible and need re painting.	Re mark cycle lanes	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
116	Felixstowe	High Road East, Felixstowe	Very poor road surface in cycle lane	Road needs resurfacing, not just another top dressing, which makes matters worse for cyclists	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
118	Felixstowe	No entry in to th ASL from 2 directions	The Garrison lane traffic lights has no entry lane into the box either from the south bound direction or the west bound	Your the engineers work it out. Last time I commented on the west bound and you removed the north bound. The whole system needs a rethink. Painted advisory cycle lanes are continually parked on rendering them useless, they are often not wide enough especially when they contain drains	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
119	Felixstowe	School traffic	At school start time there is a lot of contention when parents park on the double yellow lines across the cycleway or crisscrossing the cycle way to drop off kids.	Why can't they use the drop off circle that was designed for this within the school freeing up the high road . And the school should reopen the Maidstone entrance for cyclist	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
122	Trimley St Martin	Cycle pathway alongside A14	It's over grown and VERY uneven	A significant tidy up, re tarmac pathway	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
123	Purdis Farm	Purdis Heath SSSI - Purdis Farm Lane at the junction with Purdis Avenue	New fences with stiles have been erected in the past few weeks along with a large gate across the wide path. It looks like the plan is to be able to close the gate to prevent any vehicle/bike access but it's not clear whether there will be access for wheelchairs or buggies. We regularly use this path with a wheelchair buggy.	Stiles should not be being installed on any footpath without also providing a gate big enough for a large wheelchair or mobility scooter. This applies to all areas.	Not assessed for IDF.					
126	Lowestoft	Corton Road, Lowestoft	The painted on cycle lanes along the length of Corton Road have been allowed to fade (like a lot of other cycles lanes on other roads in Lowestoft) and have not been repainted. The presence of these lanes and provide reassurance to cyclists using the road.	Repaint and maintain the cycle lanes.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
127	Lowestoft	High Street between Camden Street and Mariners Street, Lowestoft	Cycles are permitted to ride south along this part and there is no contraflow cycle lane painted onto the road. If one was here it would give confidence to people cycling in that direction and also remind motorists this is permitted. The southern end of high street between Dukes head street and the Triangle market area, also needs resurfacing as its becoming very uncomfortable and bumpy when cycling over.	Paint a contraflow cycle lane and resurface the High street where it needs doing.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF, on-road white lines have not been assessed by the IDF.					
130	Hollesley	Street between Duck Corner and Woodbridge Walk, Hollesley	main road between two parts of the village, but no cycle or footpath. Both parts of the village are within a cycling distance but the 60mph speed limit and no pathways make it too dangerous.  Has been spoken about for at least twenty years but no positive outcome.	Some cycle or footpath to allow people to safely walk from one part of the village to another.	N/A	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
134	Frostenden	Frostenden Hall	Cyclists using footpaths putting walkers, employees and contractors in danger.  It is illegal for a cyclist to cycle along a public footpath without the land owner's permission. Very few cyclists are aware of this.	Educate cyclists . Identification numbers on cycles will help deter persistent offenders. Inform navigation apps that some of their information could be incorrect	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
136	<Null>	New cycle lane barriers	The barriers are an improvement of sorts except that they seem to give drivers the impression at they can drive as close to them as they like! If you have a bike with 2 full panniers, it is difficult to join and exit through the barriers.	Make the cycle lanes wider and improve entrance and exit areas especially near roundabouts.  General comment for ALL cycle lanes - STOP any vehicles parking in them!	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
137	Felixstowe	Felixstowe, Undercliffe Rd at the Leisure Centre car park	Section of road (part of national cycle route 51) extremely dangerous for cyclists due to uncontrolled parking along the road on the Leisure Centre car park side.	Double yellow lines along this section of road on the car park side. Could provide some 30 minute free parking spaces in the nearby leisure centre and Convalescent Hill car parks to mitigate any impact on the businesses facing the leisure centre car park.	Double yellow lines have not been assessed in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
138	Westerfield	Lower Road, Westerfield	Lower Road and Church Lane are used as a rat run by large numbers of motorists seeking a short cut to main routes West of Ipswich. This is made worse when there are closures of the Orwell Bridge.  There is no footpath along much of this route, forcing pedestrians to mix with often speeding traffic. As a resident of the village, I know that a number of other residents are afraid to walk there, particularly the more elderly. This results in both unnecessary car journeys and social isolation.	My suggestion would be to make both Lower Road and Church Lane one-way for motor traffic, as there are viable alternative routes into and out of the village. Proper footways could then be installed and a contraflow cycle lane, preferably with grade separation, or, at minimum, flexible wands or similar.	Modal Filter					
139	Trimley St Martin	Morston Hall Road between Levington and Trimley	This is mostly a single track road with passing places used by cyclists as a commuting and leisure route between Ipswich and Felixstowe. The width of the single lane sections does not leave a lot of room for vehicles to overtake or for oncoming vehicles to pass and a large proportion of drivers see no reason to slow down when passing, so it can often feel unsafe for cyclists.	There is a very wide verge along the whole length of Morston Hall Road which could be converted to a dedicated cycle path or shared use path.	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
146	Otley	Gibraltar Road / Ipswich Road & Thomsons Lane	FYI - These three lanes have been proposed by Otley as potential 'Green Lanes' under SCC's latest initiative. They make an ideal cycle / walking /horse riding route between Otley, Ashbocking & Swilland avoiding the B1078 / B1077 & B1079 Road triangle.	Extend the 40mph Speed limit on the B1078 from Ashbocking towards Otley encompass the "Swilland" cross roads"....	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
147	Otley	Thomson's Lane, Otley.	FYI - Proposed by Otley as a potential Green Lane under the current SCC Initiative	Please support this proposal...	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
148	Otley	Ipswich Road, Otley	FYI - Proposed by Otley as a potential Green Lane under the current SCC Initiative	Please support this proposal...	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
153	Great Bealings	Seckford Hall Road (West of A12 Woodbridge)	Consider incorporating this lane into a designated cycle route from woodbridge to the Bealings and out lying villages.	Some sort of protected status such as Green Lane, no HGV' route, reduced speed limit, currently national speed limit status	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
157	Otley	Chapel Road, Otley	Land allocated for significant housing development within the village. Increases in the number of houses within the village will inevitably increase the amount of motorised traffic within the village, which in turn will make the roads feel less safe for cyclists, parents of children and other road users (Mobilty Scooters, Horse riders etc). This will have a detrimental effect on the plan to increase cycling and walking...	1. Install a 'Full sized' roundabout on Chapel Road at the point of this development (where the Primary School, Village Hall and Doctors Surgery are currently located). This would help significantly to reduce 'speeding' traffic along Chapel Road. 2. Reduce the Village 30mph speed limits to 20mph...	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
158	Rendlesham	Rendlesham has no safe walking or cycling connectivity to anywhere else...	Rendlesham is accessible only from the A1152 - all entry/exits are along that road which has no foot/cycle path. There is no signage to indicate cyclists/walkers may be present. The speed limit of 40 stops before Rendlesham Mews - and is frequently exceeded by drivers who presume it's a safe-for-them straight stretch, they can see the upcoming increase of speed permission sign. Vehicles passing the Mews at 60 mph+ makes it unsafe for cyclists to turn into the Mews and lanes beyond.	Create a path along the A1152 to extend from the roundabout to the Mews. Extend the speed limit to 40 all the way to Eyke. This would remove the dangerous 60 stretch that includes turnings to the Mews and to the lanes that lead to Friday Street/the forest on one side and to Rendlesham St Gregory's Church/Campsey Ash/Wickham Market on the other. Put up signage on the A1152 that indicates to drivers that they are passing through a residential area where cyclists and walkers may be present.	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Beneficial
160	Melton	B1438 Woodbridge to Wickham Market	This is a direct route between the two towns, avoiding the A12 Dual Carriageway. Local traffic uses this road in preference to the A12. With increased housing being seen in Wickham traffic levels will rise hence increasing the vulnerability of cyclists using this route, including any young persons wishing to cycle to/from school in Woodbridge.	Create a dedicated cycle lane the whole route, improve cycling related signage and reduce speed limits. Make Melton traffic lights a cycle friendly road junction and extend the cycle route up Woods lane to the Melton A12 roundabout (connect with existing cycle route/path). Continue the cycle route into Woodbridge via Melton hill as per other suggestions. Maybe connect it with a riverside foot/cycle path at Wilford Bridge	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,00	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
164	Melton	Between Woods Lane lights, Melton to Bromeswell Roundabout to Sutton Hoo	Road is extremely busy, narrow and has blind bends. It is the only way into Woodbridge (and beyond) for cyclists coming from villages on Bawdsey peninsula and yet there is no cycling infrastructure. The stretch between Melton level crossing and the junction on the Hollesley and Alderton roads near Sutton Hoo are particularly dangerous for cyclists with cars overtaking on blind bends and not giving space to cyclists.	Cycle lanes on all roads into Woodbridge from surrounding villages.	High	£3,500,000-£4,000,000	SCC, DFT, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	Access and junction improvements at Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club	Essential/Critical
166	Bromeswell	Road between Sutton Hoo and Rock Barracks	No pavement or cycle lane - vehicles travel extremely fast on this road (60mph) and yet there is no cycle lane or pedestrian route from the barracks into Woodbridge. Many people walk this route (especially from the Travellers Site) and it is very dangerous - especially in the dark. There should be a safe cycle route from all the villages into Woodbridge to enable people to commute by bicycle instead of driving, especially as the bus services are so infrequent and do not connect with trains.	Cycle lane from villages into Woodbridge plus pavement/pedestrian footpath between Barracks and Melton.	N/A	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
167	Otley	X-roads on B1078 with Gibraltar Rd. Otley and High Rd. Swilland.	V. dangerous junction because of speed of traffic and overtaking on B1078 .	Extend the speed limit of 40 mph at the Ashbocking x-roads so that it continues all the way to the 40 mph limit near Otley College.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
168	Hoo	Chimer Lane/Hall Lane/Honeypot Lane junction near Charsfield	This whole area not just this confluence of c -roads is an exceptionally rich completely rural area which offers outstanding cycling. The nature of the roads is that of restricted width and with many blind bends. Unfortunately motorists seem to think it is a racetrack and often are moving at unsafe speeds for cyclists. At least once in last month I have been almost brushed by a passing car at speed, unsafe for him/her and me	The diversity of nature is outstanding in this area. Just today cycling that route I encountered a young stag with approximately 8 points on his antlers, several buzzards, hunting; various other birds and rabbits. An upper speed limit of 40mph on such roads whilst not making them safe would reduce some of the risk. Could we have a countryside limit please in Suffolk or lobby for such nationally on roads of a diminished width?	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
170	Woodbridge	Cumberland Street	Drivers consistently ignore the time restrictions and use this route as a rat-run.	Turning the road into fully 1-way from North-East to South-West would reduce it's desirability as a rat-run - but continue to allow 2-way bicycle traffic	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
171	Woodbridge	The Thoroughfare	Cars using the road as a rat-run	Reversing the one-way direction would remove the routes desirability as a rat-run.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
172	Aldeburgh	Aldeburgh...et al	Like many of our towns Aldeburgh high street is often full of cars...especially during holiday seasons..making life difficult for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users.	Promote the idea of regular car free days across the district....where cars are banned from the centre of towns such as Aldeburgh, Woodbridge, Southwold, Framlingham, Halesworth, Beccles, Bungay etc...Maybe one Sunday per month..in support of World Car free day..it works in London why not in Suffolk	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
177	Clopton	B1078 junction with Manor Road at Clopton IP13 6QN	Traffic coming up the hill in Easterly direction is often speeding and also often overtakes on the brow of the hill where the driver can have no view of road ahead. At the top of the hill is a road junction, a blind corner, a village hall, a childrens' play area and a bus stop. Cycling and walking along this stretch of road is made suicidal by speeding traffic, and HGVs. It is necessary to cross this road to access local footpaths, the childrens play area and the village hall.	A speed limit through the village of 30mph would be a good idea to start with. At the very least, double white lines (no overtaking) up the hill to prevent blind overtaking would be a step forward.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
178	Clopton	B1079 between Grundisburgh and Otley	Twisty narrow road with considerable lorry traffic is not safe for cyclists or walkers.	Newly developed cycling routes should avoid this road.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
181	<Null>	Bridleways & Footpaths missing from mapping software	The mapping system does not appear to show 'bridleways' and 'footpaths'. Suffolk has many bridleways which make good offroad routes for walkers and cyclists both for leisure and for local use as connections to local services. The marker is tagging the end of bridleway that connects Gosbeck with Pettaugh as an example, this route is often overgrown and rutted by tractors.	Ensure that all bridleways (RUPP's, BOATs' et al) are maintained to a minimum standard of width and firm surface to enable cyclists and less abled walkers to use them safely.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
182	Otley	Footpath East of Otley Bottom	Footpath that runs from driveway of Chalet Bungalow at Otleybottom up hill (NE direction) and across to unamed road from Church Road is often completely overgrown, muddy and lacking any form of maintenance including repair of broken styles and signage.	Maintain footpath to a higher standard....this path represents a viable walking route from Suffolk Rural College to Otley Village.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
184	Burgh	B1079, Grundisburgh to Otley	This particular section of the B1079 is a narrow, windy and undulating road and poses a real safety challenge to anyone wishing to walk, mobility Scoot, cycle or ride a horse along it. Its common to see organised 'charity' rides using it as part of their route planning to/from Woodbridge, which further puts cyclists at risk as well as making overtaking difficult for following vehicles.	1. Create one continuous 30mph speed limit along its length, Otley to Woodbridge. 2. Develop an alternative 'cycle' route via the parallel smaller lanes. 3. Encourage organised rides not to use this part of the B1079.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
186	Waldringfield	Footpaths in and around Waldringfield, and elsewhere throughout East Suffolk	With the rising popularity of cycling we seem to have lost respect for the differences between footpaths and bridleways. Cyclists seem to no longer acknowledge that footpaths are not for cycling along, making it potentially dangerous for walkers and causing damage to footpaths. In the same way that cyclists wish to see improvements to the road infrastructure to feel safe from vehicles we need to acknowledge that there are similar issues on footpaths...which are NOT rights of way for cyclists.	A campaign of education about the differences between footpaths and bridleways coupled with improved signage and potentially sanctions for non compliance	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
188	Corton	Hopton to North Lowestoft lack of a cycle route either along the A47, the coast road from Corton to Hopton or on bits of the old railway line.	There is no dedicated cycle route from north Lowestoft to Gorleston or Yarmouth. There is a dedicated cycle path alongside the A47 in Norfolk, from Gorleston to Hopton, after that there is nothing. Cyclists either have to go along the busy A47 or the coast road, which has high hedges, sharp bends and adds distance to the journey. This road is used by tourists staying at facilities in Corton and Hopton, who are not used to tight bends and cyclists. It is a real health and safety issue.	The options are either a continuation of the cycle path alongside the A47 from Hopton to the Corton Long Lane roundabout and possibly a spur off to Oulton Broad or a dedicated cycle route alongside the coast road.	Medium	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, CIL, NH	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT	Potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)  Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
191	Oulton Broad	Beccles Road to Suffolk Wildlife Trust's Carlton Marshes	There should be provision of cycle hire at Oulton Broad South railway station for visitors to the Carlton Marshes reserve who arrive by train, also a dedicated cycle route from the station to the nature reserve. This would assist ecotourism, visitor numbers to the reserve and assist locals cycling in the area as well.	Either a dedicated cycle route by the Angles Way route from the reserve to Oulton Broad or a dedicated cycle route along Beccles Road.	High	£950,000-£1,000,000	SCC	SCC		Beneficial
192	Saxmundham	B1121 between Benhal Saxmundham and Kelsale	Three villages cycle path	the three villages cycle path should be put in place ASAP	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT		
194	Framlingham	Framlingham - New Road to B1120 Brabling Green	Road is crying out to be a Quiet Lane. Heavily used by both cyclists and walkers pretty much the whole length. Also, the 60 mph speed limit should be reduced and appropriate signage installed at each end plus repeaters at appropriate intervals.	Road is crying out to be a Quiet Lane. Heavily used by both cyclists and walkers pretty much the whole length. Also, the 60 mph speed limit should be reduced and appropriate signage installed at each end plus repeaters at appropriate intervals.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team. Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
195	North Cove	End of combined cycle-way/footpath from North Cove church to The Street	Cyclists exit the cycle way at speed without stopping to give way at the end sometimes going over the bonnets of cars travelling from the A146 towards Pinewood Gardens and Marsh Lane.	Just repainting the Give Way lines and triangle so that it shows up more to see if that helps resolve the problem.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
197	Barnby	Barnby bends	The road is far too narrow and winding and it needs a cycle path/lane that follows the same route but takes cycles off the main road as it is dangerous and causes huge tailbacks. The only cycle route takes cyclists so far off this route that they just don't use it! I would not dare cycle to work because it is just dangerous and any other route is far too far round (via Mutford)	Totally bypass the Barnby bends and include a cycle path - this has been needed for decades! At least widen the road to include a proper cycle path on each side of the road	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000 (cycle infrastructure only not highway)	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, ESC, DFT		Essential
199	Levington	Old Felixstowe Road (formerly A45) between Felixstowe Road/Seven Hills and Levington slip road off A14	Ideal stretch of road to introduce segregated cycle lanes &/or reduce speed limits &/or prohibit through vehicular movement other than if required for public transport or "Operation Stack" An alternative is needed to Cycle route 51 (via Stratton Hall, Levington Church and Nacton village, which although is a picturesque leisure ride, is considerably longer than the direct route, and is also quite hilly in several places	This was once the main A45 (now A14), the speed limit is still 60mph or 70mph in the dual carriageway near Bridge Road. This 2-mile length of road could be provided with a separated cycle lane in both directions &/or have the speed limit reduced to 20 or 30mph as it runs completely parallel with the A14 dual carriageway. I appreciate the road has historically been used for "Operation Stack", but Port of Felixstowe's Vehicle Booking System has largely removed the need for the road to be designated in this way 24/7/365.	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	Developer, SCC, NH, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.21)	Critical
200	Melton	North of Melton Old Church	Road frequently flooded. This is especially dangerous for cyclists because there are often potholes that cannot be seen under the water. Also there is a thick layer of mud along the centre of the road. This is an important route for those wishing to cycle between Ufford and Melton/Woodbridge.	Flooding and mud has been reported numerous times but SCC Highways have failed to provide any drainage.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
201	Bredfield	Junction of A12 and New Road between Melton and Bredfield	At busy times it is very difficult and hazardous for cyclists to cross the A12 when travelling between Melton and Bredfield. The A12 carriageway is very wide at this junction	Provide central reservation for cyclists and pedestrians. This could also make the junction safer for motorists.	Not assessed for IDF.					
203	Rendlesham	Rendlesham to Woodbridge A1152 Road	Provision of a dedicated cycle lane/path. With the intended major housing development at Rendlesham, it will only serve to increase the amount of motorised traffic travelling to and from Woodbridge via Wilford Bridge. This will actively discourage people from cycling.	There is a huge opportunity for a dedicated cycle/footpath lane to be established along this road to encourage people to cycle to/from Woodbridge rather than use their cars. (Similar maybe to the one already in existence between Leiston and Sizewell) There is plenty of room and it could easily connect with other cycle / walking infrastructure at Woodbridge. As well as use for local journeys such as cycling to school it would also be useful for leisure / tourist cycling connecting Woodbridge with the Rendlesham forest area and the coast	N/A	£3,600,000-£3,700,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT		Essential
204	Woodbridge	The Thoroughfare, Woodbridge	This is a narrow ancient street where cars pedestrians and cyclists are not segregated, Despite the no access to vehicles at certain times restriction cars and delivery vehicles are still ignoring this, creating a conflict particularly between pedestrians, mobility scooters and vehicles.	Install 'pop up' barriers/bollards at the Melton End (& retain existing one way system) as per the centre of Cambridge to remove all non essential motorised traffic from this street completely. This would make the whole Thoroughfare a more pleasant place to 'be in' both for local residents, shoppers, and visitors to woodbridge. Deliveries to shops could be made overnight, emergency services could have transponders...it works in Cambridge why not Woodbridge or indeed other East Suffolk towns which have a 'thoroughfare' style main street.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
207	Snape	Cycle route Snape to Aldeburgh avoiding A1094	Cycling along the A1094 can be perilous at times and not encouraging for inexperienced/young cyclists	Consider upgrading the Suffolk Coastal Route path from Snape to Aldeburgh to a 'gravel' cycle/footpath path from Snape, through marshes to the western fringe of Aldeburgh, continue 'cycle/footpath' into town centre.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	Access and junction improvements at Land rear of Rose Hill	Essential/Critical
209	Hollesley	The road to Shingle Street	The road is very congested and during the summer a huge number of cars park on the verges, ruining the unique beauty of the beach and marshes. It is difficult and dangerous for walkers and cyclists to navigate the traffic.	The road should be used by vehicles only for access to the homes at Shingle Street. Visitors should be required to park at the Shepherd & Dog pub or the Suffolk Punch Trust and walk or cycle to the beach. Bikes and trailers could be offered for hire to raise funds for the community, and the Trust, village shop and pub would also benefit from increased footfall in the village.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
210	Stratford St Andrew	Where the cycle route crosses the A12 just west of Farnham (Tinker Brook)	The 30mph limit stops just short of this crossing. If it was extended a 100 metres or so toward Glemham it would be safer to cross the A12 by bicycle.	The 30mph limit stops just short of this crossing. If it was extended a 100 metres or so toward Glemham it would be safer to cross the A12 by bicycle.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
211	Cransford	Bannocks Lane Cransford	This is on a marked cycle route. When the road was resurfaced pot holes were not filled prior to coverage with chippings. This makes the the pot holes more dangerous as it is much more difficult to see them.  This applies in many other areas of the region and is potentially very dangerous both to cycles and cyclists.	All pot holes should be repaired prior to any surface dressing being applied. Contractors work needs to be thoroughly checked by council officials.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
212	Otley	Thompson Lane Ashbocking/Otley	Road surface is falling apart making it difficult to cycle	Resurface and reduce crowning/camber to make cycling safer	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF					
213	Melton	River Wall path between Wilford Bridge and Woodbridge	This is currently a footpath, but could be changed to allow bikes.	Keeping the current surface would help to limit bike speed. Having a green cycle route between Melton& Woodbridge would provide relief from the poor road conditions.	Not assessed for IDF.					
218	Westerfield	Westerfield Business Centre / Station	Possible site for an Ipswich northern 'Park & Cycle' car park. There is nowhere to park when using Westerfield Station.	Given the emerging development north of Ipswich this would make a good spot for a park,ride and cycle carpark similiar to those seen around the fringes of Cambridge. This would enable those of us travelling into Ipswich from the North (aka East Suffolk District) to park up and then either use the train to go northward towards lowestoft or cycle(or walk) or bus the short distance into the middle of Ipswich.	Not assessed for IDF.					
219	Lowestoft	The Road surface between The Falcon Public House and Mariners Street.	The road surface heading south as you leave the cycle lane and head passed the Falcon public house is unsuitable for road bikes. It has been patched hundreds of times over a period of many years and is now unfit for cycling without a mountain bike.	The road needs resurfacing.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF					
220	Lowestoft	At the junction of Sussex road and Yarmouth road.	After some light rain the road here floods because of an ongoing problem with drainage. unfortunately there is a serious pothole next to a sunken drain cover which can end up submerged. If a cyclist was to ride through the flood and hit the pothole the accident would be serious.	This has been reported to Highways on a number of times with little effect. The flooding has been continuous for many years. You wouldn't think it would be too hard to drain an area like Yarmouth road which is on the top of a hill! (The Ravine). it needs a new drain and the pothole filling before someone gets hurt.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
221	Lowestoft	Cycle Lane on Corton Road	There is a designated Cycle lane running the length of the Corton Rd, that no one can use because there are always cars parked in it. It feels dangerous as a cyclist to have to constantly overtake these parked vehicles without a designated Cycle Lane.	Move the cycle lane to the outside of the parked vehicles as they do in Holland, and similar to the High Street outside the Lighthouse.	Not assessed for IDF.					
222	Blundeston	Lowestoft road coming into Blundeston Village	The walking/cycling links into and out of the village are awful, especially for kids who frequently use this road to access the skate park in the summer and vice versa with those venturing out. A pathway along the entire road would vastly improve access out of the village for those of all ages. There is a large development of houses about to be built near that road, meaning this worse is even more essential.	Investigate the safety of pedestrians in Blundeston entering and existing the village, especially children. Think about how it could improve social isolation. Also factor in this matter when giving permission to large housing developments.	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC		Essential

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
232	Swilland	B1078 & Swilland Crossroads	Turning right off the B1078 for cyclists is perilous, particularly during the rushhour periods when the B1078 is busy with streams of vehicles travelling at the speed limit which at this point is 60mph. Its noticeable that there is a tendency amongst some motorists to overtake at speed along this stretch into the face of oncoming traffic which if you are a cyclist or walker is actually terrifying....Traffic does not 'naturally give way' to anyone attempting to walk along the road.	As a minimum the Ashbocking 40mph limit should be extended to the College 40mph to create one continuous 40mph limit	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
233	Otley	Chapel Road, Otley	The School, Village hall and Doctors surgeries are all co-located at this point on Chapel Road. These are magnets for cars particularly at drop off times, this creates an area of local congestion and conflict with pedestrians particularly those with children trying to cross the road or indeed cycle to the school. Through traffic travelling at speed compounds the safety risk as the village hall carpark (which is used as the school drop off area) exit/entrance is on a blind bend.	Given the potential of further significant housing development in this area it would make sense to create a roundabout at this point giving safer access to the Hall carpark and Doctors surgery and also serve to calm the through traffic on Chapel road, a carpark within the development would also ease the congestion and provide some public off street parking within the village.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
238	Woodbridge	The junction of Warren Hill Road with Ipswich Road.	When cycling up the hill from the Cherry Tree Road mini roundabout it is extremely difficult and dangerous to move across in order to turn right into Warren Hill Road. When waiting at the junction in the middle of the road for a gap in the traffic in order to turn right is very hazardous.	Road markings need to mark out a right turn lane and a illuminated bollard would provide some protection/safety when waiting to turn.	Traffic management not assessed by IDF.					
239	Woodbridge	The traffic lights at the junction of The Thoroughfare and Melton Road.	When cycling into Woodbridge you may need to turn right at these traffic lights to either go straight over into the Thoroughfare or right into St.Johns Street. There is nothing marked on the road to show where cyclists should wait and nothing to protect you from oncoming traffic. The filter system of the lights often mean that you are waiting in the middle whilst traffic squeezes by on your inside and is also passing you on the other side.	A space for cyclists to wait, a bollard to protect and make traffic keep their distance. A mini roundabout may help.	Traffic management not assessed by IDF.					
240	<Null>	Along A1071between hadleigh road and A1214	No cycle route provided along this way for cyclists coming from south of ipswich and needing to get to hadleigh road.	With new estate being built a route through could be planned there is an existing foot path across fields that could be upgraded or an extra lane on either side of the existing A1071	Outside East Suffolk so not scored for IDF.					
241	<Null>	Underpass under the A14	Lack of cycling access through to sproughton meaning cyclists either have to go to central ipswich or the very busy Sproughton high street if attempting to get to the Sproughton road/Morrisons areas of ipswich	The current underpass be redesignated as having cycling access, and the steps on the hadleigh road side replaced with a ramp which will help cyclists, pedestrians with pushchairs/trolleys and those with walking difficulties	Largely outside East Suffolk so has not been assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
243	Aldringham Cum Thorpe	This whole redundant railway line should be surfaced and rebuilt as a cycleway between Leiston and Aldeburgh	Could be a dedicated cycleway with funding from the windfarms perhaps? You know - like a proper dedicated route like they have in other parts of the country.	Could be a dedicated cycleway with funding from the windfarms perhaps? You know - like a proper dedicated route like they have in other parts of the country.	N/A	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
247	Wantisden	Future Rendlesham / Bentwaters Development	Lack of Public Right of Way's connecting 'Rendlesham' to 'Rendlesham Forest', Wantisden, Butley and the coast.	1. Consider running a new cycle/footpath across Bentwaters Airfield to connect Rendlesham Housing estates with Wantisden Corner road. Provides an off road walking route and removes the need for cyclists to use the local 'B roads'. 2. Consider upgrading the 'path' that runs across the eastern end of the runway towards Friday Street.	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	N/A	Desirable
249	Bucklesham	Levington Lane & crossing the A14 at this point	There is a public right of way that crosses the A14 (Levington Lane) at this point via a gap in the central reservation. It is possible to get across without being killed but you have to be quick.... The A14 verges are often overgrown....	Tidy verges so that there is better visibility of the crossing.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
251	Nacton	A1156 Nacton to Warren Heath Ipswich	Limited cycle path from Seven Hills / Nacton into Ipswich	Consider providing a full cycle/footpath all the way from Nacton (even Seven Hills Junction) towards Warren Heath (Past the Show Ground)	N/A	£1,600,000-£1,700,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT	N/A	Essential
253	Kettleburgh	Easton to Kettleburgh Road, big dip in road about 0.75m from verge going up the hill into Kettleburgh, catches cyclists and motorbiked out.	Raise grate and level road	Raise grate and level road	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
255	Bromeswell	Wilford Bridge Melton	This is a dangerous road to cross for pedestrians using the footpaths either side of the river and also bad for cyclists too.	Slowing traffic down so pedestrians get a chance to cross the road ,or narrow the road to slow traffic down and widen the pavements which could then accommodate a bike lane.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
263	Martlesham	The entirety of the Martlesham retail development.	There is no pedestrian walkways between the myriad of large shops on the new retail development at Martlesham. Whilst the lack of footpaths was acceptable when this was a mainly commercial area, the explosion of retail outlets and consequential increase in footfall has meant both pedestrians, cyclists and motorists are now at considerable risk as they move about this area.	Provision of a complete footpath network linking all the parking and shopping areas such that by parking anywhere within the retail park area you can walk to any of the retail stores without having to walk along a roadway, with safe crossing places provided where any paths ways cross the road network.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
264	Martlesham	General consideration of the motorist as a part of the cycling and walking strategy	The growing positive bias in Council policies and strategies towards walking and cycling seems at times to be bordering on a demonisation of all motorists.  Any new initiatives should take into account Suffolk's rural environment and the need for many people - including the aged or disabled - to make journeys that are not viable on foot or by cycle.  These people and their needs do not seem to be given due consideration in some of the rushed often ill-conceived initiatives that are proposed.	Ensure full and due consideration is given to all classes of road users when creating any schemes that seek to offer improvements to the built environment. Fulfilling the demands of any particular pressure group will undoubtedly lead to a less than optimum solution for the general populous who after all are the majority...  In respects to all proposals there should be full consultation with all user groups prior to any initiative being taken forward, its especially important to reach out proactively to those who do not have the technical knowledge or access to the mainly internet focused mechanisms that currently form the backbone of the consultation process.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
267	Trimley St Martin	Capel Hall Lane/Brook Lane/Back Lane/Lower Road	Create a network of Quiet Lanes between Trimley St Martin (Capel Hall Lane) and Falkenham Church via Brook Lane/Back Lane/Lower Road/Falkenham Sink	As above - requires only designation and signage.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
269	Woodbridge	The length of the Woodbridge Thoroughfare.	Frequency and speed of traffic is unacceptable and totally unreasonable.	Vehicles & cycles need to be banned and the Thoroughfare made pedestrian only. Residents would need to be given access at certain hours. The car park could increase disabled parking to assist but at present the speed and frequency of traffic is unacceptable and totally unreasonable. There are plenty of examples of where this has been successfully implemented.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
270	Trimley St Mary	Trimley St Mary Bridleway 14: Clickett Hill Road to Nicholas Road	The area immediately to the west of Clickett Hill Road becomes very damp and muddy over the autumn-winter-spring period and needs to be surfaced - as part of Suffolk Cycle Route 5	As above	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
271	Woodbridge	Willford Bridget to Martlesham creek. Waldringfield along the river front to Woodbridge	We walk these areas and are passed by cycles on these footpath routes, it is a bone of contention for walkers and cyclist. In Scotland I believe that footpaths can be used by cyclist as well as walkers, why can we not just adopt this policy, The paths can be used by both as long as cyclist pass with caution and slow down. I like to cycle also but in Woodbridge we are restricted to the roads as the only safe cycle route is by the bypass, and you have to cycle the roads to get there.	solution make the footpaths for cycles as well, with the emphasis that the walker has the right of way with the cyclist either dismounting or passing with care.	Not assessed for IDF.					
275	Bredfield	Pavement through Bredfield	Much of the "pavement" is now too broken or overgrown for safe walking, particularly for anyone with a buggy, a wheeled walker. or a wheelchair People are forced to walk in the road.	The "pavement" needs to be resurfaced and parts of it need to be remade.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
280	Wissett	A separate cycle/pathway along the south side of Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth.	A separate cycle/walkway alongside the Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth would make walking and cycling a lot safer for non-vehicle users along this narrow twisty country road which has a high bank and big hedges along its northern side. Many potential users do not use this route due to its obvious dangers for walkers and cyclists.	A separate cycle/walkway alongside the Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth would make walking and cycling a lot safer for non-vehicle users along this narrow twisty country road which has a high bank and big hedges along its northern side. Many potential users do not use this route due to its obvious dangers for walkers and cyclists.	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
284	Wissett	Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth is very dangerous for cyclist and pedestrians	This Halesworth Road is narrow, twisting and bounded by a high bank on the north side. There is space on the south side of this road for a dedicated cycle/pathway which would encourage more people to cycle or walk the short distance into Halesworth. Currently it is too dangerous, except for the brave and the foolhardy to risk it. The number of bends means that drivers are often suddenly confronted with a walker or cyclist in a road that is only just wide enough for two cars	This Halesworth Road is narrow, twisting and bounded by a high bank on the north side. There is space on the south side of this road for a dedicated cycle/pathway which would encourage more people to cycle or walk the short distance into Halesworth. Currently it is too dangerous, except for the brave and the foolhardy to risk it. The number of bends means that drivers are often suddenly confronted with a walker or cyclist in a road that is only just wide enough for two cars	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
290	Kesgrave	The service road/cycle lane that runs the southern length of Main Road A1214 along the settlement boundary of Kesgrave.	The cycle path was created from a service road with pedestrian access to shared cycle use. Due to neglect it is unfit for purpose and is dangerous and therefore unused. The surface is poor and the many side roads are hazardous. Cars frequently drive straight out over the cycle path exiting shops/garages. Give Way signs have worn away or are non-existent. Cars park on it (esp near shops and school) again making the case for cyclists to choose the main road.	This is a golden opportunity to do something to put cycling and walking at the centre of transport policy for the future while not actually preventing other road users having access. The land is there to be properly utilised and turned into a modern cycling freeway on a major through route into Ipswich. It needs real imagination and investment.	High	£1,900,000-£2,000,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
292	<Null>	All Schools.	If we want to increase safe cycle usage it should start with young people so that it becomes absolutely normal to cycle, and especially to school.	I suggest that all schools have a cycling policy produced by stake holders eg teachers, parents, students, police, local council, etc. The policy would include among other things: Suggested safe routes to school from all the main centres of population that feed into the school. And perhaps roads that should be avoided as unsafe for cyclists to use. The council should consider providing suitable signage for cyclists and other users along the routes. Safe dry cycle storage within the school. Safe storage of helmets, hi-vis clothing. Cycling competency certification schemes.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
293	Halesworth	A144 roundabout joining Quay Street and Saxons Way (Hooker House), up to the Triple Plea Roundabout where Sparrowhawk Road joins the A144 Norwich Road	The current main south-north cycle and pedestrian route up Norwich Road to businesses to the north of the town, and importantly to the Edgar Sewter Primary School, is dangerous, too complex (multiple road crossings with varying priorities) and does not serve the primary school for sustainable transport	From the Norwich Road/Quay Street roundabout (A144), move the existing cycle route from the east side of the A144 across to the west. Create a 'Copenhagen' or similar vastly improved crossing at Wissett Road junction, widen what would become the shared pedestrian/cycle path on the west side, remove all existing parking where necessary on the west side (especially near Wissett Road junction, and up A144 past the police station), and replace with single yellow lines with waiting limits of 1 hour (to support school visits and drop-offs). This route must link from the Quay Street Hooker House roundabout up as far as the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout near the Triple Please Road and pub. Suggest NCR1 route is also amended to utilise this new safer less complex route, once established, and once connected to other proposals entered onto the interactive map. Agreed with the Halesworth NPSG Cycle Advisory Team	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	N/A	Essential

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
304	Halesworth	Halesworth - provide new 20mp speed limit through town to calm traffic and promote safer cycling and low speed vehicle use	Unlike many Suffolk and National towns and villages, Halesworth has no reduced speed limits to 20mph even outside the Edgar Sewter Primary School. This is creating direct danger to cyclists and pedestrians alike, particularly being combined with very poor parking practices in London Road, Norwich Road, Holton Road and Quay Street.	Halesworth requires traffic calming/slowing measures, and the popular and effective way like other nearby market towns would be to provide 20mph speed limiting as follows: 1. The main A144 north-south route from Bramfield Road/London Road junction (Kerridges garage) all the way along London Road, Saxons Way, and Norwich Road as far north as "The Avenue". 2. Eastwards from the Norwich Road Hooker House roundabout along Quay Street and Holton Road, as far as "Castle House" at the top of Holton Road hill. 3. Westwards from the Angel Link roundabout and London Road (Coop roundabout) to the junction of Roman Way and Chediston Road. 4. Roman Way from its junction at Chediston Road, to the junction at London Road near the Rifle Hall.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
306	Halesworth	Halesworth - Remove parking and apply waiting limits to Norwich Road between its junctions with "Wissett Road" and "The Avenue"	Current unrestricted parking is posing an immediate safety hazard to other road users - cyclists and people/children crossing Norwich Road. It is believed the current prolonged parking may be businesses and Police Station employees. Current parking risks doors being opened into other road users' paths, and pedestrian/children crossing between parked cars onto the main through-route including HGVs, is very dangerous. This is a site of previous cyclists being knocked off cycles by cars.	Provide double yellow lines between Wissett Road junction and opposite Hammonds Ford Garage, and from there northwards to the junction with "The Avenue" provide single yellow line restricted parking for 1 hour to enable school drop-off and school visit parking.	Double yellow lines have not been assessed in IDF.					
308	Alderton	Alderton Road/Hollesley Road between the two villages (60mph section).	This is, not unreasonably, a 60mph stretch of road, so has fast cars upon it. It is, however, too narrow in all places to allow vehicles to pass at speed, let alone for cyclists to be/feel safe.	There appears to be significant potential on farmland on the east side to both expand the road and to add a cycle/footpath adjacent to the road.	N/A	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
310	Walpole	Heart of Suffolk - Cycle loop passing through Halesworth, Framlingham, Debenham, Eye, Hoxne and Bungay requires improved signage and route granting	This beautiful previously published loop ("The Heart of Suffolk") passes through unspoilt countryside on minor roads and passing churches and other historic points of interest, linking several old market towns. The brown waymarked signs has fallen into real disrepute over the last 5 years or so, and should be granted a formal county route number plus get better signage. The loop can boost local tourism and cafe/craft visits along its whole length.	Review the whole loop and grant a formal route 'number' for the county. Replace existing deteriorated and erroneous direction signs, and republish the loop on an appropriate map and/or website to include GPS files which can be downloaded by other cyclists. Promote links to nearest rail and bus services enroute, to ease the way for shorter distance or less able cyclists. The originator of this request has cycle navigation files which could be used as a basis for publicising online via relevant cycling internet sites.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
311	Holton	Halesworth - suggested new waymarked county cycle loop (Halesworth, Beccles and Bungay)	This suggested loop follows all back/minor roads and links three prominent market towns, plus would join the route from Beccles to Southwold at Stoven/Sotterley. It would enable joining the loop by train links at either Halesworth, Brampton or Beccles	The originator has navigation files that could be used to illustrate and publicise this route which is a family-safe and beautifully scenic route that can be done in parts or as a while (total 35-40 miles). Heads north from Halesworth through Holton, Brampton, Stoven, Sotterley, Ellough, Beccles, Ringsfield, Ilketshall St Andrews, Mettingham, Bungay, St Peters, St Margarets, Rumburgh and back to Halesworth. Granting of a formal route number and signage would be required - navigation files are available for this very safe route that also piggy-backs a part of NCR1.	Not assessed for IDF.					
312	Felixstowe	Traffic light controlled cross roads of Langer Road and Beach Station Road, Felixstowe.	The traffic lights are activated by sensors in the road. However, they are not activated by cyclists. If a cyclist approaches the junction during quiet times, they face the choice of either waiting for a car to come along and activate the sensor, or jumping red lights. It is incredibly frustrating watching the lights on the intersecting road change through multiple cycles of green orange and red whilst the lights controlling your own progress remain fixed on red.	The sensors need either to be adjusted to ensure that a lone cyclist will be detected and will activate the traffic lights, or the whole system needs to be changed to a simple timer with the requirement for a vehicle to activate a sensor being dispensed with completely.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
313	Felixstowe	Cross roads controlled by traffic lights, at High Road West and Garrison Lane, Felixstowe	The traffic lights are activated by sensors in the road. However, they are not activated by cyclists. If a lone cyclist approaches the junction during quiet times, they face the choice of either waiting for a car to come along and activate the sensor, or jumping red lights. It is incredibly frustrating watching the lights on the intersecting road change through multiple cycles of green orange and red whilst the lights controlling your own progress remain fixed on red.	The sensors need either to be adjusted to guarantee that a lone cyclist will be detected and will activate the traffic lights, or the whole system needs to be changed to a timer with the requirement for a vehicle to activate a sensor being dispensed with completely.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
315	Felixstowe	The bridleway which passes Hill House Cottages and Candlet Farm between Gulpher Road and Thurmans Lane	Someone else has suggested diverting cyclists from the High Road to this bridleway. This would be a significant and grossly unreasonably lengthy diversion for cyclists needing to transit between eastern Felixstowe and Trimley. That said, the improvement of the bridleway is a good idea to benefit cyclists who already use it, but it should not be on condition that cyclists who would otherwise use the High Road being expected to divert, as the likely net result would be a reduction in cycling.	Someone else has suggested diverting cyclists from the High Road to this bridleway. This would be a significant and grossly unreasonably lengthy diversion for cyclists needing to transit between eastern Felixstowe and Trimley. That said, the improvement of the bridleway is a good idea to benefit cyclists who already use it, but it should not be on condition that cyclists who would otherwise use the High Road being expected to divert, as the likely net result would be a reduction in cycling.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
316	Trimley St Mary	Level crossing from Fagbury Road	On occasions the gates governing access across the level crossing are electronically locked for no apparent reason. It is not seem possible to predict when this may occur. This results in a significant detour to the nearest available level crossing which is a considerable distance away. The risk is that frustration will lead to persons crossing the railway when unsafe to do so.	If there is a need for the gates to be temporarily locked for safety reasons, there needs to be a way for a pedestrian or cyclist to find out how long the delay will be and/or to contact someone in control of the locking mechanism to request access.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
318	Purdis Farm	Bike paths via Murrills Road park	The barriers at Murrills Road & Bucklesham Road are tight to get a cargo bike through. Cars are often parked at the Meadow Crescent entrance/exit.	Increase gap of barriers at Murrills Road & Bucklesham Road. Add 2m of double yellow line at Meadow Crescent.	Not assessed for IDF.					
320	Trimley St Mary	High Road Trimley nr Faulkeners Way	Cars parked in cycle lane and even on cycle path approaching mini roundabout.	Solid white lines and no parking in bike lanes with enforcement.	Not assessed for IDF.					
322	Felixstowe	High Road East, Felixstowe, & out through Trimleys	Cars regularly parked in cycle lanes	Change from dotted to continuous white line and enforce no parking in bike lanes.	Not assessed for IDF.					
325	<Null>	Widen and improve the current footpath to make it a shared pedestrian and cycleway.	Cyclists are currently sharing a dual carriageway with fast moving traffic.	If the path was widened to make a shared footpath/cycleway, it would to separate cycles from traffic using the dual carriageway. This would be especially effective where slow moving cyclists are riding up the hill from Ipswich to Copdock.	Outside East Suffolk so not scored for IDF.					
326	Melton	New Housing development, Woods Lane Woodbridge	Example of where significant new housing has been allowed without provision for safe cycling to the local shops, centre of Woodbridge and the local primary school. The housing is disconnected from Woodbridge by the A12 & busy Woods lane, necessitating car ownership to access local services.	1.) Upgrade the footpath along Bredfield Road into Woodbridge to cycle/footpath standard. 2.) Create a cycle route down Woods lane to the Melton Traffic lights to connect with Melton Road	Very High	£800,000-£850,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
327	Playford	Playford Road - west of its junction with Butts Road.	Playford Road used by motorists wanting to avoid speed limit on A1214 making it unpleasant and less safe to cycle as many of them drive far to fast.	This route was really popular during the lockdown when there was much less traffic and cyclists felt safe. Closing the road here and at junction further east would provide an excellent cycle route to Woodbridge and yet allow motorists to travel between Playford and/or Bealings and the A1214.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
333	Southwold	Southwold	At the present time the only cycle lane 'in' Southwold is the approach road from the Lowestoft Road junction to the North Road junction. This is completely useless as it is not a solid white line hence parking seems to be acceptable anywhere along it thus completely stopping cyclists from using it and further increasing the hazard of an accident as they swing out round parked cars. Southwold has a problem with speeding which is never picked up by the local town council.	I suggest the cycle lane be removed as it serves no purpose and a strictly enforced 20mph speed limit be put in place from St Felix School and also implemented in Reydon to make sure the whole, very popular cycling and walking area, is safer for cyclists and pedestrians alike.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
334	Westerfield	Westerfield Business Park/Westerfield Station	With reference to the comment of having a cycle park for using the railway , the last time I wanted to use it to take my cycle to Woodbridge I found that the majority of Lowestoft trains do not stop at Westerfield. Could there be liaison with the railway companies to make Westerfield Station at least a request Halt for cyclists to use all trains.	Request to make Westerfield Station at least a request Halt Station for all users.	A matter outside the Strategy and not assessed in the IDF.					
335	<Null>	Cycle paths in Ipswich	There is a lack of clarity in Ipswich as to where cycle paths begin and end and which footpaths are shared space.	Paint all cycle tracks to increase visibility for pedestrians and cyclists	Largely outside East Suffolk so has not been assessed for IDF.					
336	<Null>	The junction between the Market Place and Bridges Street and the contraflow cycle lane.	The junction going uphill is rather dangerous because cyclists must give way to unpredictable traffic. The turn from the market place makes larger cars/vans/lorries swing into the cycle lane round a blind corner. The 20 mph speed limit in Bridge Street is frequently ignored. Cars and vans park in the cycle lane, pushing cyclists into the path of oncoming traffic. Bridge Street is a rat run for traffic going to Norwich. The noise levels and vibration are unacceptable.	"No Entry (except cycles)" at the Market Place/Bridge Street junction, preferably with a planter partially blocking the access for vehicles. "Access to Bridge Street via Nethergate Street" , enabling deliveries and residents access while quietening the road. Widening the pavements, initially with paint and identified loading bays to enable street life to take place safely.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
339	Trimley St Martin	Cycle path alongside A14 dual carriageway near Morston Hall Road	Using this cycle path is unpleasant and very scary being so close to fast moving traffic on the A14 with NO crash barrier. I prefer to use Morston Hall Road but this is not wide enough for cars to pass cyclists.	Provide a cycle path adjacent to Morston Hall Road away from A14.	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
343	Kesgrave	Cycle lane along Woodbridge road east	The cycle path/lane on the pavement along woodbridge road is a joke: it is old, raid surface is terrible, too narrow and occupied by pedestrians, blocked by driveways making it very dangerous and cars d not stop	The cycle path/lane on the pavement along woodbridge road is a joke: it is old, raid surface is terrible, too narrow and occupied by pedestrians, blocked by driveways making it very dangerous and cars d not stop	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
346	Aldeburgh	Between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness	As in a previous comment, the road is unsuitable for riding a bike comfortably, safely and pleasantly. The path is really a footpath not a cycle path. Shared use paths are against LTN 1/20 so the best thing to do is build a new cycle only path. This will be welcomed by people who walk and cycle there.	So that the new cycle path has greater currency, there is a need to link with cycle routes at either end. If there aren't any, then either build them or designate a new route using existing infrastructure.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Desirable
348	<Null>	Ribbons Park Development, Ipswich	Exemplar & Award winning example of a new housing development with a Modeshift STARS "Residential Travel Plan" <a href="https://www.modeshiftstars.org/first-residential-development-achieves-national-stars-accreditation/">https://www.modeshiftstars.org/first-residential-development-achieves-national-stars-accreditation/</a>	This requirement should be included with all new housing developments within Suffolk.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
351	Tunstall	main road between Rendlesham and Tunstall	It is too dangerous for children even with adult supervision to cycle to Rendlesham school from Tunstall and Blaxhall. Road is very busy and has narrow 2 lanes with limited visibility due to the bends.	Off road cycle path would be best solution this could also be extended to Tunstall Forest where the Viking cycle trail is located allowing the public to cycle there instead of having to take their bikes on vehicles.	N/A	£1,100,000-£1,200,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Desirable
354	<Null>	Riverside Beccles	The path becomes very muddy in autumn and winter. It would be excellent if path could be maintained ie adding grit or building a broadwalk. This would encourage many more people to use the path.	Add grit or build broadwalk	Not assessed for IDF.					
355	Woodbridge	The whole of the river path from Martlesham to Melton is unsuitable for dual use (pedestrians and cyclists). Cyclists are currently prohibited, but very few take notice of the fact and push past	The path is only just wide enough for pedestrians to pass in a lot of places. To widen it to the necessary regulation width for dual use would likely not be possible and would also spoil the area. Enforcement is necessary before someone is seriously injured.	enforcement action against cyclists using the path	A matter outside the Strategy and not assessed in the IDF.					
356	Martlesham	Cycle lanes anywhere in the east suffolk region	Can you make sure that any cycle lanes (road or pavement) that are installed are to the regulation width and not too narrow to use (some parts on Felixstowe Road Martlesham are about 60cm). If any of the plastic wands/bollards are used then the 2m width of the cycle lane should be used. I have a tricycle and cannot use the lanes in Ipswich which have wands installed without either hitting the kerb or wands as they are too narrow,	keep to the planning guidelines and standard for all cycle lane provision. That way motor vehicles can give some clearance to cyclists, even if driving right onto the white line or wand	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
357	<Null>	All over Suffolk	Your footpath signs are rubbish, they keep falling over and have to be reported and a worker brought out to stand them up again. Change to metal? Sit them inside some kind of flange plate with soil on top. Label with the footpath number. Could even have suggestions where they lead to! Look at Kent system.	As above	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
358	<Null>	All over Suffolk	Stiles	Get rid of them and have metal kissing gates that the less able and dogs can use.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
360	Halesworth	Round Halesworth	A Councillor has suggested a list of cycle route round the town. I support all of the councillors ideas and am not going to write all out again on this cumbersome system.	Do, what the Councillor suggests.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
362	Kelsale Cum Carlton	Yoxford to Saxmundham	Cycleway alongside A12 from Yoxford to the B1121 turnoff to Saxmundham is poorly maintained or non-existent. This could provide a direct route to access important local services in Saxmundham such as the medical centre, shops and pharmacy for cyclists from Parishes to the north	Cycleway alongside A12 from Yoxford to the B1121 turnoff to Saxmundham is poorly maintained or non-existent. This could provide a direct route to access important local services in Saxmundham such as the medical centre, shops and pharmacy for cyclists from Parishes to the north	N/A	£3,000,000-£3,500,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
363	Playford	Main A1214 from Martlesham to Ipswich (Kesgrave Town section)	Being frank the entire cycle path from Martlesham to Ipswich is a disgrace. The surface is worn due to car traffic crossing it to access the many houses along its length. The path is dangerous and cyclists are at more risk of collision with cars from the many side roads because the Stop lines are painted on A1214 not on the cycle lane and Give Way signs on the cycle path are worn away. It is therefore safer to cycle on the main road as the least dangerous option defeating the need for a path.	Maintain the cycle with a good surface, clearly mark give way signs. Improve visibility because you cant see cyclists when approaching the A1214 from the numerous side roads Mark "Give way" before the Cycle path on all sideroad junctions rather than on the main road which is some 10 to 15m further away ; cars are still slowing down and not stopped so a 10 to 15 mph side on collision is very likely.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
369	Levington	Levington and Stratton Hall	Public footpaths are enjoyed by many walkers but are increasingly being plagued by cyclists who endanger the use by walkers and erode narrow coastal paths, delicate in many places as previous breaches will testify.  Once the strategy is adopted, the bridleways and cycle paths must be properly maintained to encourage their use. The poor state of the A14 cycle way is an example of poor maintenance.	Although the misuse of footpaths contravenes the tort law of trespass, it is highly unlikely to be enforced by any landowner. Any strategy needs to make clear that cycling on public footpaths is unacceptable and unlawful. Parishes like ours who welcome considerate walkers to the footpaths are becoming increasingly inundated by rubbish dumped. Although litter picks clear up their rubbish, it needs to be clear that rubbish dumping is a increasing nuisance and that measures should be introduced to eliminate it. The provision of cycle paths seems to be less than public footpaths and this needs to change to avoid clashes between those on foot and those on cycles.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
371	Kesgrave	Bus stop opposite Penzance Road in Bell Lane Kesgrave	there is a sign here stating pedestrians and cyclists allowed. Cyclists assume they are able to cycle from here to Foxhall Road on the pavement as they have been allowed so to do from the Woodbridge Road end of Bell Lane. Pedestrians are of a different opinion, and there is contention	If cyclists are allowed to cycle all the way to Foxhall Road from the last sign at the junction of PenzanceRd/Bell Ln then more signs are needed. If they are not then a sign saying cycling ceases/stops/not permitted is needed to stop confusion and a likely future accident	Not assessed for IDF.					
372	Otley	B1078 junction with Charity Lane, Otley	B1078 Traffic turning right into Charity Lane often cuts across the junction ignoring the road markings which if you're a cyclist or car waiting to turn right out of it is quite disconcerting. The road markings have been rubbed away. This is typical of many junctions along this road where the mouth of a minor road is narrow. Vehicle drivers naturally cut the corner, rather than making the full 90 degree manoeuvre.	Improved markings on the B1078 & at the junction itself on Charity Lane.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
373	Felixstowe	Junction of Chaucer Road and Garrison Lane	Cyclists travelling northward along Garrison Lane wishing to then head towards Western Felixstowe are compelled to continue along the busy Garrison Lane all the way to the crossroads with Mill Lane to turn left onto Mill Lane. There is a junction however with Chaucer Road which is exit only to all traffic including cyclists.	Alter the junction between Chaucer Road and Garrison Lane to permit cyclists bound for Western Felixstowe to turn left from Garrison Lane onto Chaucer Road so that they can avoid the busy part of Garrison Lane approaching the crossroads. Chaucer Road is much quieter and suitable for cycling as well as slightly shortening the distance travelled. The junction would require physical work to safely permit cyclists, but not motorists, to enter from Garrison Lane. It should also permit cyclist travelling south along Chaucer Road to turn right onto Garrison Lane or straight over onto Orwell Road.	Not assessed for IDF.					
374	Wickham Market	A section of permissive footpath on our circular walks route, south side of B1078 The Gallows Route developed with SCC (Discover Suffolk)	A section of permissive footpath on our circular walks route, blue The Gallows Route developed with SCC (Discover Suffolk) has been closed by the landowner forcing people to walk along the dangerous B1078.	Liaise with landowner and SCC Highways to arrange re-opening please. Raised several times this year with SCC and a Cllr.	Not assessed for IDF.					
375	Bredfield	the thoroughfare woodbridge.	walking/shopping on this street at times when motorised vehicles have unrestricted access can be a very unpleasant experience, it becomes a noisy, dangerous and polluted area, and pavement parking further limits the safe public space, forcing vulnerable pedestrians/ shoppers onto the space remaining to compete with powerful industrial machines. this is in complete contrast to the safer, relaxed, more sociable atmosphere that prevails when motorised vehicle movement is restricted.	consider making this street safe for shoppers/ walkers / cyclists / vulnerable people like children, elderly and disabled at all times, not just for a few hours each day. if you need to know how its done look at other towns and cities, much bigger and more complex than Woodbridge, that confronted and resolved this conflict years ago. this has to be considered low hanging fruit for any council developing a cycling and walking strategy.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
379	Trimley St Martin	The village of Trimley St Martin and its links to neighbouring villages	As a result of local plan allocations the number of dwellings in Trimley St Martin will increase by 630 which is over 50%. This is likely to result in traffic congestion and increased danger for those walking and cycling, but it also provides the opportunity to make significant improvements to encourage cycling.	The first step should be to conduct a full and detailed review of cycling within and around the village looking at the possibility of creating new off-road cycle routes as well as improving the provision for sections where on road routes are unavoidable.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
382	Barnby	There need to be a safe cycle track from Carlton Colville to Beccles on the A146	Several people cycle the A146 and it is very dangerous especially by the Barnby Bends. The back rounds are hazardous in the dark morning and evening so there is no safe route. If there was a cycle track I'm sure more people would cycle rather than use cars.	Decent cycle track to link towns and villages	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000 (cycle infrastructure only not highway)	SCC, DFT, CIL	SCC, CIL, DFT		Essential
383	Lowestoft	Denmark Road cycle path from station to Rotterdam Road	This must be the worst and most dangerous cycle path in the country. It is extremely uneven and shakes bones and bikes unbearably. There is also a concrete obstruction along with at least one place where the kerb has not been dropped.	Re-lay the path and drop the kerbs where required. Not sure what the obstruction is so unsure if it can be moved. Maybe designate the path on the opposite side as a shared footpath/cycle path as it is plenty wide enough along most of its length.	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC		Essential

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
384	Woodbridge	Junction of the top (i.e. west end) of Market Hill and west-bound Seckford Street	Firstly, visibility from the top of Market Hill into west-bound Seckford Street is non-existent. One has to pull out across the junction to see if there is anything coming, and if there is, then there is little space for the oncoming vehicle. Secondly, vehicles coming up the south side of Market Hill and turning across the top of Market Hill cut the corner, right into the path of any cyclist waiting to turn right into Seckford Street.	Make the Market Hill a one-way street all the way round, clockwise. This will clear the problem completely.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
385	Woodbridge	Junction of the top (west end) of Market Hill and the east side	Cyclists going north along the top of Market Hill and wanting to turn east down the side of the Shire Hall have no visibility of oncoming traffic coming down Theatre Street, and so have to pull out to look, into the path of any oncoming vehicle. As vehicle exiting from the top of Angel Lane tend to cause vehicles travelling down Theatre Street to pull out, this means these vehicles are already on the wrong side of the road when they meet the Market Hill junction, thus compounding the problem.	Make the Market Hill a one-way street all the way round, clockwise. This will allow cyclists to get into the right hand lane at the top of Market Hill and have greater visibility up Theatre Street. This will clear the problem completely.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
386	Lowestoft	Cycle path outside Claremont Pier	Cyclists are asked to dismount for the short section passing the pier. I can see this may have been done for the safety of pedestrians, but think a warning to go slow and also for pedestrians to be aware of cyclist would be better.	Cyclists are asked to dismount for the short section passing the pier. I can see this may have been done for the safety of pedestrians, but think a warning to go slow and also for pedestrians to be aware of cyclist would be better.	Not assessed for IDF.					
390	Kesgrave	Main Road Kesgrave	the cycling path which runs along Main Road is an asset to Kesgrave. The High School, which is located along the Main Road has one of the highest amount of pupils who cycle to school in the County. This cycle path is in great need of repair. the markings, signage and surfacing all need updating, re instating and re tarmacking. If ESC wish to encourage cycling and walking in East Suffolk then these issues need to be addressed ASAP.	As above.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
392	Melton	New Street, Woodbridge	Introduce a 20mph speed limit throughout the centre of Woodbridge. Divert through traffic away from New Street. Introduce a chicane half way down New Street to slow the traffic.	Introduce a 20mph speed limit throughout the centre of Woodbridge. Divert through traffic away from New Street. Introduce a chicane half way down New Street to slow the traffic.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
395	Melton	Melton and Woodbridge	Aside from cycling in the parks and A12 (cycle path) there are no family friendly or safe routes. No exclusive cycling options. I feel the narrow streets and way people drive is unsafe for children of primary age to cycle. Exclusive areas would improve children's and parents confidence and encourage families to get on bikes.	Research locations for family safe cycling routes and designate land where you could create this. Partner with land owners.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
396	Ufford	Footpath along B1438	The footpath for almost the whole way from Melton up to the top of Yarmouth Road is too narrow. In places this appears to just be overgrown where the vegetation has been allowed to reclaim the footpath - especially at the upper end around Ufford Park entrance. This leaves pedestrians walking perilously close to the road.	Cut back the vegetation and hedges, widen the path properly. Then keep the path cleared regularly to avoid this in future.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,00	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
397	Ufford	Footpath between Ufford and Wickham Market alongside B1438	This footpath is very narrow and in poor condition. The path surface has fractured and it is overgrown with weeds. In places the path is non-existent or is heavily rutted. Pedestrians and particularly those with children are in danger from passing traffic and from trip and slip hazards. The path is quite well used but could see much greater footfall if improvements were made.	Widen and resurface this footpath and make sure that the missing sections are filled in. Cut back overhanging bushes to avoid pedestrians having to step into the road	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,00	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
398	Hollesley	The level of traffic on the small lane to Shingle Street	It is dangerous to walk down this lane to Shingle Street in the summer months because of the number of visitor cars to the area. It is a popular route for walkers, local families, rambler groups, D of E groups to visit Shingle Street. The large volume of cars using the lane makes it very dangerous for non-vehicle users because it is narrow, with unmarked 90 degree bends and there is nowhere to escape if a car is travelling too fast or misjudges the space available to safely pass	Register the lane under the Quiet Lane Scheme. Mark out on the road surface a lane for walkers/cyclists to reduce the speed of the cars by highlighting the lack of space for the cars to pass other users Ban cars parking from the bridge down to Shingle Street, except resident vehicles during the summer months.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
399	Ufford	between The Avenue and Loudham lane Ufford. the hedge on the west side need cutting back. there are branches and brambles that stick out which cars coming down loudham lane push you into.	the hedge on the west side need cutting back. there are branches and brambles that stick out which cars coming down loudham lane push you into.	cutting hedge	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
400	Ufford	Ufford	There are many footpaths in and around Ufford that are widely used by residents. While many are across fields and through woodland, walkers are obliged to use the lanes in Ufford to access them. There are very few pavements in the village, obliging walkers to compete with vehicle traffic on single track lanes.	Installing pavements is impractical in most instances due to cost and planning issues. However, there is a simple, cost effective improvement available. The vehicle speed limit within the village is 30 mph. Decreasing this to 20 mph on single lane roadways would dramatically increase safety for both walkers and cyclists, with little effect on traffic flow. Ufford lane road traffic is largely local, with little through traffic.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
401	Campsea Ashe	Mill Lane Campsea Ashe	Narrow road, high hedges, no footpaths, heavy traffic from agriculture	Mark as unsuitable for cyclists/walkers	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
402	Ufford	The whole of Byng Hall Road but particularly where it passes the houses up to the underpass of the A12	Concerns around visibility here particularly around the Public Rights of Way path that has its entrance/exit on the inside of the bend outside "Wayside", and the visibility along Byng Hall Road for both vehicles travelling in opposing directions and the pedestrians/cyclists/equestrian users. 2 speed roundels (outside Wayside & Woodcott) that have been consumed by the vegetation. The encroachment of the verge onto the carriageway on the eastern side of Byng Hall Road.	To complete the work highlighted from the site visit and then either introduce 20 mph speed limits or designate as a Quiet Lane	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team. Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
403	Ufford	Spring Lane from the High Street to Lower Ufford	Single track road often used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians that is very tight with some blind bends. Danger of accidents with some of the aforementioned parties with vehicles. Often overgrown and often not able to drive down in a car without the vegetation coming in to contact with the vehicle	Vegetation control (cutting) and Categorise as a Quiet Lane	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team. Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
404	Ufford	Lower road Ufford - the entire length.	Single track road often used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians that is often flooded and muddy.	Look at improving the drainage and because of the frequent use by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians designate as a Quiet Lane.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
406	Ufford	Yarmouth Road footpath adjacent to Ufford Park Hotel.	Due to the encroachment of soil and grass and other plants over the concrete footpath, the footpath is now extremely narrow. This has resulted in pedestrians having to walk very close to the road side. The footpath is only wide enough for pedestrians to walk in single file thereby making it impossible to safely hold a young child's hand or to push a toddler's buggy. It is extremely uncomfortable and dangerous to walk this part of the footpath as being so close to the road is dangerous.	The soil/grass/plants need to be dug or scraped back so that the full width of the concrete footpath is available.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
409	Waldringfield	Waldringfield	No WC accessible to the public walking or cycling in the area. It would get more people out walking and/or cycling if they could feel sure that they would be able to find WCs en route. Waldringfield is a classic example of a place in a prime location for walkers, but no toilets. This applies to most villages these days so Waldringfield is just one example.	Public WCs should be brought back in villages. Funding could perhaps be eased by charging, and since there is little call to carry coins these days, perhaps this could be arranged via a mobile phone app similar to car-parking. Pubs and cafes (in Waldringfield the Maybush is perfectly located) should be encouraged, or even compelled, to allow passers-by to use their toilets for a small charge (which they might even refund if the user then decides to buy something) - rather than walkers "go" in the bushes.	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
414	Tunstall	Access to Wickham Market Train Station in Campsea Ashe from Tunstall	Dangerous road for cyclists and walkers, pot holes are uneven surface on edge of road on Ashe Road, very sharp blind corners and road is regularly used by lorries. This means poor access for both cyclist and walkers to the train station. Public transport in this area is poor so access to the train station is vital for allowing people greener methods of transport.	The best solution would be cycle lanes and footpaths that allow direct access between Tunstall and Campsea Ashe or alternatively follow the road. Alternative solution would be improving Ashe Lane and adding protected cycle lanes.	N/A	£2,300,000-£2,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
417	Framlingham	Castle Street btw Double Street and Fore Street	Castle Street is one-way eastbound which reduces access to the town centre and church from estates on the east side of the town	Suggested contraflow cycle lane. There wouldn't be any loss of parking as the only parking currently is the widest section - there are two exit / queuing lanes and you only need one. West of Double Street may well be too narrow but not a problem as cycles can turn down Double Street which is 2-way	Not assessed for IDF.					
419	Kesgrave	Cycle path A1214 Kesgrave Road	A typical example of a 'stop start' cycle path where motor vehicles are given priority at each minor road junction and property driveway entrance, hence impeding the steady progress of cyclists and pedestrians	Consider giving cyclists & pedestrians the right of way at minor junctions by removing the 'giveaway' from the cyclepath and moving the road 'giveaway' lines back from the junction to before where the cycle path crosses it. Also where a cyclepath crosses the front of a property entrance put the giveaway lines across the entrance to ensure that anyone leaving the property gives way to the cyclist, rather than relying on the cyclist having to dodge vehicles sticking their nose out onto the cycle path. This is common practice in countries where cyclists are given priority over vehicles, rather than in the uk where vehicles are given priority over cyclists (and pedestrians, mobility scooter users etc).	Not assessed for IDF.					
420	Melton	Station Road Melton	This is part of the main pedestrian route through the village. In places, the pavement is less than 1m wide. The road is used on a daily basis by HGVs and agricultural vehicles. This is not safe and is very polluting.	Work with other authorities e.g. Suffolk County Council to introduce weight/width restrictions. Work with satnav providers to direct heavy vehicles to more suitable routes.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
421	Saxmundham	Many of the pavements in Saxmundham (particularly the high street and the roads off the cross roads at the traffic lights on town.	The pavements in Saxmundham are in many places very narrow and not fit for purpose. In many places they are too narrow for mobility scooters and pushchairs or even for two pedestrians to pass safely. This is especially true on the high street.	Making a section of the high street pedestrians/deliveries and disabled access only.	Modal Filter					
422	Saxmundham	The B1121 between Kelsale, Saxmundham and Benhall	Lack of safe cycling route along this road which links two primary schools, two villages and the town centre and is used by motorists and lorries to access town/A12. It also has a very narrow pavement between Benhall and Saxmundham which forces pedestrians very close to the fast moving traffic.	Implementation of the Three Communities Link proposal. Providing an inclusive and safe cyclist and pedestrian route for vulnerable road users including those with children, pushchairs and mobility scooters.  The plan already exists, just requires funding.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT		Essential

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
423	Tunstall	Example - Snape Maltings but applies to towns, villages and popular visitor locations.	Provide or assist businesses in providing sufficient good quality and secure cycle parking. These need to be in high footfall areas with CCTV and good lighting to discourage theft. Cycle lockers at station and other transport hubs would be ideal. Unless cyclist feel confident that there are good cycle parking facilities that are safe they just won't visit these places.	As above.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
424	Snape	Legitimise cycling between Snape and Aldeburgh.	To be able to cycle safely from Snape to Aldeburgh (and the other way of course) would be a major improvement and add to the economy by all the holidaymakers and second homers being able to cycle with children to Snape or vice versa and the route is almost there, along the river wall, down the sailors path and along the verge to Aldeburgh. Just a small spend to improve the river wall and the verge and you are there.. it would also be a fantastic addition for local folk to cycle it.	Maybe just a bit of edging along the river and verge to contain some road planings and a few signs to be respectful of pedestrians.	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC		Desirable
434	Theberton	Old railway line between Aldeburgh and Leiston	Absence of safe cycling route for tourists and residents between Aldeburgh and Leiston. Roads are too dangerous and existing cycle route along coast path isn't accessible for most. We don't have an easily cycled tourist route like other parts of the country.	The old railway line between Aldeburgh and Leiston provides an ideal route. Starting from the caravan park, heading along the old line, across the road at Thorpeness holt, continuing along the line route until Crown Farm, this would join the existing cycle path along Lovers Lane, a new extension proposed by EDF (DCO) and Leiston's Cycle Strategy route into Town. A tarmac track (Suffolk's version of the 'cinder trail' - route 1 of National cycle network) would give access to many more residents who cannot currently cycle easily or safely between the two towns for work/recreation. It would be a boost for tourism as more people would access the route as a flat and easily cycled surface. E Bikes could be promoted to reduce car journeys.	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC	SCC		Essential
437	Felixstowe	Area bounded by Candlet Rd, Gulpher Rd, The Grove	This area is the subject of a major planning application for 560 houses, ref DC/20/1002/ARM, containing significant walking & cycling proposals. Although the formal comment period for that is closed, those interested in this area may wish to look at that for information, and possibly also add a comment there.	All Walking and cycling matters in this area and those to West and East planned for development in the East Suffolk Local Plan should be considered in the context of the entire area.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
438	Felixstowe	Area bounded by Candlet Rd, Gulpher Rd and approximately the track to Candlet Farm	This area is the subject of major proposals for development of housing and a sports centre in the East Suffolk Local Plan containing significant walking & cycling proposals. Those interested in this area may wish to look at that for information. The relevant policy is at pages 215-221.	All Walking and cycling matters in this area and those to the East planned for development in the East Suffolk Local Plan should be considered in the future context of the entire area.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
440	Felixstowe	Area bounded by Links Avenue, Upperfield Drive, Ferry Rd, Gulpher Rd to The Grove	This area is the subject of major proposals for development of housing in the East Suffolk Local Plan containing significant walking & cycling proposals. Those interested in this area may wish to look at that for information. The relevant policy is at pages 215-221.	All walking and cycling matters in this area and those to the East planned for development in the East Suffolk Local Plan should be considered in the future context of the entire area	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
441	Southwold	No access to Easten Bavents beach	Suffolk Coastal path takes a huge inland diversion between Southwold and Covehithe. The latter is now spilling over with people trying to access the beach.	Safe steps over the breakwaters at the north end of Southwold Parade would meet a need, avoid people taking risks on the rocks and allow escape if stranded by rising tides.	Not assessed for IDF.					
458	Kesgrave	Brendan Drive	NCN 1 & the cycle route into Ipswich is via an estate road at this point and sections are cluttered with parked cars, and a couple of short hilly sections where less abled and older riders have to get off and push.	It would make sense to upgrade the footpath that runs across Rushmere Common to Heath Road to a Cycle/footpath there by giving cyclists a section of the route that is traffic free and relatively flat. It would also connect in the other direction with the bridle way that runs east towards Bell lane and beyond... giving a continuous traffic free cycle route from the Hospital to almost the Brightwell Development Area.	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
460	Woodbridge	The entire Riverside of Woodbridge and Melton from Kyson Point to Wilford Bridge	Tourism is vital to Woodbridge's economy and the river is a major tourist attraction. I know that cycle tour companies have expressed amazement that it is not possible to cycle through Woodbridge along the river bank. It is scandalous that we do not make the most of our beautiful river and actively discourage cyclists. There is no safe provision anywhere in the town for them.	From Kyson Point to The Avenue there is a rough narrow grass track below and to the left of the raised river path that could be made into a cycle path.  From just beyond Deben Road to Wilford Bridge in many places there are already two clear paths and it should be possible to convert and extend one of these into a cycle path.  In the few places where this would not be possible could there not be signs saying 'cycling permitted but priority must always be given to pedestrians'. In my experience if you are a polite careful cyclist, pedestrians have no objection to cyclists along the part of the river.  Between The Avenue and Deben Road there should be signs diverting cyclists along the road. A 20 mph limit should be established on the Avenue, Cherry Tree Road, Kingston Farm Road, Kingston Road and Station Road, so that where there is not a dedicated route along the river cyclists can be diverted to a cycle friendly route.	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
461	Woodbridge	the junction of the Thoroughfare and Lime Kiln Quay Road, Woodbridge (traffic lights)	dangerous junction for cyclists	provision of a cyclists' box marked out in front of the car traffic - particularly necessary if travelling from Melton Hill and going right or straight on at the lights and if travelling up Lime Kiln Quay Road going right.	Not assessed for IDF.					
463	Melton	The roundabout top of Woods Lane / A12	1.impossible to see oncoming traffic coming from south on A12 when crossing A12 on the path from the north 2. Impossible to see oncoming traffic when crossing Woods Lane from North to South on the path	In both instances, the path could be closer to the roundabout	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
466	Ufford	Hawkeswade Bridge on road from Ufford to Eyke	This bridge is on a narrow lane with a blind corner, making visibility poor for both vehicles and pedestrians. The footpath and area nearby is used by walkers and cyclists so is often hazardous. Although there is 30 mph sign just before the bridge, there is no road narrows sign and traffic often speeds or has to back up. The road is used by traffic cutting through to the A12 as well as by lorries and tractors from nearby farms.	<p>Improve signage at this dangerous point and also near Melton hamlet where this snoter blind corner for pedestrians.</p> <p>Consider adopting a 20 mph limit on this difficult section.</p>	Not assessed for IDF.					
467	Melton	Footpath alongside Woods Lane heading down towards Melton traffic lights.	Observed Farlingaye School students going home to Melton village. Some were walking, others cycling. There were also other pedestrians. Those on bikes had chosen to ride on the pavement as the road is busy and often has large vehicles and is not wide. It is therefore safer on the pavement. However the pavement is not wide enough to accommodate everyone safely. The problem is aggravated by the steepness of the hill. I am a regular cyclist and don't use Woods Lane.	<p>1. Find an alternative safe route for school children who live in Melton village and beyond. This might involve new permissive paths, resurfacing, etc. Basically Woods Lane is unsafe for cyclists.</p> <p>2. Have a proper dedicated cycle lane. This would probably involve widening the road or the pavement.</p>	Very High	£800,000-£850,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
468	Gedgrave	River Wall - eastern side of Butley River. The path along the river wall between the points TM 393 505 and TM 396 485	This section of river wall is blocked off to the public by fencing. Its omission from the Definitive map could simply be an anomaly as the route recorded on the Definitive Map as Chillesford Footpath 18 stops abruptly at the Chillesford/Gedgrave parish boundary which is absurd.	This route must be added to the Definitive map by way of a Creation Order or Agreement. The proper recording of this route would enable a fine circular walk linking Chillesford and the Butley Ferry.	Not assessed for IDF.					
471	Gedgrave	River Wall – Butley River, The Gull, River Ore. Butley Ferry to Tide Guage (TM393481 to TM415484).	This is another section where there is no apparent reason for the route not to be recorded on the Definitive Map. It is freely used (possibly on a permissive basis) but is another instance where a Creation Order or Agreement should be funded.	Path should be added to the Definitive Map by way of a Creation Order or Agreement.	Not assessed for IDF.					
472	Iken	Alde River wall east of Iken Church (TM412567 - TM443556)	This is another section of river wall that should be opened to the public as a public footpath to link Iken Church with Public Footpath Iken 7. We are recommending to Natural England that it becomes part of the England Coast Path.	A Creation Order or Agreement is needed.	Not assessed for IDF.					
473	Leiston Cum Sizewell	The British Energy permissive path between the small car park off Lovers Lan 6452.	This path forms part of the important recreational route known as The Sandlings Walk. Currently it is permissive only and as such can be withdrawn at any time.	It should be made into a permanent public right of way by means of a Creation Order or Agreement. The other adjoining permissive paths on British Energy's estate through Sizewell Belts should also be made permanent public rights of way.	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
474	Aldeburgh	The old railway track bed between TM 4601 5745 and TM 4622 5945.	This forms part of much walked circular routes taking in Aldeburgh, Thorpeness, the Aldringham Fen and Aldringham Walks. It also presents for walkers and cyclists a safe alternative to the B1122 which is a fast and extremely dangerous road and the only other direct link between Aldeburgh and Leiston Much of the track bed appears to be in private ownership but is open, presumably as a permissive path. Permissive paths are unsatisfactory because the permission can be withdrawn at any time.	Creation Agreements or Orders should be funded to secure the route as a permanent public right of way. An ideal solution would be for a bridleway to be created over the track bed as this would provide a multi-user facility for walkers, horseriders and cyclists.	N/A	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
475	Ramsholt	Ramsholt to Bawdsey – The stretch of river wall from Ramsholt to Bawdsey on the Deben	There is no public access along this stretch river wall	This should be made available to the public to connect with existing routes and become part of the England Coast Path. This section of river wall is not currently open to the public but could be made a public footpath with a minimum of alteration and expenditure with no inconvenience to the landowners. A Creation Order or Agreement is required. It will have a good deal of support from local residents as well as visitors.	Not assessed for IDF.					
476	Aldeburgh	Verge of the A1094 near Aldeburgh Golf Course forming part of “the Sailors’ Path”,	Until recently there was no safe link at the Aldeburgh end between the small car park at TM443581 and the footway at TM448577. Walkers were expected to walk in the carriageway of a fast and dangerous road after it leaves the 30mph limit. Verges are narrow, sloping and uneven with drainage channels - totally inadequate. SCC has secured a licensed path but this is understood to be a ten-year agreement only.	A permanent right of way is required over this licensed path. The verges on the southern side of the road fronting the gardens between the Golf Club and the small car park also need dedicating.	N/A	£450,000-£500,000	Developer, SCC, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access and junction improvements at Land rear of Rose Hill, Saxmundham	Essential/Critical
478	Westerfield	Moss Lane Westerfield	This road is single track and used by a large range of vehicles as a short cut. It is unsuitable as a rat run and should be closed to through traffic thus protecting cyclist and pedestrians.	This road is single track and used by a large range of vehicles as a short cut. It is unsuitable as a rat run and should be closed to through traffic thus protecting cyclist and pedestrians.	Modal Filter					comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.
479	Melton	Wilford Bridge Road leading onto Sutton Road onwards	In an ideal world separate coned cycle lanes would be in operation but due to roads being too narrow and in order for cyclists to feel reasonably safe, speed limits must be reduced for motorised traffic from 60 mph to 40 mph maximum on rural roads between 30 mph towns and villages to help avoid potentially fatal accidents involving cyclists and horse riders too. Ultimately we want more people on bicycles for commuting as well as leisure but safety is paramount if this is to happen.	As above. Will obviously also benefit pedestrians/those trying to cross increasingly busy roads.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
480	Halesworth	The thoroughfare, Halesworth. Between Halesworth Library and the Thoroughfare/London Road junction	Cycling to be allowed in both directions, thus allowing both local and visiting cyclists to travel through The Thoroughfare and use its facilities	Cycling to be allowed in both directions, thus allowing both local and visiting cyclists to travel through The Thoroughfare and use its facilities	Not assessed for IDF.					
481	Ilkeshall St Lawrence	The high street and the A143 junction	We live between bungay and spexhall, we have no pathways at all, it would be fantastic to have a walkway or cycle path put in between bungay where we do our shopping and spexhall where our local public house is situated that we use for social events, I cycle but feel very unsafe riding on the main road as it is very dangerous, my partner has a mobility scooter that she could never use between these two points on the map, so we have to always use the car but would much rather use our cycle and scooter	Pathway or cycle lane from bungay to spexhall along the A143	N/A	£5,500,000-£6,000,0000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
483	Saxmundham	9 points on Saxmundham bypass: TM380656 Kelsale FP 10; TM373646 Kelsale FP 38; TM376644 Kelsale FP 1; TM375639 Kelsale FP 3; TM375636 Sax FP 5; TM375632 Sax FP 11; TM376630 Sax FP 13; TM377621 Benhall FP 22; TM378616, Benhall BR 25	Paths severed by A12 bypass with no thought for walkers. Crossings lethal- single carriageway with 60 speed limit. No warnings to motorists- no central refuges- in two instances (TM 376 644 and TM 375 636) one must climb over Armco-type barriers on each side. TM 375 632 crossing is oblique requiring a considerable walk alongside the carriageway to cross it at a right angle. Traffic increased many fold by new housing on western edge of the town. Sizewell C traffic would exacerbate more.	These crossings must be made safer and easier through speed limits, warning signs to motorists, provision of gaps in the Armco barriers and the installation of central refuges and waiting areas.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
490	Lowestoft	On the cycle path running adjacent to Tom Crisp Way, South West of the main traffic light junction with Carlton Road and Long Road.	Steel post erected on the cycle path. This is a part of a sign (which consists of two posts) notifying road users of the distance to various destinations. One post is in the cycle lane, the other is in the grass verge. This post poses a heightened risk of a collision with it, especially in the dark where it can become near enough impossible to see it with the glare from oncoming vehicles when travelling North East on the cycle path.	To remove the post and if possible the sign. If it is still needed, have a smaller sign which would only need the use of one post.	Not assessed for IDF.					
491	Grundisburgh	Proposed 80 house development in Grundisburgh	A proposed large housing development accessed only via two minor roads with no direct access to the 'B' road network. Increased motorised traffic during construction and when inhabited will increase the risk factor for cyclists, pedestrians and other vulnerable road users trying to negotiate Park, Chapel, Lower & Ipswich Roads all of which have limited if any pavements. This will actively discourage walking and cycling in the area, particularly with regard to those less able...	Motorised traffic on these local roads need to be forcefully restricted to allow more vulnerable road users to safely walk, cycle, scoot or trot along them to/from local amenities. The developer should be instructed to provide suitable cycle/footpaths along the roadside boundaries of the development and off site connecting with the School and local amenities. There is considerable local opposition to this development as per the comments on the current planning application.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
492	Lowestoft	On the cycle path running adjacent to Tom Crispway.	The use of multiple posts in the middle of the path to notify users of what he path is for.	These posts seem to offer little or no purpose. But what they do offer is an increased risk of a collision due to a cyclist crashing into a post which has no need to be there in the first place. In contrast, you wouldn't have a post in a road for no particular reason. One improvement would be to remove all the posts that have little or no reason for being there. I recognise the purpose of some of these to cause an obstruction to vehicles potentially using the paths, but ones like these are a danger.	Not assessed for IDF.					
494	<Null>	This is a general comment, Sport England, as a non-statutory consultee, supports the development of this strategy, which will improve opportunities for physical activity, in line with Sport England's Active Design principles.	n/a	n/a	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
495	Trimley St Martin	Cycle path adjacent to Trimley to Levington link road	This path is in a very poor state with many uneven bumps and potholes, and is also dangerously close to a fast section of the A14. As a result, many cyclists choose the link road, slowing vehicular traffic and causing drivers to be impatient.	Ideally, the path should be re-sited to run alongside the link road, far safer. In short term, it should be resurfaced and a sturdy barrier placde to shield it from the A14	N/A	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
496	Campsea Ashe	Marlesford Lane dips beneath railway line at Bucks Head bridge.	Road often floods after rain in winter and from irrigation run-off in summer. Existing drain usually blocked. Water depth often sufficient to prevent access by walkers and cyclists - sometimes deep enough to cause abandonment of motor vehicles.	New drainage works.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
497	Hacheston	Lane leaving B1078 adjacent to where southbound A12 slip road joins B1078	Register as a quiet cycling route to Campsea Ashe, avoiding the B1078 which can be busy with motor traffic and which, in places, is narrow with high banks. This also gives access at Well Cottage to a lane which crosses the railway line via the Blackstock level crossing to give a quite cycling route via Station Road to Blaxhall and on to Snape.	Register as a quiet cycling route to Campsea Ashe, avoiding the B1078 which can be busy with motor traffic and which, in places, is narrow with high banks. This also gives access at Well Cottage to a lane which crosses the railway line via the Blackstock level crossing to give a quite cycling route via Station Road to Blaxhall and on to Snape.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
499	Campsea Ashe	Ashe Road between Campsea Ashe and Eyke / Rendlesham	Register as a quiet walking and cycling route between Campsea Ashe station and Eyke or Rendlesham. Give priority to walkers and cyclists.	Register as a quiet walking and cycling route between Campsea Ashe station and Eyke or Rendlesham. Give priority to walkers and cyclists.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
500	Campsea Ashe	Ivy Lodge Road between Campsea Ashe and Rendlesham / Bentwaters	Register as a quiet cycling route.	Frequently used as a short cut by lorries accessing Bentwaters from the A12. Road not suitable for HGVs and potentially dangerous for walkers and cyclists Prohibit HGVs from using this route (with exception of agricultural vehicles).	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
501	Bredfield	A12 between Ufford Road junction to Bredfield and Woods Lane roundabout	There is only a pedestrian path alongside the main road, not authorised for cyclists.	1. Authorise making this a shared user (pedestrians & cyclists) and thus legitimise current practise. 2. Widen the path	Very High	£1,400,000-£1,500,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Desirable/Essential
504	Melton	A1152 & Wilford Bridge	Lack of a cycle path, Melton traffic lights to Bromeswell Quiet lanes...	Having cycled along the footpaths on this route, there does seem to be enough room on the verge to widen the existing footpaths to create a cycle/footpath pretty much all the way along, past the station and across the bridge and round to the Bromeswell 'Quiet lane'	High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
505	Melton	Riduna Park. Woodbridge	<p>Example of new industrial development with...</p> <p>No obvious cycle parking facilities for...</p> <p>1) Members of the Public Visiting East Suffolk Council Offices</p> <p>2) Employees cycling to work at each unit</p> <p>2) Cyclists wishing to use units providing food and drink such as Honey &amp; Harveys.</p>	<p>1) Encourage developers to give up one car parking space per unit as a dedicated cycle parking space with stands or provide secure storage as per the Councils own staff facility.</p> <p>2) Encourage developers to give up unit space to a dedicated indoor bike storage space including showers and lockers. This could be a shared facility for all on the park</p> <p>3) A few sheffield stands outside the front door of the Council Offices would be useful and look good to passers by. Include a dropped kerb at the roadside end of the main entrance path so that disabled users / buggies can easily access it from the Melton direction.</p>	Not assessed for IDF.					
506	Melton	Melton	Well done to Melton Parish Council for converting this short length of footpath into a cycle/footpath. It might win the prize for the shortest cyclepath in East Suffolk but it is an example of where a small 'parish council' have been able to upgrade the designation of a footpath to a cyclepath.	East Suffolk DC to proactively support and encourage Parish Councils to upgrade footpaths to foot/cycle paths.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
507	Sutton	Sutton Heath	Walking & Cycling along 'Heath Road'..As already noted this is a fast and straight road which makes it unsafe to walk or cycle along	<p>Create a path parallel to the road but on the 'heath' side of the fence line where possible.</p> <p>The path could be a simple woodland style path suitable for walkers or those using mountain bikes.</p> <p>The verges are wide in places as well although it might mean some crossing of the road in places, but thats safer than walking down the road as I saw someone doing the other day.</p>	N/A	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
513	Woodbridge	Sandy Lane, Martlesham as far as Ipswich Road, Woodbridge	<p>Many motorists tend to drive too fast and show their reluctance to slow down for less powerful craft such as a bicycle. The railway bridge often results in a last second lurch for many.</p> <p>For a cyclist to exit the bottom of the hill from Broomheath on the way to Woodbridge, it has become quite difficult to exit onto Ipswich Road going to Woodbridge.</p>	Possible solution might be to widen the pavement thus curbing the motorists and allow cyclist to share with the few pedestrians. I would be interested to hear your views.	Very High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Desirable
514	Melton	Road between Woodbridge Thoroughfare and Melton cross roads	<p>The all day parking on both sides has reduced the width of this road by about half. Mostly shoppers or commuters are seeking to travel but the all day parkers are an obstruction and a danger to any under aware pedestrian.</p> <p>The other day I had an appointment in Common Lane, Melton and the traffic was gridlocked, from Woodbridge to Melton. I thought there must have been an accident but no. On the bike I was able to nimble past them it was a ridiculous situation.</p>	Is it time for bikes only for trips under 10 miles? Some days a week. It is moving that way.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
519	Martlesham	Pathway from Martlesham Creek to Kyson Point and on to Woodbridge	Having made much use of the pathway from Martlesham Creek to Kyson point and on to Woodbridge over the last lockdown months we have often been forced to step aside into less than safe areas to let cyclists pass. They should not be on these narrow paths at all - signs are inadequate.  There have been talks about making this route more accessible for cycling which would cause considerable work and disruption and cost a very large sum. We are against such a proposal.	Having made much use of the pathway from Martlesham Creek to Kyson point and on to Woodbridge over the last lockdown months we have often been forced to step aside into less than safe areas to let cyclists pass. They should not be on these narrow paths at all - signs are inadequate.  There have been talks about making this route more accessible for cycling which would cause considerable work and disruption and cost a very large sum. We are against such a proposal.	Not assessed for IDF.					
526	Lowestoft	East coast of Suffolk	The longest single signed cycle route in the world, approx. 6,000Km, is signed along the north Lowestoft sea wall and around the Gunton St Peter's estate. Each year many people travel from all around the world to cycle this route. Currently, the route goes from Norwich to Beccles and stays inland to Harwich missing out on the Suffolk coast.	In conjunction with Sustrans could some serious consideration be given to routing the North Sea Cycle Route from Beccles to Lowestoft and follow the Suffolk coast down to Harwich.	Not assessed for IDF.					
530	Melton	The junction with The Street/Wiford Bridge and Melton Hill Road	The crossing from The Street to the primary school is very narrow and there is considerable congestion during school hours. The traffic is also very heavy at these times,  The Street should have light vehicles only using the road between Woodbridge and Ufford except for access to and from business in the area. As a walker I have nearly been struck several times by large vehicles passing along the road close to the pavement	Re landscape grass verges on the junctions with the lights and the crossings to Melton Primary School.  Erect sign asking motorists to switch of engines when idling by lights.  Prohibit large vehicles from using the road between Woodbridge, Melton and Ufford unless for delivery only to local business.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
534	Martlesham	Felixstowe Road	The road markings are completely bonkers. Cars sometimes drive in the middle very near to oncoming traffic as if they think it's one-way. Also, traffic moves too fast, often far quicker than 30mph which I guess is the limit. At rush hour, cars sit in the cycle lane in a long line queuing at the t-junction. The pavements are too narrow too.  I cycle daily between martlesham and woodbridge and this is one of the bits which I think could be made much safer for cyclists and pedestrians.	Impose a speed limit, sort out road markings, possibly chicanes (things that stop motorists using it as a rat run and really make it a cyclist priority route as intended).	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
535	Martlesham	Right turn onto Sandy Lane	It is a hairy right-hand turn coming down the hill to turn right onto sandy lane.	Speed limit or separate waiting space would help	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
536	Woodbridge	Ipswich Road	There isn't any provision for cyclists here and the traffic moves very impatiently. There's a lot of unsafe overtaking, especially when there are two cyclists going in different directions and motorists on each side trying to overtake.	Cycles lanes and wider pavements would be great on this stretch. If it felt safe walking or cycling between woodbridge and martlesham I'm sure many more people would do it.	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	Access and junction improvements at Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club	Essential/Critical
539	Lowestoft	Denmark Road, south side. near junction with Rotterdam Road	When reaching the end of the cycle track you have to go on to the road. You cannot cross to the cycle track on the other side as there is no drop kerb at this point on the north side.	This may all change with the construction of the new bridge. All the cycle tracks at this point should be reconsidered	Very High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC, CIL	SCC, CIL	N/A	Essential
540	Lowestoft	From the roundabout at the junction of Corton Lone Lane and A47	In addition to the lack of cycle lanes to the north of this junction on the A47 to Hopton. There are very few direct cycle lanes along the A47 to the centre of Lowestoft. There are good lanes along the new Millennium Way and also around the back roads into Lowestoft, but not a direct route down the A47	Please see if you can introduce lanes south, along the existing A47	Very High	£2,200,000-£2,300,000	Developer, SCC, CIL, NH, DFT	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT, NH	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton	Essential
541	Oulton	Gorleston Road, west side between Mobbs Way and Dunston Drive. Oulton	A build up of vegetation and leaves over the past 2 years has reduced the width of the footpath. This means that if a mobility scooter is coming on this path any other scooter, buggy or pedestrian has to walk into the road to get past.	Remove all debris from the tarmac footpath. The footpath extends to just behind the lamp posts and this will double the width of the footpath. My wife has rung up a number of times about this.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
543	Trimley St Mary	Gaymer's Lane	A safer way to cycle to Trimley was via a path on to Gaymer's lane (then the new Bridle way ) from St Stennetts Close, (come up the Avenue) but someone has now blocked this.	removal of barrier	Not assessed for IDF.					
545	Trimley St Martin	Kirton Road, parallel to A14, Trimley St Martin. Unlit country road.	Trees growing to road edge, leaving no walking space, also forces cyclists out further out into traffic The verges have been mown, but under the trees	Cut back trees as far as ensibly possible	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
548	<Null>	Grange Farm Avenue, close to junction with Brackley Close	There is a traffic-calming measure here which requires east bound traffic to give way to westbound traffic. However some motorists often do not respect oncoming cyclists when the cyclist has right of way and this has clear potential to cause a head-on collision. (There is a sign that reads "think bike" however it faces traffic that DOES have right of way so I am not sure what its purpose is). There is a similar issue with Mill Lane at the point where the bridge crosses the railway line.	Either - reverse the sign that reads "think bike" so that it faces traffic that is required to give way; Or, preferably, remove the aforementioned sign and replace with a sign that more specifically reminds traffic that they need to give way to cyclists when the cyclist has right of way.	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
549	Felixstowe	South Hill, Felixstowe	Due to parking of cars on both sides the width of carriageway available on South Hill is limited and it is not possible for a car to pass a cyclist safely, and many motorists especially those descending refuse to slow down or wait for cyclists and pass dangerously, there is the risk that a speeding motorist coming down the hill will have a head on collision with a cyclist climbing the hill.	Make South Hill one way for motor vehicles, I suggest this should be uphill only (and retain two-way passage for cyclists) reflecting the solution arrived at for Bent Hill several years ago as a response to a serious accident. Convalescent Hill is the only one of the three roads ascending the cliff in this area between Sea Road and the Spa Pavilion that is suitable for through motorised traffic.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
550	Little Bealings	Playford Road and Martlesham Road, Little Bealings	The Parish Council is aware that both these roads are used regularly by cyclists, including cycling clubs at weekends, and by walkers passing between footpaths. The route is a rat run to Ipswich for vehicles seeking to avoid the A1214 and there has long been concern over the volume and speed of traffic	Traffic calming, such as width restriction or a barrier across part of the road. There was hatching in Martlesham Road, but this faded and SCC did not replace it. There was also a surface change introduced in Playford Road at one time, but this has also gone due to resurfacing.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
551	Aldringham Cum Thorpe	Old rail line running between aldeburgh and crown farm, lovers Lane, leiston, sizewell	Restore old rail line route from Aldeburgh to leiston (crown farm junction) a hard surfaced cycle route for tourists. This could then be extended through to Southwold	Suffolk's own cinder track for cyclists. Smooth hard surface available to all and not just hardcore 'off roaders'	N/A	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
552	Woodbridge	JUNCTION between Warren Hill Road and Ipswich Road.	This is a very dangerous junction for cyclists turning right into Warren Hill Road. Motorists coming down the hill are going faster, also they often fail to see cyclists waiting in the centre of Ipswich Road to turn right; the driver side A pillar of their vehicle obscures the waiting cyclist. Also, vehicles bearing right round the bend tend to move to the centre of the road. This is so dangerous I will no longer make this turn by bike.	There needs to be a safe space for cyclists in the middle of the road. This requires an illuminated island at the junction and line markings on the road indicating cyclist space. NOT just white lines, these could cause more problems by giving the appearance of safe space. There have already been accidents involving cyclists at this junction.	Not assessed for IDF.					
553	Woodbridge	Junction of Ipswich Road with Warren Hill Road	When cycling up the hill along the Ipswich Road it is very dangerous turning right into Warren Hill Road. The oncoming traffic is fast, often breaking the 30mph speed limit, because the road is wide and the traffic is going downhill. Visibility for both traffic and cyclist is poor because it is on a blind bend. The cyclist is forced to wait in the middle of the road, between lines of traffic.	A safe space for cyclists in the centre of the road. Painted white lines as these are not visible enough to traffic, and could even make the problem worse by creating an illusion of safety for cyclists. Cyclists need to feel safe. An island is the only solution.	Not assessed for IDF.					
554	Woodbridge	Cumberland St off the B1438	Pavements are way too narrow here. Since resurfacing, cars go far too fast, often on the school run. Pedestrians have to walk on the road to maintain social distancing and are constantly at risk from vehicles.	This lovely medieval street should be shared use; space for vehicles should be reduced to one way with passing places and pedestrian space should be made wider by use of bollards and planters; an inexpensive solution. Ideally, resurface at one level.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
556	Woodbridge	Cumberland Street off B1438	Cumberland St is a beautiful medieval street which should be a pleasure to walk along. Instead it is an intimidating place because the pavements are very narrow. Cars go very close by at 30mph (and sometimes more) as there is nothing to slow them down, since the road is very smooth and the double yellow lines keep the road generally free of parked cars. People frequently need to walk in the road, if they need to pass each other, or walk two abreast for example.	Shared space for vehicles and pedestrians. Traffic could be slowed easily by putting planters alongside the pavement at intervals, narrowing the access for traffic and making it slow down. Drivers should be made aware that they need to share this space with other road users.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
557	Woodbridge	Kingston Field	Kingston Field is entirely surrounded by kerbed areas; there is, surprisingly, no disabled access to this field.	Put in flat driveway type access in at least two places. Not too expensive and VERY disabled friendly.	Not assessed for IDF.					
559	Woodbridge	Kingston Field, Woodbridge	No disabled access on to this important and intensively used council owned leisure space.	There should be two points of access, I suggest one at the bottom of Cherry Tree Road and another near the car park entrance on The Avenue.	Not assessed for IDF.					
562	Woodbridge	Quay St, Church St, New St..	All these streets have inadequate space for pedestrians. Pavements are too narrow, vehicles go too fast.	Widen the pavements; if need be with temporary bollards, helping to maintain social distancing. Slow down the cars with obstructions. Better still, shut the cars out.	N/A	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
563	Melton	Melton Rd, Woodbridge to Melton	Cycle use of this road is dangerous. Cars move too fast and the road has no cycle lanes.	20 mph speed limit would be helpful here. Purpose built cycle path ideally, until then marked cycle lanes on the road.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
565	Woodbridge	The whole of Quay Street, Church Street and New Street, Woodbridge	Here we have beautiful medieval town centre streets which are impossible to walk along feeling safe because the pavements are so narrow. Priority is given to the traffic using these streets, with pedestrians having to get out of the way. This traffic goes close by at 30mph (or more if it s breaking the current speed limit). As well as being dangerous is is polluting and noisy, especially HGVs. People must be allowed to feel safe, and be able too social distance from other pedestrians.	The traffic must be slowed down, and much more emphasis must be placed on traffic giving way to pedestrians. Pavements could be widened and the roads narrowed until the traffic can be shut out completely. Even Quay street could be treated in this way. The other two roads are one way so could easily be narrowed. Chicanes along New Street (one on South side of B1079, one near Mariners Pub) would slow traffic coming down the hill here. Another solution is to take away all distinctions between pavements and road, levelling the whole space in order to make the dominant hierarchy of road usage by cars less clear, forcing traffic to slow down for pedestrians,	N/A	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
571	Foxhall	Junction from Felixstowe Road (A1156) and Straight Road	Cyclists seek westbound on the popular A1156 Felixstowe Road seeking to turn north up Straight Road have a limited opportunity to safely merge to the centre of the road with fast moving traffic behind them.	Provision of a cycleway along the A1156 and any additional safety features to enable cyclists to be able to turn right in to Straight Road (and potentially right from Straight Road on to the A1156).	Very High	£2,400,000-£2,500,000	Developer, SCC, CIL, DFT	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DFT, NH	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road and Footway improvements at Ransomes,	Critical

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
574 <Null>		Southwold to Felixstowe via Woodbridge	Following a good deal of British success at the elite level and a general desire to improve mental and physical health, cycling has become an increasingly popular activity, whether it be commuting or for leisure. However, poorly lit roads and busy traffic prevent it becoming more commonplace with people still opting for four wheels rather than two.	There is enough open space to build a cycle path from Lowestoft to Felixstowe via Woodbridge. This could be done quickly and at modest expense.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
575	Lowestoft	Between Corton Long Lane, Lowestoft, NR32 5, GBR going northwards to Hopton roundabout lack of cycle path/footpath	Cyclists/pedestrians/currently use the busy A47 or the bendy coast road B1385 which has no footpath. As a motorist I see the dangers of cyclists using this fast dual carriageway, even if they are entitled to, but people make bad choices. I have even seen a person in a mobility scooter using this road. Death wish. As a cyclist and pedestrian I use the coast road every time, but it is bendy, there is no footpath and it is a bus route.	It would be a great amenity and so much safer to have a cycle/footpath between Corton Long Lane, Lowestoft, NR32 5, GBR going northwards to link with the existing one at Hopton. It might help mobility scooter users too. Near the roundabout there would ideally have to be some kind of crossing point to link users into the existing track past St Margaret's Church, Hopton (grid ref: TG 5241 0004) on the old Lowestoft Road.	High	£1,000,000-£1,100,000	NH, SCC, Developer, CIL	S278, S106, CIL, SCC, NH, DFT	Cycle link between Lowestoft and Hopton and potential safety improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Essential
576	Lowestoft	The clifftop cycle path/footpath at Pakefield going from The Jolly Sailors. Pakefield Street, NR33 0JS, to Arbor Lane	It's rather narrow for the amount of users it gets, especially at weekends and peak holiday times. The path is used by pedestrians, dog walkers, people in mobility scooters and cyclists and there has to be a lot of give and take between them. It can be snail pace for cyclists.	Widening of the route and having a dedicated cycle path would make life a lot easier for all concerned and allow cyclist to make progress.	High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Beneficial
577	Rushmere St Andrew	A1214 cycle route through Kesgrave plus other locations	Like many of the cycle routes alongside roads in Suffolk cyclists need to give way at junctions. This requires looking over the right shoulder to look for cars turning left. This is dangerous and is also a major inconvenience having to slow down or stop at junctions. If cycling on the road the cyclist like vehicles has a right of way across the junction. Also pedestrians have a right of way at junctions according to the highway code.	I lived in Munich for 2 years and cycled there. Cycle routes had a right of way over side roads that they crossed. It worked well all vehicles gave way as needed.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
580 <Null>		General comment about public footpaths	Officially public footpaths are not for use by cyclists. A lot could probably be opened up to cyclists and would provide safe off-road routes.	Open suitable public footpaths to cyclists	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
581 <Null>		Speed of cars on country lanes endangers cyclists and pedestrians	cars travel too fast on country lanes and endanger cyclists and pedestrians	For many country lanes (especially single track lanes) a realistic speed limit would be 30mph. The speed limit on country lanes should be reduced to 30mph. It would probably have a minimal effect on journey times along the country lanes for cars. It would also improve villages if the speed limit within the settlement boundary is 20mph. This would also reduce CO2 emissions etc.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
582	Trimley St Martin	Cars parked near the shop	Highly dangerous to cycle past the shop area (in particular in the east direction) due to slowing / stopping cars that are parking for the shop, also cars pulling out after using the shop. Frequent near misses due to poor awareness of cycling traffic. Cycle lane is constantly parked on. The road is also very narrow at this point.	20 mph zone? mandatory cycle lane? Dedicated parking bay surrounded by double yellow lines? parking enforcement?	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
584	Melton	Woods Lane	Children use this route for cycling from Melton to Farlingaye school. It is very busy with huge lorries coming to and from Rendlesham Bentwaters. Needs shared cycle/footway or cycle Lane to make safer for cyclists.	Children use this route for cycling from Melton to Farlingaye school. It is very busy with huge lorries coming to and from Rendlesham Bentwaters. Needs shared cycle/footway or cycle Lane to make safer for cyclists.	Very High	£800,000-£850,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
586	Woodbridge	Theatre Street and Burkitt Road	I either cycle or walk my son to playgroup at St Mary's Primary School before I head off to work. Walking or cycling are both a bit hairy as the traffic often zooms by on this stretch – there's no indication of what the speed limit is so people take that as licence to go as fast as they please – often speeds in excess of 30mph. This is a busy stretch filled with children on the way to Farlingaye and St Mary's – please put up a 20mph sign!	Please put up a 20mph sign!	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
588	<Null>	Sandy Lane, Woodbridge, Ipswich Rd junction to railway bridge	Sandy Lane is a dangerous place to walk because there is no escape from speeding traffic! The stretch from Broomheath Rd to the Railway Bridge (part of Circular River Walk) is especially dangerous. The narrowness and blind bends make it unsafe.	Sandy Lane needs a footpath! And a 20mph speed limit.	Very High	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Desirable
602	Martlesham	GR 260 451	At present, ATs aiming for the Martlesham Retail Park and to cross the A12 via the foot & cycle bridge or either of the tunnels in order to reach the Martlesham P&R, Kesgrave High School, Ipswich Hospital, Town, buses or rail station, and visitors coming the other way, tend to cycle along the tarmac strip as footpaths #23 & 43 are very rough.	When Brightwell Lakes are developed, good cycleways to the A12 crossings, must be provided	Very High	£1,100,000-£1,200,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
607	Woodbridge	General	The issue is that most if not all the few existing cycle paths are marked poorly. There is no right of way marked for pedestrians or cyclists on the existing paths (ie A12 path or Martlesham to Ipswich). Most byways and other footpaths positively discriminate AGAINST cyclists, with for example, much protest about mostly harmless cycling on the river wall and bars to prevent cycles passing at most town footpath entrances and exits.	<p>Campaigns to promote a cycle 'economy' around new cycle routes, recognising that every cyclist reduces congestion for road users, reduces pollution, increases the mental and physical health of the cyclists themselves, which in turn saves more money for NHS and authorities.</p> <p>Promotion of positive recognition of cyclists who deliberately commute to better their health and lower local pollution, (combatting climate emergency) vs the negative/destructive effect of driving short distances to school and work. School promotion of cycling within a certain distance instead of driving, especially where onward commute to work is not a consideration.</p> <p>Enforce existing traffic legislation designed to promote the safety of cyclists. (ie speed limits, distances for passing cyclists, parking on cycle paths).</p>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
608 <Null>		General	Nearly all cycle paths stop abruptly at some point with direction onto a busy road with poor direction and often no further option but to stay on the road. Even the poorly marked cycle paths on main roads are usually blocked at some point by parked cars. Hurried commuters often have little time for slower cyclists who are often viewed as a non-road-fee-paying nuisance. Walkers are well catered for in most areas but can view the bike as an unwelcome nuisance also.	Support this campaign by creating and investing in a considered and continuous infrastructure of cycle paths and facilities, such as marking paths with cycle and pedestrian areas, widening existing paths, traffic reduction schemes citing the reason for promoting cycling. (such as the welcome sign for the Thoroughfare which says 'except cycles'). These paths should connect outlying villages as well as provide cross-town routes, cycling off road wherever possible. (ie routes from Bromeswell to Woodbridge using part of the river wall, which is wide enough to accommodate cycles and pedestrians. Rendlesham to Woodbridge, Bredfield to Woodbridge, Hasketon to Woodbridge, and so on).	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
609	Melton	General	Encourage a cycle lock or loop fixed to walls outside certain shops, where appropriate. Invest in wider recreational cycle route creation to enhance the area for local cyclists, pedestrians and (staycation) tourism. (ie river wall route from Wilford Bridge to Felixstowe Ferry).	Further interconnection between towns and villages of the area, including tackling awkward areas where there is seemingly less space for cycle paths, such as from the outskirts of Woodbridge towards Martlesham where routes into Ipswich are found.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
610	Barnby	Barnby Bends	Large dip on westbound although road surface not broken. Possibility of dismounting cyclist since it is downhill and cyclists could be travelling at reasonable speed. Almost dismounted cyclist in front of me yesterday - I am aware of dip so can avoid	Large dip on westbound although road surface not broken. Possibility of dismounting cyclist since it is downhill and cyclists could be travelling at reasonable speed. Almost dismounted cyclist in front of me yesterday - I am aware of dip so can avoid	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
613	Lowestoft	Lowestoft Promenade	I read there are several items on the agenda for safety, need and encouragement for even more cycle lanes to be improved, eg new lines to be re painted along the promenade. Surely this is such an easy task, low cost and needs no consolidation, as the cycle lane is already in use?	So, I ask this is to be given priority, after all there is no money issue, as I also researched the funding that central Government had given to you, I believe the sum of three million, this was to spend to fast track for cycle corridors, in the wake of the Covid 19.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
614	Lowestoft	Pakefield High School (opposite)	<p>My last request, for the spending of the money given to Lowestoft, for the high demand and in identifying the NEED for a new cycle lane opposite Pakefield High School, NR337AQ.</p> <p>I travel on London Road frequently, either on my bike, walking or by my car. Last Thursday afternoon, when the student were finishing school, I witnessed a child stumble into the road, he was very lucky not to be injured.</p>	<p>I can see from your plans that Arbour Lane, MAY be improved?</p> <p>Look at taking this new cycle lane from Mc Donald's roundabout to Pakefield road and connects to the existing track along the promenade.</p> <p>There are over three hundred students at this school, the new safety improvements need to happen promptly.</p> <p>The safety of everyone in that area should not purely be down to luck.</p>	High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Beneficial
616	Lowestoft	The Promenade	May I please ask you to consider allowing cycling on the lower promenade during off peak times. For example, not during the peak holiday season or any Bank Holiday weekends. Additionally, when cycling in the designated cycle path on the top of the promenade, pedestrians who wander aimlessly across the path also give cyclists a great amount of abuse.	May I please ask you to consider allowing cycling on the lower promenade during off peak times. For example, not during the peak holiday season or any Bank Holiday weekends. Additionally, when cycling in the designated cycle path on the top of the promenade, pedestrians who wander aimlessly across the path also give cyclists a great amount of abuse.	High	£1,200,000-£1,300,000	SCC, ESC	SCC, ESC	N/A	Beneficial
617	Lowestoft	Sparrows Nest	cycling North up the High Street, but heading to The Sparrows Nest park, involves crossing lanes of traffic, around the central island where the garage is. As I want to get to Gunton Cliff and down Links Hill to cycle back to town along the Cycle path along North Beach, I find this section really dangerous.	cycling North up the High Street, but heading to The Sparrows Nest park, involves crossing lanes of traffic, around the central island where the garage is. As I want to get to Gunton Cliff and down Links Hill to cycle back to town along the Cycle path along North Beach, I find this section really dangerous.	Very High	£2,000,000 - £2,100,000	SCC, NH, DFT, Developer	SCC, NH, DFT, S106, S278, CIL	Potential safety Improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Potentially critical
619	Wickham Market	Between Potsford Brook and the footpath that goes to the Gallows on the B1078 west of Wickham Market.	There is already an improved suggestion but if the landowner declines to allow walking along the field edge on the north side of the 1078, then consider opening up a part of the woodland on the south side as a right of way or permissive path.	There is already an improved suggestion but if the landowner declines to allow walking along the field edge on the north side of the 1078, then consider opening up a part of the woodland on the south side as a right of way or permissive path.	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
620	Letheringham	Just north of Letheringham (the Street) on the way to the Hoo/Easton road.	There is a huge run off of wet mud from the field there and this creates an uneven, rippled and potentially hazardous surface for people on bikes.	Persuade the owner of the land/field to clear the mud on a regularly and frequently.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
621	Southwold	From the bridge follow the line of the old railway up to Halesworth.	Although good footpaths and bridleways, the line of the old railway is not immediately apparent.	Join up the various footpaths and bridleways to create a cycle route between the River Blyth and Halesworth to follow the route of the railway.	N/A	£1,600,000-£1,700,000	SCC, DFT, Developer	SCC, DFT, S278, S106, CIL	Access, sustainable transport, cycle and footway improvements for South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (Policy SCLP12.29)	Critical
622	Melton	The Street, Melton	This is a historic route. The road is narrow and so are the pavements. Many of the buildings are hard against the pavement. At peak times, the vehicles are nose to tail. Pedestrians, including families on their way to school, have to run the gauntlet between the vehicles and the buildings, wreathed in exhaust fumes.	Measure the air pollution in real time to better understand the scale of the problem. Make The Street a no idling zone.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
628	Kesgrave	The A1214 between Ipswich and the A12 junction and the cycle footways alongside the A1214 that's used for Kesgrave High School access	1) The A1214 between Ipswich and the A12 junction is a key route for everyday transport cycling but is congested/polluted and on-road improvements are needed. 2) The design of the cycle/footways by Kesgrave Fisheries and Kesgrave High School are not fit for purpose and also need repair/resurfacing 3) Damage to the cycle/footways is exacerbated by vehicles driving and parking on them and vehicles also cause obstructions 4) The side road cycle priority crossings have also deteriorated.	1) Make the whole of the A1214 between Ipswich and the A12 junction a 20mph zone with priority for cyclists. It runs past a school and residential housing and lower speeds would make it safer /more attractive for cyclists/pedestrians 2) Widen the road across Rushmere Heath to create dedicated cycle lanes on either side, separated from the footway. And plant Oak/Birch etc trees along the Heath edge 3) Turn the sections of shared cycle footway by Kesgrave Fisheries, Kesgrave High School etc into wide attractive pedestrian-only routes - they are too narrow /dangerous for shared use by cycles/pedestrians/mobility scooters/wheelchairs/buggies 4) Where space allows e.g. by KHS the new pedestrian-only route could be designed and built as a wide and pleasant tree-lined boulevard to accommodate the very high level of foot traffic at school times including buggies, dogs etc. Trees would also help soak up some of the traffic pollution and help improve health, the environment and visual amenity.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
629	Kesgrave	A1214 Kesgrave especially its junction with Bell Lane and the section up to All Saints Church and Ropes Drive West roundabout and in the other direction going to Heath Road roundabout	1) The cycle/footway is too narrow on south side of A1214 and at Bell Lane junction and is heavily used for walking and cycling to/from Kesgrave High School 2) There is no pedestrian crossing of the A1214 and this is needed to enable people to cross the road from All Saints Church to access the Cemetery, Carpet Cuts and the bus stop 3) High level of air pollution by The Bell caused by traffic congestion and queing here which creates health risks for everyone- especially car drivers and occupants	Redesign A1214 corridor as safe and attractive for people to walk, cycle and use a bus. Helps address the climate emergency and public health crisis (reduces NHS burden if people can choose active travel). Make the A1214 a priority route for cyclists, buses and disabled users who need to use their cars. It's a key bus route and First Bus have previously asked for improvements to A1214. In return, ask them - with support from local councils/central government funding - to offer free bus use for a month (+ ongoing offers) to persuade people out of cars e.g. The Park and Ride bus service is excellent but few people have tried it. More bus use = less single occupancy car use +less congestion and pollution. Turn A1214 into a 20mph road to encourage cycling, offer free cycle training and bike repairs locally. Redesign the cycle/footway on the south side of A1214 as a pedestrian-only route with pedestrian crossing of A1214 and ped/cycle/bus friendly redesign of the Bell Lane/a1214 junction.	Modal Filter					comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.
631	Rushmere St Andrew	A1214 across Rushmere Heath	Key section of route in the corridor between Ipswich - Kesgrave - Woodbridge. Cyclists have no alternative routes available which are safe and convenient e.g. the footpath across the Heath is a footpath - a sandy track across which there is no legal right to cycle and there is also a risk of being hit by golf balls. And the route via Rushmere village is a long detour. If we are to encourage more people to cycle then this key section of route needs some cycling provision. It's a missing link.	Widen the A1214 here to create dedicated cycle lanes on either side of the road, segregated from the pedestrian footway. Widen the footway on either side so it's suitable for mobility scooters, wheelchairs, buggies etc. Plant suitable trees along the edge of the footway and Heath - Birch, Oak etc? and a shrub layer - gorse? to create an attractive and sheltered route for pedestrians and an attractive feature in the landscape. I think the land either side of the A1214 here is Common Land - if so, then can the Council find an area of land, comparable in size and in quality in terms of wildlife/landscape quality and public amenity/access in East Suffolk to dedicate as Common Land to substitute/compensate for that taken? And as an enhancement, perhaps East Suffolk could discuss with the owners any appropriate support for wildlife e.g. a wildlife tunnel underneath the A1214 road if helpful for connectivity for amphibians /reptiles other creatures in lowland heath habitats or other support?	High	£1,200,00 - £1,300,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
632	Playford	Playford Road between junction with Bent Lane and Hall Road and along Martlesham Road	High traffic speeds. Feels very dangerous to cycle along Playford Road. Also drivers often play chicken - overtaking me on my bike when there is oncoming traffic and they cut in front of me. There have been far too many near misses... It must be terrifying for the oncoming cars too.	I am very impressed with the recently installed speed cushions further down Playford Road between Humber Doucy Lane and Bent Lane. A big thank you to whoever initiated/funded/implemented these. There is just enough space between the cushion and side of the road for cyclists to pass and the cushions are successful in slowing traffic speeds. Also, the new mini-roundabout by Bent Lane /The Street /Playford Rd seems to have helped slow traffic speeds too. Can speed cushions be installed all the way along Playford Road and Martlesham Rd please? It is a key cycling route, but too terrifying for many people to use. And lower speed limits would hopefully benefit pedestrians too?	Speed reductions					have not been assessed for the IDF.

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
637	Lowestoft	going from High Street north on A47 (towards Corton)	I have no idea what I am supposed to do at the top of the High Street on a bicycle. There is a cycle lane coming south but I do not want to use it going into on-coming traffic. There is confusion about what pavement cycling as sometimes marked and then disappears. I don't want to cycle on the A47 as it is too fast but there is no alternative but more importantly NO SIGNAGE at all. The DENES HIGH SCHOOL is on the A47 and currently no cycle path from south to allow pupils to cycle safely.	Proper cycle ways that are NOT on the road and NOT on the pavement. Cyclists need to be protected from traffic on A roads. A cycle way along the whole of the A47	Very High	£2,000,000 - £2,100,000	SCC, NH, DFT, Developer	SCC, NH, DFT, S106, S278, CIL	Potential safety Improvements to A47 to accommodate the North Lowestoft Garden Village (Policy WLP2.12)	Potentially critical
638	Kessingland	Kessingland + A12 going south	There is no cycle route at all. There is no way for cycles to travel safely along the A12. How do we even get to Benacre from Lowestoft? Why no cycle way along the A12?	Cycle way along the A12. At present no way of getting to Lowestoft until Kessingland is reached (and then it's not very good)	Very High	£4,000,000-£4,100,000	SCC, NH, DFT	SCC, NH, DFT	N/A	Essential
639	<Null>	Whole of Lowestoft	Cycle routes are good in the town of Lowestoft (compared to other UK cities/towns but NOT when compared with most of Europe). However there is NO WAY of getting OUT of LOWESTOFT to other places: Yarmouth unsafe, Southwold unsafe/non-existent; Beccles not great; Hadiscoe very unsafe and non-existent. How do people work in other places and commute by bike (or even public transport)?	You need to work with Highways and Norfolk. There is just no investment to go from place to another. Why not work with Sustrans? (who have pulled out of Suffolk because not enough funding). More strategic thinking about cycling as a mode of transport NOT just a Sunday jolly.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
641	<Null>	Cycle paths and footpaths throughout East Suffolk	Concerns about the surface and width of footpaths and cycle paths.	Cycle paths and foot paths should be at least 2 metres wide to allow for two wheelchairs to pass. The surface should be tarmac so that all people can walk / use wheelchairs easily. They should be reasonably level, with no hills or steps, or gates. They should be regularly maintained.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
646	Waldringfield	Footpaths in and around Waldringfield, and elsewhere throughout East Suffolk (Ref186)	Waldringfield Parish Council agrees with this. WPC has put up No Cycling signs on several footpath following complaints by residents, and most of these have been destroyed, presumably by cyclists.	Waldringfield Parish Council agrees with this. WPC has put up No Cycling signs on several footpath following complaints by residents, and most of these have been destroyed, presumably by cyclists.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
647	Waldringfield	River Wall north of Waldringfield (Footpath 11)	There is a serious problem on the river wall footpath north of Waldringfield (FP11), where cycling damages the structure of the river wall and could eventually result in a breach. No cycling signs are regularly ignored by cyclists.	Barriers would be effective but are problematic because they make access for mobility vehicles difficult. Better signage might help.	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
648	Waldringfield	Waldringfield (Ref 409)	Waldringfield Parish council agrees with this, except that we do not support compelling pubs such as the Maybush to provide toilets – encouragement is far better. The absence of public toilets leaves walkers with little choice if they are ‘caught out’, resulting in health hazards as well as being offensive and off-putting.	A public toilet in the Maybush car park. There should also be far more litter bins at the start and end of public footpaths.	Not assessed for IDF.					
650	Marlesford	lack of cycling facilities Framlingham - Parham - Hacheston - Wickham Market station	The B1116 is a very busy road, and parts have a national (60mph) speed limit. Some has 30/ 40mph but from Brick Lane to The Street in Parham there is no alternative. There is a back-lane route from Hacheston to Campsea via Marlesford but there is no safe crossing of the A12. A significant number of cyclists do use the A1116 but only fit and fast ones.	Re-create the Framingham branch railway line for walking and cycling. For much of the way from Framingham to Marlesford there are public footpaths paralleling the old railway alignment, or very near by. These could be diverted, through negotiation, and joined up to follow the track bed, and be reclassified as bridleway or cycle track. In the longer term the track bed could be acquired and the surface upgraded. As an extension - though more complex - path could be extended along the old freight railway line to Snape Maltings. There are very few truly traffic-free cycling facilities in this part of Suffolk (that are not muddy). This could develop into a fantastic and very well-used facility for leisure and other purposes.	N/A	£2,100,000 - £2,200,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
651	Felixstowe	from the Dip northwards to Felixstowe Ferry along sea wall/ promenade	to be consistent with Prom south of Cobbolds Point, allow cycling access as shared use with pedestrians along prom/sea wall north off Dip. This will mean children / families won't have to use fast section of Ferry Rd through golf course if they wish to get to Fx Ferry - a popular spot for families. Also, Fx Ferry as a dead end, has a traffic and parking congestion problem, which improved cycle access to the hamlet would help mitigate.	Give permission for considerate cycling, while maintaining pedestrian priority. Narrow stretch near Cliff car park may need widening or signs for cyclists to dismount for this short stretch.	High	£450,000-£500,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
652	Lowestoft	It is a pointless exercise suggesting improvements to local infrastructure unless there is a coherent plan for cycling in Lowestoft.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lowestoft with its relatively flat terrain and low car ownership should be leading the way.</li> <li>- Instead there is a mish-mash of side streets and a few reasonable cycle routes. Few join up and almost all end in dangerous exit points at roundabouts and junctions.</li> <li>- Few routes are safe for children</li> <li>- No attempt to encourage cycle tourism, such as routes from the station to Oulton Broad or Carlton Marshes, or even signage to the beach!</li> </ul>	<p>First, come up with a proper co-ordinated strategy for cycling in Lowestoft not just minor cosmetic improvements (I would be happy to contribute).</p> <p>Secondly prioritise safe direct routes into town that you would be happy to let your children use.</p> <p>Thirdly, encourage cycle tourism by making Lowestoft a hub for routes to the Broads, and along the river Waveney.</p> <p>Fourthly get Sustrans and Lottery funds to make safe cycle tracks not dotted lines on the main road.</p> <p>Finally where there are shared routes with pedestrians, look at ways of separating the activities (eg different coloured surfaces) to increase pedestrian safety and acceptance of dual use routes.</p>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
654	Aldringham Cum Thorpe	B1353 running from Aldringham to Thorpeness	This road is heavily used by families to cycle to and from Thorpeness. The speed of traffic combined with the ever reducing width of the road makes this activity very dangerous.	A new cycle path/footpath linking these two villages would reduce the ever increasing risk to cyclists and pedestrians.	N/A	£1,300,000-£1,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Desirable
657	Sudbourne	Sudbourne	Cycling: 1. Time trial and organised events: The B1084 (Melton to Orford) is a popular route for time trial and organised events but has many narrow sections which can put cyclists and other traffic in conflict. In particular large agricultural vehicles with restricted speed, manoeuvrability and driver visibility can be hazardous for cyclists. This is a particular problem in mid / late summer with long daylight hours when they are on the same road at the same time.	1. Time trial and organised events: Organiser of these events should pre-warn affected Parish Councils of their intention to hold these organised events and routes in advance: to enable landowners / farmers in particular to ensure their vehicle movements are planned to ensure that there is minimal or reduced mixing of cycles and large agricultural vehicles. The onus has to be on the event organisers to ensure this is done in a timely manner. Information and advice for cyclists should be located at strategic locations such as Honey and Harveys in Melton a frequent meeting point for cycling groups. Event organisers should include their contact details on all roadside signage and once cycle events have been completed, they are responsible for its removal of all to reduce the amount of roadside litter created.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
659	Sudbourne	Sudbourne	2. Condition of Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route 41 (Orford to Iken / Snape via Ferry Road through Sudbourne): This promoted rural route is quiet, picturesque and in many ways ideal for cyclists. However, the route suffers from multiple large areas of sand that have run-off from fields in particular near gate / road ways. This sand surface is especially dangerous for cyclists with smooth road tyres who have no grip on such surfaces.	2. Condition of National Cycle Route 41 (Orford to Iken via Ferry Road in Sudbourne): There are potentially three solutions that may be used individually or in combination. 1. Information should be added to publicity of the route that this is a hazard for cyclists to be aware of. 2. Information on the actual route should highlight the hazard in advance for cyclists 3. The land owners / Suffolk County Council should ensure the roads are clear of this washed off material.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
660	Sudbourne	Sudbourne	3. Snape road and B1084 Snape to Orford. This road in particular is often very busy with frequent blind spots and drivers who drive too fast for the prevailing road conditions and don't anticipate individual and multiple cyclists. There are few safe passing places for cars and other vehicles on this road. An alternative for cyclist route should be investigated and implemented as a matter of urgency.	3. Snape road and B1084 Snape to Orford. In order to remove the hazards from the route from Orford to Snape an alternative route with a suitable surface should be built and clearly marked through Tunstall Forest. This would provide a safe cycling environment that would be enjoyed by a wide range of cyclists and reduce the hazard on the road. There are a variety of potential routes that can be explored in more detail which would enhance the riders experience and improve safety. 4. Information signs to bikers could be Tangham campsite , Snape Maltings , car park at Iken and Sandgalls	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
661	Wickham Market	There are pinch points on the Hill at Wickham Market, at the Post Office and at The Teapot Tea Rooms. The hill coming up from Bordercot Lane on to The Hill	Cyclists to feel safe these areas to encourage them to cycle in and around the village	The introduction of 20mph speed limits and 'shared space' for cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
662	Melton	Woods Lane	Despite the 30mph zone, vehicles seldom adhere to it making this necessary pedestrian and cycling route very unpleasant and dangerous. In addition, for those wanting to turn into Woods Lane from side streets, the speed combined with the volume of traffic make this dangerous. There T-intersection with Leeks Hill is a public right of way frequented by walkers a school children and requiring them to cross.	Additional signage to ensure all drivers are aware of 30mph zone, and installation of a speed camera to ensure vehicle compliance. Potential taffic calming measures, including siganage and a pedestrian crossing point. Alternatively, and better still, reducing the speed to a 20mph zone would vastly improve this stretch of road for other users while only adding 60 seconds to vehicle journeys and reducing local noise and pollution.	Not assessed for IDF.					
663	<Null>	N/A	Beccles Town Council, noting that as Suffolk County Council also have a cycling and walking strategy, the ESC cycling and walking strategy should not duplicate this and that the two strategies should link together, particularly as Suffolk County Council are responsible for the highways and transportation infrastructure. The linking of both strategies is also important to ensure that all comments received by the separate strategies, are duly considered when the overall strategy is reviewed.	Beccles Town Council, noting that as Suffolk County Council also have a cycling and walking strategy, the ESC cycling and walking strategy should not duplicate this and that the two strategies should link together, particularly as Suffolk County Council are responsible for the highways and transportation infrastructure. The linking of both strategies is also important to ensure that all comments received by the separate strategies, are duly considered when the overall strategy is reviewed.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
666	Lowestoft	Lowestoft	The improvement that I feel needs making is that whilst it is reasonably possible to cycle within Lowestoft it is virtually impossible to cycle away from Lowestoft to any significant or interesting destination.	If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
667	Ashby, Herringfleet And Somerleyton	Between Haddiscoe and Reedham via Somerleyton	The marshes between Haddiscoe and Reedham via Somerleyton involves cycling along 'car fast' narrow lanes which have no provision whatsoever for cyclists, and any attempt to avoid fast roads involves miles of detours with in real terms no real gain in safety.	If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
668	South Cove	Lowestoft to Southwold	Lowestoft to Southwold involves large detours to avoid the A12 from Kessingland but eventually arriving at a very dangerous crossing of the A12 at Wrentham followed by several miles of very dangerous travel along the B road to Reydon and Southwold. again there is no provision whatsoever for cyclists.	If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
669	Ellough	Lowestoft to Ellough	Cycling to the Ellough farmers market from Lowestoft. The majority of this route is currently satisfactory despite no obvious provision for cyclists once out of Lowestoft, but at the end cyclists are deposited onto a very fast busy B road with no provision for cyclists.	If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
670 <Null>		East Suffolk	We are of the opinion that in a period of scarce resources we consider that the three priorities for walking should be as follows: 1. Improve existing PROWs by maintaining gates, stiles, finger posts and signage and clarify who can and cannot access PROWs. 2. Ensure land owners co-operate with this maintenance and engage with SCC highways on how to improve condition of PROWs on their land. 3. Ensure Town and Parish councils appoint PROW officer and make sure public are aware who to contact.	We note that there are already a number of cycling routes supported by ESC and SCC and these should also be given greater publicity. Greater use of cycling is a much more complex issue that requires a high level strategic approach across all relevant councils. As a small parish we can support and publicise these routes as required.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
672	Trimley St Mary	<Null>	There are a couple of areas on this road that are pinch points and of particular danger to cyclists, not least outside the school entrance on the High road and near McColls shop. If there are no plans to re-paint or enhance the cycle lane provision in this area, are there any other plans to address road safety issues in these areas?	The Parish council are also keen to find out if there would be any funding available to introduce a mini roundabout at the High road / Station road junction. This would reduce speeding in the immediate area as well as improve the road junction.  Extend the temporary 'mandatory' cycle lane through Walton and then through Trimley St Mary / Trimley St Martin	Not assessed for IDF.					
673	Southwold	Southwold Town Council	STC would like to support references that have been submitted already, namely: Refs: 333, 34 and 102 combined, and all references to the Coastal Path from north of the pier through Eastern Bawents.	STC would like to support references that have been submitted already, namely: Refs: 333, 34 and 102 combined, and all references to the Coastal Path from north of the pier through Eastern Bawents.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
674	South Cove	B1127 Lowestoft Road	The B1127, Lowestoft Road is particularly dangerous for walkers and cyclists and safety measures to improve the lot of each would be welcome.	The B1127, Lowestoft Road is particularly dangerous for walkers and cyclists and safety measures to improve the lot of each would be welcome.	N/A	£3,000,000-£3,500,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
676 <Null>		East Suffolk	In seeking to improve the cycling and walking experience in East Suffolk the safety of each is paramount - from separating them from motorised transport to ensuring that mountain and trial bikes do not despoil the environment by increasing erosion.	The most essential aspect for me, from a cyclists' viewpoint, has a to be ensuring that no parking is allowed in any cycle lane; it's crazy and euphemistic! Any mitigation, by way of educating and persuading car users to reduce their dependence upon the motor car, would be welcome, even to the extent of escalating car parking charges, perhaps?	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
678	Campsea Ashe	B1078 between Campsea Ashe and Five Ways / Lower Hacheston	very dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists trying to access the key bus stops at Five Ways from Campsea Ashe	Pavement / footway-cycleway; some can be done as pavement adjacent to kerb (e.g., in front of houses and Lower Hacheston) some as segregated track parallel to the road, behind hedgerows	N/A	£850,000-£900,000	SCC	SCC	N/A	Beneficial
679 <Null>		N/A	See attached.	See attached.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
680 <Null>		East Suffolk	See attached.	See attached.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
688	Martlesham	Martlesham	<p>The feedback by local parishioners shown on the ESC interactive map reinforces many of the issues raised by MPC over several years, in particular about the need to make improvements to encourage sustainable and safer travel between Martlesham and Woodbridge. This is all the more important given the climate emergency which SCC, ESC and MPC have declared.</p> <p>We refer you to the Martlesham NP which has a section on 'Getting Around' – see Cycling, walking and disabled access, p43, policies MAR13 &amp; 14.</p>	<p>The feedback by local parishioners shown on the ESC interactive map reinforces many of the issues raised by MPC over several years, in particular about the need to make improvements to encourage sustainable and safer travel between Martlesham and Woodbridge. This is all the more important given the climate emergency which SCC, ESC and MPC have declared.</p> <p>We refer you to the Martlesham NP which has a section on 'Getting Around' – see Cycling, walking and disabled access, p43, policies MAR13 &amp; 14.</p>	Not assessed for IDF.					
689	Felixstowe	Felixstowe	See attached.	See attached.	Assessed Separately					
691	Felixstowe	Foxgrove Lane / High Rd (Walking)	Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface	Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
693	Felixstowe	Brook Lane / Park Avenue (Walking)	Signposting, maintenance	Signposting, maintenance	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
694	Waldringfield	Footpaths in and around Waldringfield, and elsewhere throughout East Suffolk	<p>With the rising popularity of cycling we seem to have lost respect for the differences between footpaths and bridleways. Cyclists seem to no longer acknowledge that footpaths are not for cycling along, making it potentially dangerous for walkers and causing damage to footpaths. In the same way that cyclists wish to see improvements to the road infrastructure to feel safe from vehicles we need to acknowledge that there are similar issues on footpaths...which are NOT rights of way for cyclists.</p>	<p>For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC's responses are labelled as 'our response'.</p> <p>A campaign of education about the differences between footpaths and bridleways coupled with improved signage and potentially sanctions for non compliance</p> <p>Our response: We agree with this. WPC has put up No Cycling signs on several footpath following complaints by residents, and most of these have been destroyed, presumably by cyclists.</p> <p>We also have a more serious problem on the river wall footpath north of Waldringfield (FP11), where cycling damages the structure of the river wall and could eventually result in a breach.</p>	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
695	Waldringfield	Waldringfield	For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC's responses are labelled as 'our response'.  No WC accessible to the public walking or cycling in the area. It would get more people out walking and/or cycling if they could feel sure that they would be able to find WCs en route. Waldringfield is a classic example of a place in a prime location for walkers, but no toilets. This applies to most villages these days so Waldringfield is just one example.	For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC's responses are labelled as 'our response'. Our response: We agree with this, except that we do not support compelling pubs such as the Maybush to provide toilets – encouragement is far better. The absence of public toilets leaves walkers with little choice if they are 'caught out', resulting in health hazards as well as being offensive and off-putting. There should also be far more litter bins at the start and end of public footpaths.	Not assessed for IDF.					
697	Felixstowe	Martello Lane / beach (Walking)	Signposting, maintenance	Signposting, maintenance	Not assessed for IDF.					
701	Felixstowe	York Rd / rear St. Felix Church (Walking)	Signposting, maintenance	Signposting, maintenance	Not assessed for IDF.					
707	Felixstowe	Footpath xx Philip Avenue to Coronation Drive	Was closed due to slippage. What is current status?	Was closed due to slippage. What is current status?	Not assessed for IDF.					
710	Felixstowe	High Row Field / High Road (Walking)	Status? Created as part of High Row Field development. Signposting, maintenance. NB reference effects of potential redevelopment of Brackenbury Sports Centre site.	Status? Created as part of High Row Field development. Signposting, maintenance. NB reference effects of potential redevelopment of Brackenbury Sports Centre site.	Not assessed for IDF.					
711	Felixstowe	College Green / Maybush Lane (Walking)	Status? Created as part of College development. Signposting, maintenance. Ownership & rights complex. Reference correspondence about Planning Application DC/20/4188/FUL	Status? Created as part of College development. Signposting, maintenance. Ownership & rights complex. Reference correspondence about Planning Application DC/20/4188/FUL	Not assessed for IDF.					
714	Felixstowe	<Null>	Open connection beneath Leisure Centre walkway to promenade between Pier Bight Car Park existing route and the Events Area (Cycling)	Although not obvious, careful informal survey appears to indicate this is feasible. Would need negotiation with Leisure Centre operator. Previously identified by SCC 2015. Also a good principle to establish ahead of potential future development of Leisure Centre site.	Not assessed for IDF.					
715	Felixstowe	Exit Martello Park to Manor Terrace - See also map Cycle Route 51B & Insets	Track ends at boundary of Martello Park development. Cycle Route 51 continues onto Manor Terrace to Landguard via the Car Park. The large area of unmade ground is without known ownership.	This needs to be researched again (ESC did some work c. 1999 as part of South Sea Front project) and ESC should seek to claim it, as was done recently nearby on corner of Manor Road & Terrace. Could then serve as Cycling and Walking Route, and also possibly additional residents parking for Manor Terrace properties, frequently requested.  But it is also a critical access route for both ESC and EA for plant access to 2 vehicular flood gates for flood defence maintenance. Protection is believed to be formalised for EA by flood defence regulations. Layout must recognise that. NB the land cannot be built on, for that reason.	Not assessed for IDF.					
719	Tunstall	Orford to Aldeburgh via Snape	I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Orford to Aldeburgh via Snape (sections of this exist already, for instance the Sailor's Path);	I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Orford to Aldeburgh via Snape (sections of this exist already, for instance the Sailor's Path);	N/A	£6,100,000-£6,200,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
720	Wantisden	Between Orford and Woodbridge	I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Orford to Woodbridge (and Sutton Hoo).	This would link many local facilities and heritage attractions and also join up with local train stations for those wanting to come to the area with their bicycles by rail.	N/A	£9,300,000-£9,400,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
721	Sternfield	Between Snape and Saxmundham	I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Snape to Saxmundham.	This would link many local facilities and heritage attractions and also join up with local train stations for those wanting to come to the area with their bicycles by rail.	N/A	£2,700,000-£2,800,000	SCC, DFT, Developer	SCC, DFT, S106, S278, CIL	Access, sustainable transport, cycle and footway improvements for South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (Policy SCLP12.29)	Critical
723	Felixstowe	The Grove and Abbey Grove	Access to The Grove and Abbey Grove needs to have kissing gates to prevent cycling. Mountain bikes would soon ruin the pathways for walking.	Access to The Grove and Abbey Grove needs to have kissing gates to prevent cycling. Mountain bikes would soon ruin the pathways for walking.	Not assessed for IDF.					
726	Felixstowe	Beatrice Ave/Colnies roundabout to Taunton Rd	A high standard cycle path on the verge from Beatrice Ave/Colnies roundabout to Taunton Rd and into Ataka and then Gulper would work very well.	A high standard cycle path on the verge from Beatrice Ave/Colnies roundabout to Taunton Rd and into Ataka and then Gulper would work very well.	Very High	£950,000-£1,000,000	SCC, Developer	S106, S278, CIL, SCC	Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Critical
728	Felixstowe	Cycle ways in Felixstowe	Many of the so called cycle ways in Fx are too narrow given the road camber and gutter to make for safe and comfortable cycling. Too many allow cars to park in them. Cars expect cyclists to be in the lanes when they are unsuitable.	Maybe the pavement on one side of the road should be a cycle way. Again Kesgrave is very good in this respect. These lanes need to be kept clear of grit and debris that cars push into them. Better signage needed for cyclists and cars. Thought needs to be given at junctions.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
729	Felixstowe	Garrison Lane traffic lights	It is dangerous for a cyclist at Garrison Lane traffic lights if a vehicle behind at the lights turns left in front of the cyclists.	There needs to be a period during the light change that is for cyclists only. I realise this would make the lights even slower but if we want more cyclists on the road it is needed.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
731	Felixstowe	Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive	Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive should become cycle ways.	Cars could be confined to Colneis Rd unless for access. This would aid pupils reaching Colneis and Kingsfleet Schools	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
732	Felixstowe	Quiet lanes	Quiet lanes should have enforceable restrictions placed on them. Motorists do not seem to take any notice in Gulpher Rd.	It needs a mandatory scheme. Many more warning cyclists signs would help, the flashing speedo signs are good. Maybe the tarmac could be a different colour. Could the roads be access only for vehicles to stop the joy riders.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
733	Hemley	Newbourne, Hemley and Waldringfield	The lanes out towards and through Newbourne, Hemley and Waldringfield need to be 'quiet lanes'. Maybe they could be for access only by cars.	The lanes out towards and through Newbourne, Hemley and Waldringfield need to be 'quiet lanes'. Maybe they could be for access only by cars.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
734	Tunstall	Woodbridge, Campsea Ashe, Snape, Iken and Bawdsey	The area between Woodbridge, Campsea Ashe, Snape, Iken and Bawdsey could become a 'Cycling paradise area' for visitors and residents with the correct restrictions on the roads, ie 'quiet lanes'.	The area between Woodbridge, Campsea Ashe, Snape, Iken and Bawdsey could become a 'Cycling paradise area' for visitors and residents with the correct restrictions on the roads, ie 'quiet lanes'.	Quiet Lanes assessed by Quiet Lane project team.					
735	Levington	'Old' Felixstowe Rd between the Levington turn off / junction with the current Felixstowe Road	Cars travel at great speed along the 'old' Felixstowe Rd between the Levington turn off and the junction with the current Felixstowe Road.	There needs to be a dedicated cycle lane which continues through the layby area onto the dedicated cycle path on the 'current' Felixstowe Rd.	Very High	£1,800,000-£1,900,000	Developer, SCC, NH, CIL	S106, S278, CIL, SCC, DfT	Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider land at Felixstowe Road (Policy SCLP12.21)	Critical
736	Trimley St Martin	Cycle way along A14 from Goslings	The cycle way along A14 from Goslings onwards is poorly maintained.	The cycle way along A14 from Goslings onwards is poorly maintained.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
737	Purdis Farm	Cycle way approaching Warren Heath Sainsburys roundabout	Also the cycle way approaching Warren Heath Sainsburys roundabout from Felixstowe is poorly maintained (often seriously overgrown) and this encourages cyclists to stay on the road which is not sensible with the road layout at the roundabout.	Also the cycle way approaching Warren Heath Sainsburys roundabout from Felixstowe is poorly maintained (often seriously overgrown) and this encourages cyclists to stay on the road which is not sensible with the road layout at the roundabout.	Issues relating to maintenance have not been assessed for the IDF.					
738	Wissett	West and north of Halesworth	Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination.	Formalise newly devised circular walks to the West and North East of the town, that use existing public rights of way through SCC map creation. (working with the SCC PROW team to commission new maps).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
739	Halesworth	Halesworth	I have been looking at the plans for the Cycling and Walking Strategy for Halesworth and I think these are all good ideas.	The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304).	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
740	Halesworth	Town Centre to Millennium Green	Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination.	Support the improvement to the routes and connectivity from the Town Centre to the Millennium Green (see Objective 7) so encouraging more use.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
743	Halesworth	Halesworth	Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination.	Rationalise the walking maps available so they can form a suite of information online and in leaflet form and that reference each other. Some are signposted. Some need updating. Some have a specific historical focus. NB Subsequent agreement to work with Green Access team at SCC to produce a leaflet of circular walks for the Discover Suffolk website and to digitise the other leaflets so they can be accessed on the same website. Erect well designed and coherent signage once the maps and routes are finalised. (not a planning matter but a potential use of CIL money).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
752	Halesworth	Norwich Road	Make walking, cycling and scootering to Edgar Sewter primary school a safe and healthy option for children and parents. Based on consultation with years 5 and 6 children and with parents in the walking expert group the following are the suggestions as to how to achieve this policy. The planned extension to the school gives an opportunity to make changes. The proposed rerouting of the cycle track up the West side of Norwich Road could support these changes.	Make a 20mph zone along the Norwich Road in front of the main school entrance preferably from the Quay Street roundabout to The Avenue or beyond.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
753	Halesworth	Thoroughfare	Support elderly and less mobile residents with safe accessible footpaths, pavements, and crossings.	Pedestrianisation of the Thoroughfare, (Objective 7 and 6).	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
756	Halesworth	Halesworth	Support elderly and less mobile residents with safe accessible footpaths, pavements, and crossings.	Styles, gates and seats – better designs required to make walking in the countryside easier for the less mobile and more seats around town to encourage more walking to shops etc. (advice needed on what a NP can do on this)	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
757	Martlesham	Convoy riding on highway	Although riding in large groups is no doubt a pleasant experience, riding in convey without occasionally pulling in to allow build up of traffic to pass does put riders at risk of car drivers taking chances to pass. I have on more than one occasion been stuck behind such a convey from Martlesham through to Woodbridge with little opportunity to pass. One has to be patient but as said, some car drivers may try and overtake inappropriately risking themselves and cyclist to injury.	Although riding in large groups is no doubt a pleasant experience, riding in convey without occasionally pulling in to allow build up of traffic to pass does put riders at risk of car drivers taking chances to pass. I have on more than one occasion been stuck behind such a convey from Martlesham through to Woodbridge with little opportunity to pass. One has to be patient but as said, some car drivers may try and overtake inappropriately risking themselves and cyclist to injury.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
758	Felixstowe	Bent Hill, Felixstowe	Cyclist riding at speed down the middle of Bent Hill thus risking themselves, walkers and car drivers to injury. An accident waiting to happen (but should it wait?) Incidentally the same goes for skateboarders.	Cyclist riding at speed down the middle of Bent Hill thus risking themselves, walkers and car drivers to injury. An accident waiting to happen (but should it wait?) Incidentally the same goes for skateboarders.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
759	Felixstowe	Hamilton Road shared space	Cycling one way, same as traffic, would help with safety of walkers especially the deaf and poor sighted. Cyclists/skateboarders play in this area.	Cycling one way, same as traffic, would help with safety of walkers especially the deaf and poor sighted. Cyclists/skateboarders play in this area.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
760	Trimley St Mary	Cycle lanes along highway	A white line separating cyclist from vehicles is not a safe option. Cars parked in cycle lanes requires cyclists to move around cars in the hope no one opens a car door as rider passes. I appreciate the solution is not an easy one but one has to be found if we are to encourage more cyclists to use network of roads. I personally have ceased cycling into Felixstowe from Trimley.	A white line separating cyclist from vehicles is not a safe option. Cars parked in cycle lanes requires cyclists to move around cars in the hope no one opens a car door as rider passes. I appreciate the solution is not an easy one but one has to be found if we are to encourage more cyclists to use network of roads. I personally have ceased cycling into Felixstowe from Trimley.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
762	Trimley St Martin	See attached documents	See attached documents	See attached documents	Not assessed for IDF.					
763	<Null>	Cycling - general comments	See attached document. Points 2 to 5 are plotted on the map in the relevant area which relates to the matter.	See attached document. Points 2 to 5 are plotted on the map in the relevant area which relates to the matter.	Assessed Separately					
766	Westerfield	Westerfield footpaths	The Parish Council have sought to apply for definitive status for a number of footpaths that were known to be used by residents but in all cases access to these routes for a circular walk includes use walking along dangerous local roads.	The Parish Council have sought to apply for definitive status for a number of footpaths that were known to be used by residents but in all cases access to these routes for a circular walk includes use walking along dangerous local roads.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
767	Westerfield	Westerfield	The only recognition of cycling in the village is that a section of the East/West route from Lower Road and Church Lane and then Moss Lane to Tuddenham is part of a Long-Distance Cycle Route.	The only recognition of cycling in the village is that a section of the East/West route from Lower Road and Church Lane and then Moss Lane to Tuddenham is part of a Long-Distance Cycle Route.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
770	Westerfield	Lower Road, Westerfield	This road is unsuitable for cyclists and pedestrians due to the amount and the speed of traffic. This narrow road does not have footways or walkable verges and where the minimum width is 5 metres a drainage ditch is immediately adjacent only protected by reflective marker posts.	Although Speed indicators are present it is obvious that physical measures are needed to improve reduce traffic speeds and enable cyclists and pedestrians to use this road in safety. Consideration should be given to traffic management measures such as restricting vehicles to single lane working alongside pedestrian/cycling facilities and/or any other provision to decrease the number and speed of vehicles.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
771	Westerfield	Church Lane, Westerfield	This road is unsuitable for cyclists and pedestrians due to the amount and the speed of traffic. This narrow road does not have footways or walkable verges and limited visibility is an additional hazard.	Although Speed indicators are present it is obvious that physical measures are needed to improve reduce traffic speeds and enable cyclists and pedestrians to use this road in safety. Consideration should be given to traffic management measures such as restricting vehicles to single lane working alongside pedestrian/cycling facilities and/or any other provision to decrease the number and speed of vehicles.	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
772	Westerfield	Moss Lane	This road is single vehicle width and used by a large range of vehicles as a short cut. It is unsuitable as a rat run and should be closed to through traffic thus protecting cyclist and pedestrians. The SCC ROW Improvement Plan referred to possible classification as a Green Lane (Similar Comment to that already registered No478)	This road is single vehicle width and used by a large range of vehicles as a short cut. It is unsuitable as a rat run and should be closed to through traffic thus protecting cyclist and pedestrians. The SCC ROW Improvement Plan referred to possible classification as a Green Lane (Similar Comment to that already registered No478)	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
774	Westerfield	Westerfield Railway Station and Greater Anglia	In order to make better use of rail services and reduce dependence of local residents on car travel there's a need for East Suffolk Line services to stop at Westerfield. In the past it has been possible to use this service to or from Woodbridge as part of a cycle ride or a ramble, in fact it's listed as an East Suffolk Line walk. Stopping trains on the East Suffolk line would therefore help to encourage walking and cycling while also eliminating car journeys and contributing to "Green" policies.	In order to make better use of rail services and reduce dependence of local residents on car travel there's a need for East Suffolk Line services to stop at Westerfield. In the past it has been possible to use this service to or from Woodbridge as part of a cycle ride or a ramble, in fact it's listed as an East Suffolk Line walk. Stopping trains on the East Suffolk line would therefore help to encourage walking and cycling while also eliminating car journeys and contributing to "Green" policies.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
776	<Null>	East Suffolk	More and more cyclists are riding on footpaths and some are very arrogant and dangerous with it. Can we PLEASE have signs saying that these are FOOT PATHS and therefore cycling is forbidden.	More and more cyclists are riding on footpaths and some are very arrogant and dangerous with it. Can we PLEASE have signs saying that these are FOOT PATHS and therefore cycling is forbidden.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
779	Lowestoft	Lowestoft	The third crossing will mean even less excuse for not having more 20 mph speed limits. There is plentiful evidence they create more cycling. I particularly argue Yarmouth Road would be a good candidate. Come the third crossing, I guess its classification could change. There is arguably a precedent in that in south Lowestoft stretches of Marine Parade/Wellington Esplanade/Kirkley Cliff Road, which are the A12 are 20 mph.	I realise that the A47 is the responsibility of Highways England. Frankly, the cycling provision is a shambles. For a lot of the way it is shared with pedestrians on PARTICULARLY narrow footways, passing bus stops, driveways and crossing roads without priority, i.e. it goes completely against CUK's guidance. There are points where the shared path stops so cyclists have to continuously temporarily rejoin the carriageway. That can increase danger as drivers do not expect it. Ironically, the one reasonable stretch of the cycle path, which is segregated from the footway and runs between Sussex Rd and Hollingsworth Rd, passing Ormiston Academy, gets parking on it at school run times. In my opinion, as the Northern Spine Road is part of a route to bypass Lowestoft centre to reduce congestion, there is no reason why Yarmouth Rd should not already be 20mph to the roundabout with the Northern Spine Road/Corton Long Lane/Blundeston Road. It could encourage compliance with using the bypass route.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
780 <Null>		East Suffolk	CUK's position is that priority should be to consider whether the road environment can be made comfortable for cycling and that sharing with pedestrians should be the last resort. The latest guidance from the Department for Transport is in agreement stating improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists should be separated and road-narrowing to enable correct width cycle lanes should be considered which is in effect saying making roads comfortable for cycling should be the first consideration.	Considering the nature of many of Lowestoft's busier roads, I understand why on-road facilities would be difficult. I hope there will be proper consultation (CUK would probably accept off-road facilities are more appropriate anyway). Many cyclists will say they want more cycle paths and they don't mind sharing with pedestrians as anything is better than being on road. It is impossible for there to be off-road facilities everywhere. The more cyclists on the roads the safer on-road cycling is, especially if there are 20mph limits. Routes need to be as direct as possible, perhaps even giving cycling time-saving, advantages over driving. Many off-road routes involve time-consuming waits at toucan crossings etc. There are pedestrians who dislike sharing with cyclists, so even considerate riders on shared facilities experience hostility. Having to slow for pedestrians, and possibly dismount and walk, works against cycling being quicker than driving for short journeys.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
782	Oulton Broad	Oulton Broad	There are good and bad things about the short stretch of cycle path running from the traffic lights just south of the Bridge Road/Saltwater Way/Victoria Road roundabout, past the fish and chip shop and former Spar store into Oulton Broad centre. The good point is that it gives cyclists a geographical advantage to/from the centre and links, via the toucan crossing, with the shared facility to/from the railway bridge.	Ironically, ideally it should be shorter, avoiding passing the fish and chip shop and former Spar. I cannot exaggerate how many more pedestrians walk on the cycle path instead of the footway, despite, in this case, being reasonably wide. Also, cars regularly park on it and when the Spar was open, it included lorries. The nature of the road means there would be no harm in cyclists having to ride it a little further, especially as a 20 mph speed limit would be easily enforceable.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
783	Lowestoft	Lowestoft	Concerning cycle lanes, i.e. white lines on roads, many of them in Lowestoft are not the stipulated minimum width of 1.5 metres. Local Transport Note (LTN) 2/08, paragraph 7.4.2 states: "Cycle lanes should be 2 metres wide on busy roads, or where traffic is travelling over 40 mph. A minimum width of 1.5 metres may be generally acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit.	For cycle feeder lanes to advanced stop line arrangements, a minimum width of 1.2m may be acceptable. Cycle lanes less than 1.2 metres wide cannot easily accommodate tricycles or child carrying cycle trailers wholly within the lane." A pertinent point is that the Highway Code advises cyclists to ride 0.5 metres away from the kerb. Cycle lanes less than 1.5 metres can, ironically, increase cycling danger by misleading drivers into thinking those are safe distances to overtake cyclists. LTN 2/08 was withdrawn on 20 July because it has been superseded by LTN 1/20. However, paragraph 6.4.2 indicates 1.5 metres is now only acceptable for one-way roads.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
787	Lowestoft	Ormiston Academy	I hope there will be discussion to resolve the issue of parents parking on the cycle path outside Ormiston Academy.	I hope there will be discussion to resolve the issue of parents parking on the cycle path outside Ormiston Academy.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
788 <Null>		East Suffolk	20 mph speed limits just outside schools do not encourage more cycling of the school run.	Where there are not off-road facilities on popular school routes, often along residential roads, there need to be 20 mph limits. They have been proved to work.	Speed reductions have not been assessed for the IDF.					
789 <Null>		See attached.	See attached.	See attached.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
790 <Null>		See attached.	See attached.	See attached.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
791 <Null>		East Suffolk	See below.	<p>I would like to ask that when compiling your cycling and walking strategy, you also take into account the wishes and needs of horse riders, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horse riding is also a healthy form of outdoor exercise</li> <li>• Horse riders share rights of way (bridlepaths and byways) with cyclists, and their needs may be different. For example putting down a hard surface to make a right of way better for cyclists would be detrimental if not dangerous for horse riders</li> <li>• Horse riding contributes significantly to the local economy, such as riding schools, livery yards, farriers, vets, feed merchants, tack shops etc</li> <li>• Horses have to be kept all year round, we don't just put them in a shed for the winter and get them out again when the weather improves!</li> </ul> <p>Local horse riding organisations, and the British Horse Society, should be consulted for their views on any proposed changes to bridlepaths and byways.</p>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
792 <Null>		East Suffolk	<p>Good Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cheap</li> <li>- Good lights &amp; clothing</li> <li>- Short journeys don't take longer than car</li> <li>- Healthy</li> <li>- Fun in good weather</li> <li>- Reduced oil consumption</li> <li>- Panniers &amp; back packs assist shopping</li> </ul> <p>Bad Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Punctures</li> <li>- Hills and inclines (e-bikes help!)</li> <li>- Bad weather</li> <li>- Aggressive driving</li> <li>- Most local roads have 60mph limit</li> <li>- Hard verges and kerbs reduce vehicle options when being over-taken or vehicle approaching from opposite direction (cars rarely wait for cyclists, agricultural vehicles NEVER do)</li> </ul>	<p>I suggest that we start by looking at short journeys of 5 miles or fewer. This could include travelling to work or school and daily and intra weekly shopping trips for most people in East Suffolk. To provide encouragement, the following notes may help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Direct cyclists to cycle-friendly routes?</li> <li>- Can we provide shopping discounts for people who arrive by cycle or walk?</li> <li>- Encourage more frequent shopping trips for lighter, smaller loads</li> <li>- Shop close to home – you're saving on fuel to compensate for any higher prices</li> <li>- Have we got enough cycle racks?</li> <li>- Are they fit for purpose and in a suitable place?</li> </ul> <p>Cycle routes don't require lots of infrastructure, but the following help greatly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate signage at each end of the route</li> <li>- Preferably NOT along 60 mph roads</li> <li>- Quiet lanes are perfect</li> <li>- Soft level verges (assuming single carriageway roads)</li> <li>- Well-maintained road surfaces</li> <li>- No hedge cutting using flails!!!</li> </ul>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
793	Lowestoft	Lowestoft	The Town Council is aware that more people in Lowestoft than the national average use the bicycle as a form of transport. Connectivity of routes through and around town should be reviewed and the East Suffolk Council should scrutinise and strongly lobby the County Council on lack of funding being allotted to Lowestoft as opposed to other Suffolk towns.	It is hoped the public will submit their individual comments to East Suffolk Council in response to this consultation, however, again, it is noted that a digital consultation is not inclusive to the whole community.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
794 <Null>		East Suffolk	As a result of the number of consultations we are currently receiving, we regret that we are unable to comment specifically at this time.	As a result of the number of consultations we are currently receiving, we regret that we are unable to comment specifically at this time.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
795	Butley	Butley	What is not shown are the number of footpaths in existence. Surely if you want to get people to get out walking and use the footpaths you need to identify them! In the EADT last week it commented that 1904 miles of footpaths had been lost in SUFFOLK alone. They could not have just disappeared! There has been an erosion of the rights of walkers by farmers ploughing up the ways. Establish where these paths are and get them re-established.	As chairman of Butley PC I have raised the issue of farmers ploughing up paths and never even received any answer from Suffolk CC. So lets have some joined up thinking and action. Otherwise this is all a waste of time and money.	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
796 <Null>		East Suffolk	Natural England has no comments to make at this time. However, we will be happy to comment on future forward planning consultations which come forward.	Natural England has no comments to make at this time. However, we will be happy to comment on future forward planning consultations which come forward.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
798 <Null>		East Suffolk	The County Council supports the underlying sustainable aims and objectives of the emerging Strategy and would suggest that engagement is made with neighbouring authorities in Norfolk (i.e. Great Yarmouth Borough Council and Norfolk County Council) to ensure that the maximum benefits can be made through cross-boundary working in respect of cycling and walking routes to Norfolk Settlements.	The County Council supports the underlying sustainable aims and objectives of the emerging Strategy and would suggest that engagement is made with neighbouring authorities in Norfolk (i.e. Great Yarmouth Borough Council and Norfolk County Council) to ensure that the maximum benefits can be made through cross-boundary working in respect of cycling and walking routes to Norfolk Settlements.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
799 <Null>		East Suffolk	<p>1. despite recent resurfacing work there are many pot holes on back lanes</p> <p>2. again on many lanes there is a build up of sand, gravel or tree debris</p> <p>3. in autumn when farmers cut hedges the tractor powered methods strew the road with sharp fragments which create a very significant risk of punctures not only to bikes but also cars</p> <p>4. signposts, so valuable to anyone not relying on sat-nav, are increasingly corroded through and lying in the verge</p>	<p>1. Cyclists are aware of road condition and promoting the existing SCC online reporting tool amongst them would reduce the need for staff to carry out road surveys.</p> <p>2. Reduce verge cutting, which is prejudicial to wildlife, spend it on sweeping roads free of sand and flints which are a particular problem with the local geology.</p> <p>3. Anyone strewing a road with tacks would soon be subject to enforcement action so it seems strange that there are no moves to deal with the hacking of hedges with no regard to the state the road is left in.</p> <p>4. Signposts are in a poor state. If there is insufficient money to replace, an imaginative solution needs to be found. Perhaps a plastic insert to reconnect the tubular uprights on an interim basis?</p> <p>5. A new, imaginative look at our roads needs to be promoted rather than just doing, or not doing, what always has been. While much of the direct responsibility for remedial work lies with higher tiers, is E.S.C. supportive of the objectives?</p>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
800 <Null>		Walberswick	<p>The Council strongly supports developing a cycling and walking strategy. We support putting in additional cycling and walking routes and increasing the level of maintenance that ESC and SCC spend on maintaining routes. Walberswick Parish Council has already objected to Sizewell C including that its construction period will make it impossible to cycle on the roads in and around the area as huge increases in traffic, HGVs and rat running will make roads busy and dangerous for cyclists and walkers.</p>	<p>Should Sizewell C go ahead, ESC should address this particular issue in the Cycling and Walking Strategy along with the ongoing work in the rest of the District.</p>	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
805 Halesworth		new development at Chediston Street/Roman Way	<p>Link residential areas to the main town destinations and the NCR1</p>	<p>The proposed new development at Chediston Street/Roman Way includes suggestion for a cycle route up Chediston Street into the town centre. This is considered dangerous and an alternative route should be planned. From the estate a route should be created into Allington Road. This makes best use of the contours of the land and connects into Dukes Drive near to the bus stop. It would then cross Roman Way to connect to the existing cycle route in Holmere Drive and into Church Farm Lane. This creates a relatively safe cycling route into the Market Place and town centre via the quiet northern end of London Road around the St Mary's Church yard.</p>	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
811	Halesworth	Roundabout at Quay Street up the Norwich Road to Sparrowhawk Road	<p>Create a direct and safe 'key movement' cycle route from the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout in the north to the Bramfield Road/London Road intersection in the South.</p> <p>This would reduce the 'inconsistent and confused approach for cyclists and pedestrians' and thereby reduce conflict for all users' as they navigate the Town Centre (Waveney Local Plan). Rerouting of NCR1 would be needed.</p>	<p>Cycle route from the roundabout at Quay Street up the Norwich Road should be on the west side of the road. The partial and inadequate cycle route that goes up to Harrisons Lane on the east should be decommissioned as dangerous.</p> <p>The west side of the road would solve some of the issues for children cycling to school. At present they cannot cross safely from the present cycle route to the school.</p> <p>Poor parking on the west side of Norwich Road (from Edgar Sewter Primary School to 'The Avenue'), caused by overspill from the Police Station, businesses in town, and by parents dropping children off at school, would need to be resolved.</p> <p>This route would become a re-routed NCR1 doing away with the confusing route down Harrisons Lane into Holton and then up to Sparrowhawk Road. At Sparrowhawk Roundabout the NCR1 route could go up the road in front of the Triple Plea pub and join the present NCR1 route at Butts Road in a more direct and straightforward route towards the railway Mill Post Crossing.</p>	N/A	£1,500,000-£1,600,000	SCC, Developer, DFT	SCC, S106, S278, CIL, DFT	N/A	Essential
812	Halesworth	Saxons Way	<p>Create a direct and safe 'key movement' cycle route from the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout in the north to the Bramfield Road/London Road intersection in the South.</p>	<p>The pavements along Saxons Way, from Quay Street roundabout to the Coop/London Road roundabout should become safe, shared cycle and pedestrian paths. ( the east side of Saxons Way may be the best option as it links with the proposed east side route on London Road and would not impinge on the entrance to the new development on the west side or the entrance to the car park).</p> <p>The Saxons Way route would remove the confusing one way cycling in the Thoroughfare and the dismount instruction at the southern end of the Thoroughfare.</p> <p>The route should then continue along the eastern side of London Road to the turning with Bramfield Road (the main route into Halesworth from the A12)</p>	N/A	£1,500,000-£1,600,000	SCC, Developer, DFT	SCC, S106, S278, CIL, DFT	N/A	Essential
813	Halesworth	Thoroughfare / Bridge Street	<p>Reroute the NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare / Bridge Street.</p> <p>The rerouting of NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare/Bridge Street between the Quay Street and the entrance to the car park removes a confusing and badly signposted national route from a semi pedestrianised shopping street and allows for the Thoroughfare to become safer and more pedestrianised route.</p>	<p>Reroute the NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare / Bridge Street.</p> <p>The rerouting of NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare/Bridge Street between the Quay Street and the entrance to the car park removes a confusing and badly signposted national route from a semi pedestrianised shopping street and allows for the Thoroughfare to become safer and more pedestrianised route.</p>	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
112b	Benacre	Kessingland to Southwold	<p>To make this journey by bike you have to go inland through Henstead to avoid the A12. A long way out of your way.</p>	<p>This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council in exploring whether there is potential along a more coastal path.</p>	N/A	£2,100,000-£2,200,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
120a	Trimley St Martin	A14 cycle path Felixstowe to Levington	The cycle path is in a terrible state of disrepair, overgrown and strewn with debris. It is not maintained and the surface is dangerously uneven. It's also frighteningly close to A14 traffic. Because of these issues it's considered by most cyclists to be unusable, and certainly not safe for families with children.	The cycle path was installed prior to the single track link road which now runs beside it. It would be great if the cycle path could be relocated to nearer the quieter link road and away from the A14.	Very High	£1,900,000-£2,000,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
179a	Woodbridge	Riverside path from Broomfield to Woodbridge	This is a single track path suitable only for walkers, and I believe cyclists are not permitted. However over the past year more and more cyclists are using it and it is plainly not suitable for mixed use.	Erect barriers to prevent cyclists	Not assessed for IDF.					
205b	Woodbridge	Hasketon Road/Ransome Road, Woodbridge	Recognising that Farlingaye does not have very good access there is often a conflict between cars & cars and cars & bicycles in this part of Woodbridge, particularly during the morning rush hour / School drop off hour. School hours generally coincide with the morning rush hour creating increased numbers of cars and cycles (young cyclist) in this area of woodbridge including the B1079.	2) Look at the 'on street parking' around this area, maybe some(or less) more yellow lines.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
205c	Woodbridge	Hasketon Road/Ransome Road, Woodbridge	Recognising that Farlingaye does not have very good access there is often a conflict between cars & cars and cars & bicycles in this part of Woodbridge, particularly during the morning rush hour / School drop off hour. School hours generally coincide with the morning rush hour creating increased numbers of cars and cycles (young cyclist) in this area of woodbridge including the B1079.	3) Consider making Hasketon Road and the B1079 roads oneway utilising the A12 roundabouts and a roundabout at the Hasketon/B1079 junction.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
279a	Rushmere St Andrew	Land allocated for Housing 'Humber Doucy Lane & Rushmere'	Land allocated for housing will increase the number of vehicles on the local roads particularly 'Tuddenham Road' & 'Humber Doucy Lane', this already a cut through road, but also popular with cyclists travelling out of Ipswich towards Tuddenham and the villages beyond. There is limited pavement and no cycle lane/protection along its route.	Humber Doucy lane could be widened to incorporate a dedicated footpath / cycle track connecting the development with Ipswich cycle infrastructure.	Largely outside East Suffolk so has not been assessed for IDF.					
279b	Rushmere St Andrew	Land allocated for Housing 'Humber Doucy Lane & Rushmere'	Land allocated for housing will increase the number of vehicles on the local roads particularly 'Tuddenham Road' & 'Humber Doucy Lane', this already a cut through road, but also popular with cyclists travelling out of Ipswich towards Tuddenham and the villages beyond. There is limited pavement and no cycle lane/protection along its route.	There is an opportunity to upgrade the bridleway at the end of Tuddenham lane to provide a safe cycling and walking route to Tuddenham avoiding 'Tuddenham Main Road' which is a commuter route into Ipswich for cars.	Partially outside East Suffolk so has not been assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
328a	Little Bealings	Playford Road - east of junction with The Street and Hall Road.	Playford Road and Martlesham Road has become much busier with through traffic between Ipswich and Woodbridge making it less unpleasant and much less safe to cycle on. The road was very popular during the lockdown when there was little or no traffic, as those new to cycling and those wanting to encourage their children to cycle found out.	Close the road to the east of the junction along with closure further to the west so that cyclists have a safe and attractive route between Ipswich and Woodbridge, whilst allowing car drivers to reach Bealings from the A1214 if necessary.	Modal Filter comments from the community comment section have not been assessed in IDF.					
353a	Melton	Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton	Melton road into Woodbridge	Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Melton Road	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
353b	Melton	Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton	Melton road into Woodbridge	Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Chapel Street	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
353c	Melton	Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton	Melton road into Woodbridge	Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Castle Street	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
353d	Melton	Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton	Melton road into Woodbridge	Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Bredfield Road	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
353e	Melton	Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton	Melton road into Woodbridge	Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Seckford Street and Theatre Street	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
410b	Kesgrave	Kesgrave School	Doesn't appear to be a safe route for children and other cyclists to get to Dr. Watsons Lane (to Playford) and Hall Road (to Bealings) from the Northern (School) side of the road or indeed the existing cycle path on the South side. Hence limiting the opportunity for children and parents from the villages to cycle to the school in safety.	1). Provide a proper crossing and short section of cycle/footpath on the northside of the road where the central refuge is on the A1214 at Hall Road. 2). Extend the existing cycle path beyond the Bell Lane traffic lights past the Doctor Watsons lane junction and provide a separate crossing integrated with the existing traffic lights. 3) This would also help all cyclists wishing to travel from the Kesgrave development north into the villages and beyond.	High	£1,100,000-£1,200,000	SCC, DFT	SCC, DFT	N/A	Beneficial
531C	Martlesham	Martlesham retail and business park, Old Felixstowe Road, Main Road Martlesham, Sandy Lane into Woodbridge	Volume of motorised traffic make this route unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians	1 Traffic management scheme within the retail/industrial area channeling traffic onto A12 2 Restoration of Old Felixstowe Road to a safe cycle priority route by limiting motorised through traffic to buses and emergency vehicles 3 Traffic calming chicanes in The Street, Martlesham 4 No through motorised traffic on Sandy Lane achieved by a physical barrier at the railway bridge	Highway matter not assessed by IDF.					
673a	Southwold	Southwold Town Council	<Null>	<Null>	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
673b	Southwold	Southwold Town Council	<Null>	<Null>	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
673c	Southwold	Southwold Town Council	<Null>	<Null>	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
684 (category 1 - Point 1)	Martlesham	Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas	Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked.	Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog.	Not assessed for IDF.					
684 (category 1 - Point 2)	Martlesham	Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas	Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked.	Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog.	Not assessed for IDF.					
684 (Category 3)	Martlesham	Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas	Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked.	Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog.	Not assessed for IDF.					
739a	Halesworth	Halesworth	Comment 306	The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested. (comments already assessed)					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
739b	Halesworth	Halesworth	Comment 303	The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested. (comments already assessed)					
739c	Halesworth	Halesworth	Comment 302	The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested. (comments already assessed)					
739d	Halesworth	Halesworth	Comment 480	The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested. (comments already assessed)					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
739e	Halesworth	Halesworth	Comment 304	The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304).	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested. (comments already assessed)					
761B	Stratton Hall	See attached documents - Stratton Hall	See attached documents	See attached documents	Comment too generalised to assess in IDF.					
X1	Felixstowe	ELMCROFT LANE /WESTMORLAND ROAD TO CLIFF ROAD	FOOTPATH 8 REPLACE STAGGERED BARRIERS WITH BOLLARD AND SIGN ROUTE.	FOOTPATH 8 REPLACE STAGGERED BARRIERS WITH BOLLARD AND SIGN ROUTE.	Not assessed for IDF.					
X12	Felixstowe	LANGER ROAD	SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL CONVERT WESTERN FOOTWAY BETWEEN WALTON AVE TO HOLLAND ROAD	SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL CONVERT WESTERN FOOTWAY BETWEEN WALTON AVE TO HOLLAND ROAD	Very High	£800,000-£850,000	SCC	SCC	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
X16	Felixstowe	GARRISON LANE	ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN ITS JUNCTION OF UNDERCLIFFE ROAD WEST AND HIGH ROAD WEST.	ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN ITS JUNCTION OF UNDERCLIFFE ROAD WEST AND HIGH ROAD WEST.	Not assessed for IDF.					
X18	Felixstowe	PRINCES ROAD/ SOUTH HILL	SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE TO PIER	SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE TO PIER	Not assessed for IDF.					
X19	Felixstowe	CRESCENT ROAD	BETWEEN GARRISON LANE & COBBOLD ROAD EXISTING SIGNED AS NCR51 ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES	BETWEEN GARRISON LANE & COBBOLD ROAD EXISTING SIGNED AS NCR51 ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES	Not assessed for IDF.					
X2	Felixstowe	LOCAL ROUTE 1 COLNEIS ROAD	ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN JUNCTION OF CHURCH ROAD AND BEATRICE AVE	ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN JUNCTION OF CHURCH ROAD AND BEATRICE AVE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X20	Felixstowe	PRIORY ROAD	BETWEEN HIGH ROAD WEST & GOLF ROAD SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE	BETWEEN HIGH ROAD WEST & GOLF ROAD SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X21	Felixstowe	CARR ROAD	BETWEEN BEACH STATION ROAD & DOCK GATES SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE	BETWEEN BEACH STATION ROAD & DOCK GATES SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X22	Felixstowe	ORFORD ROAD	BETWEEN CARR ROAD & SEA ROAD REMOVE NCN SIGN REPLACE WITH LOCAL ROUTE SIGNING	BETWEEN CARR ROAD & SEA ROAD REMOVE NCN SIGN REPLACE WITH LOCAL ROUTE SIGNING	Not assessed for IDF.					
X23	Felixstowe	MANOR ROAD & MANOR TERRACE	REMOVE NCN SIGNAGE BETWEEN CARR ROAD WORK ITEM 13	REMOVE NCN SIGNAGE BETWEEN CARR ROAD WORK ITEM 14	Not assessed for IDF.					
X28	Felixstowe	HIGH ROAD WEST	EXTEND ADVISORY CYCLE LANE THROUGH TRAFFIC ISLAND TOWARDS RNDBT TO START OF OFF ROAD CYCLE TRACK.	EXTEND ADVISORY CYCLE LANE THROUGH TRAFFIC ISLAND TOWARDS RNDBT TO START OF OFF ROAD CYCLE TRACK.	Not assessed for IDF.					
X29	Felixstowe	WALTON AVE EXTENSION WEST	ET06180	ET06181	Not assessed for IDF.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
X3	Felixstowe	CHURCH ROAD	SIGN ROUTE	SIGN ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X33	Felixstowe	FERRY LANE	FROM END OF OFF ROAD CYCLE FACILITIES ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES TO HODGKINSON ROAD/DOOLEY INN PH	FROM END OF OFF ROAD CYCLE FACILITIES ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES TO HODGKINSON ROAD/DOOLEY INN PH	Not assessed for IDF.					
X34	Felixstowe	GRANGE FARM AVENUE	BETWEEN LANGLEY AVE & SUDBOURNE RD ADD CYCLE LOGOS AND ADVISORY CYCLE LANES THROUGH ISLAND PINCH POINTS	BETWEEN LANGLEY AVE & SUDBOURNE RD ADD CYCLE LOGOS AND ADVISORY CYCLE LANES THROUGH ISLAND PINCH POINTS	Not assessed for IDF.					
X35	Felixstowe	GRANGE FARM AVENUE (GFA)	AT CROSS ROADS FORMED BY BRACKLEY & POND CLOSE. TERMINATE CYCLE PATH AT POND CL ADD SPUR TO CROSS GFA WHERE BUILD OUT NARROWS ROAD. CONSTRUCT CYCLE BYPASS TOWARDS BRACKLEY CLOSE AND ADD CYCLE LANE ACROSS ITS MOUTH.	AT CROSS ROADS FORMED BY BRACKLEY & POND CLOSE. TERMINATE CYCLE PATH AT POND CL ADD SPUR TO CROSS GFA WHERE BUILD OUT NARROWS ROAD. CONSTRUCT CYCLE BYPASS TOWARDS BRACKLEY CLOSE AND ADD CYCLE LANE ACROSS ITS MOUTH.	Not assessed for IDF.					
X36	Felixstowe	GRANGE FARM AVENUE	EXISTING CYCLE FACILITY ADD GIVE WAYS & SIGNS - DO WHAT TO THEM?	EXISTING CYCLE FACILITY ADD GIVE WAYS & SIGNS - DO WHAT TO THEM?	Not assessed for IDF.					
X39	Felixstowe	WESTMORLAND ROAD	SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE	SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X4	Felixstowe	ROSEMARY AVENUE	REVISED ROUTING OF LOCAL ROUTE 1, SIGN & ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES	REVISED ROUTING OF LOCAL ROUTE 1, SIGN & ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES	Not assessed for IDF.					
X41	Felixstowe	NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 41	SUFFOLK COASTAL CYCLE ROUTE	SUFFOLK COASTAL CYCLE ROUTE	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
X42	Felixstowe	NORTH SEA CYCLE ROUTE	FORMERLY NCN 1 NOW NCN41 &51	FORMERLY NCN 1 NOW NCN41 &52	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
X43	Felixstowe	MILL LANE	ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN GARRISON LANE AND GRANGE ROAD. AT BRIDGE REDUCE VISUAL RUNNING LANE BY WHITE LINE & HATCHING.	ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN GARRISON LANE AND GRANGE ROAD. AT BRIDGE REDUCE VISUAL RUNNING LANE BY WHITE LINE & HATCHING.	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
X44	Felixstowe	TRIMLEY ROAD KIRTON	ADD CYCLE LOGOS (1057) 100M NORTH OF SCHOOL TO ROSELEA NURSERY	ADD CYCLE LOGOS (1057) 100M NORTH OF SCHOOL TO ROSELEA NURSERY	To Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					
X48	Felixstowe	HIGH ROAD TRIMLEY ST MARTIN	ADD CYCLE LOGOS 1057 FROM EGRESS OF CYCLE PATH TO MILL LANE	ADD CYCLE LOGOS 1057 FROM EGRESS OF CYCLE PATH TO MILL LANE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X49	Felixstowe	HIGH ROAD TRIMLEYS & HIGH ST WALTON	REPLACE THE MISSING SECTION OF ADVISORY CYCLES & ADD NEW TO PROVIDE CONTINUOUS LANES BETWEEN GARRISON LANE AND HOWLETT WAY.	REPLACE THE MISSING SECTION OF ADVISORY CYCLES & ADD NEW TO PROVIDE CONTINUOUS LANES BETWEEN GARRISON LANE AND HOWLETT WAY.	Not assessed for IDF.					
X5	Felixstowe	TAUNTON & EXETER ROADS	SIGN ROUTE	SIGN ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X51	Felixstowe	NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 51	HARWICH TO CAMBRIDGE	HARWICH TO CAMBRIDGE	No Cycling and Walking infrastructure improvement suggested.					

Ref	Parish	Where is the matter/improvement located?	What is the matter/improvement?	Please suggest a possible solution / improvement	C&WS priority	Approximate cost	Potential Funding Sources	Potential Funding Mechanisms	Local Plan IDF Project	IDF Priority
X52	Felixstowe	MAIDSTONE ROAD & GRANGE ROAD	ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 BETWEEN RAISED TABLE BETWEEN HIGH ST WALTON AND WESSEL AVE /PEWITT HILL	ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 BETWEEN RAISED TABLE BETWEEN HIGH ST WALTON AND WESSEL AVE /PEWITT HILL	Not assessed for IDF.					
X54	Felixstowe	SEA ROAD	ADD CYCLE LOGOS BETWEEN UNDERCLIFF ROAD & ORFORD ROAD	ADD CYCLE LOGOS BETWEEN UNDERCLIFF ROAD & ORFORD ROAD	Not assessed for IDF.					
X55	Felixstowe	HAMILTON ROAD	CONTRA FLOW CYCLING BETWEEN COBBOLD ROAD & ORWELL ROAD	CONTRA FLOW CYCLING BETWEEN COBBOLD ROAD & ORWELL ROAD	Not assessed for IDF.					
X56	Felixstowe	HIGH ROAD EAST	EXTEND ADVISORY CYCLE LANE FROM PRIORY Road TO CLIFF ROAD	EXTEND ADVISORY CYCLE LANE FROM PRIORY Road TO CLIFF ROAD	Not assessed for IDF.					
X57(1 )	Felixstowe	MAIDSTONE ROAD -SEATON ROAD RNCBT	OPTION 1 REDUCE ROAD ENTRY WIDTH OF THE 3 ARMS BY LINING AND HATCHING ADD CYCLE LOGOS.	OPTION 1 REDUCE ROAD ENTRY WIDTH OF THE 3 ARMS BY LINING AND HATCHING ADD CYCLE LOGOS.	Not assessed for IDF.					
X58	Felixstowe	SEATON ROAD	ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 BETWEEN HIGH RD WALTON AND MAIDSTONE ROAD	ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 BETWEEN HIGH RD WALTON AND MAIDSTONE ROAD	Not assessed for IDF.					
X59	Felixstowe	BACK LANE	ADD CONTRA FLOW CYCLE LANE BETWEEN SEATON ROAD AND HIGH ST WALTON	ADD CONTRA FLOW CYCLE LANE BETWEEN SEATON ROAD AND HIGH ST WALTON	Not assessed for IDF.					
X60	Felixstowe	FELIXSTOWE LEISURE CENTRE	CONSTRUCT NEW OFF ROAD FACILITY FROM UNDERCLIFFE ROAD TO SEA ROAD BEHIND SEA FLOOD WALL. SCDC ASPIRATIONAL ROUTE	CONSTRUCT NEW OFF ROAD FACILITY FROM UNDERCLIFFE ROAD TO SEA ROAD BEHIND SEA FLOOD WALL. SCDC ASPIRATIONAL ROUTE	N/A	£1,500,000-£1,600,000	SCC, DFT, Developer, ESC	SCC, DFT, S106, S278, CIL	Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe	Essential
X61	Felixstowe	CRESCENT ROAD /HAMILTON ROAD JUNCTION	AT TRFFIC LIGHT INSTALL ADVANCED STOP LINES (ASL)	AT TRFFIC LIGHT INSTALL ADVANCED STOP LINES (ASL)	Not assessed for IDF.					
X7	Felixstowe	PICKETTS ROAD	SIGN ROUTE	SIGN ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					
X9	Felixstowe	BETWEEN GARRISON LANE & MAYBUSH LANE	SIGN AS LOCAL ROUTE 7 ST ANDREWS ROAD & FOXGROVE LANE AS CYCLE ROUTE	SIGN AS LOCAL ROUTE 7 ST ANDREWS ROAD & FOXGROVE LANE AS CYCLE ROUTE	Not assessed for IDF.					