

APPENDIX A – REPRESENTATIONS

	REPRESENTATIVE	Key Response	MKCC Response and recommendation
1	Resident - Support	Seems an excellent idea.	
2	Resident - Support	Very happy this well-needed work is being planned, to connect Fairfields with Stony Stratford	
3	Resident - Support	Much needed - Fairfields needs more links to wider community without relying on a car	
4	Resident - Support	Very excited, I take this path everyday anyway and have slipped lots of times in the mud. It's hard to get through with my pushchair. My only hope is that the way isn't closed for too long as it would add a lot of time to my journey to take my daughter to school during construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After speaking with our contractor, we are looking at 6-8 weeks of construction. - We will be placing notices on site for when the works are to begin.
5	Resident - Objection	- Counting from the roundabout, humps #2 and #3 should be moved to the Redway crossings and widened, so that wheelchair etc users can cross at grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Redway is 3m wide and gradient to be in line with the carriageway.
6	Resident - Support	Long overdue plans that will prevent people walking through the mud as they currently do.	
7	Resident - Support	This will make the route from Fairfields to Stony much safer.	
8	Resident - Support	20mph is fine but speed humps are not required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists in the area.
9	Resident - Objection	- There is a natural trodden path on the other side of the road. This will continue to be used - just put a path here which is what is needed rather than 2 unnecessary road crossings that could be avoided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath outside properties 1-3 Tudor Gardens - Would encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - We are proposing one new crossing point and upgrading an existing one. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists in the area.
10	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully supportive of the redway extension. - People will likely still walk to the desire line outside people's boundary, regardless. - Not sure speed bumps are necessary. - People have been walking this way for years regardless. Even more dangerous is the junction of Watling Street and Ridgeway coming out of Calverton end on the right. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
13	Resident - Support	Please, please, please make this happen.	
14	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are both 20mph speed limit and traffic calming measures required? - This is an excellent proposal and will assist the local transport network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speeds of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.

15	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a designed pedestrian route adjacent no71 Latimer which is adopted highway, the post and rail on the north side of the proposed redway would inhibit this part formal/part informal route, please reduce extents of fencing. - Where the three trees are to be removed at the western extent, please provide replacements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites. To create diverse species, mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - All trees taken down will be replaced with a more suitable and more robust species.
16	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the removal of the trees - Wants to know how many trees are affected by Ash dieback? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All our schemes with the least impact on the existing environment. - To provide a safe walking and cycling route, we need to remove 14 trees. - We will be replacing all trees that are to be removed. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects their trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove diseased Ash trees where they have safety concerns for the public. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - All trees taken down will be replaced with a more suitable and more robust species.
17	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan to run the Redway on the opposite side of the road to the existing path. Require pedestrians and cyclists to cross the roads three times, thereby increasing the risk of accidents. - Why have a 20mph speed limit on this road when people could cross just once, as they currently do, on the “unofficial” route that people are already using anyway, and will most likely continue to? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath outside properties 1-3 Tudor Gardens - Would encroach onto private land. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered. This would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - We are proposing one new crossing point and upgrading an existing one. - For road safety measures, we are reducing the speed to 30mph and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - Any new proposals would be subject to the owners of the properties selling their land. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.
18	Resident – Objection	<p>Pedestrians from Fairfields have created their own route which connects with the nearest footpath in Tudor Gardens and doesn’t involve crossing roads or destroying trees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an existing path that doesn’t require the removal of trees. A more practical and cost-effective option in my view would be to pave the short natural path already created by pedestrians from Fairfields which links to the existing pavement. - The 2 chestnut trees are marked for removal, this was a major feature for the area in the 1970. Without these trees the area becomes ugly and exposed and will lack privacy and shade. - Any trees planted to replace those felled would not mature enough in my lifetime to create a similar effect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - H1 are very rich in Ash trees, these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance. - We are increasing the number of new trees. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. - This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, this would not need to be closed for any reason.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC.
19	Resident - Support	A much overdue improvement!	
20	Resident - Objection	<p>There is nothing to protect along this section of the road. Only one speed bump required (on H1 before crossing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against 20mph throughout the estate - Is the route of the redway optimised to channel pedestrian/cycle traffic along the redway? - Questions about position of new redway, means that the entire need for all/most of the traffic calming is seriously questionable. - Why design a path that requires crossing the road three times necessary when upgrading and extending the path along Tudor Gardens, could achieve the link with only one crossing. - The 90 degrees turn at the end of H1 is already challenging as rather tight especially when larger vehicles are on-coming and for any vehicles exiting Tudor Gardens/Latimer - adding a pedestrian crossing at such a bend will significantly add to the challenges/risks associated with this short section of road. - Objection to the post and rail fencing. - If not possible to extend/upgrade existing path on Tudor Gardens the crossing at the T junction should be simplified so that there is only one road crossing here (over the road to Latimer) and joining the existing redway 10-20m from the road and removing or down grading that existing short section of redway up to Tudor Gardens T junction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The new proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speeds of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.
21	Resident - Support	<p>It is great to be able to have a red way connecting Fairfields with other estates stony Stratford is one, but much is needed to Whitehouse side too for children to go safely to secondary school. I'm glad the trees lost will be replaced.</p> <p>Has there been any consideration of the wildlife that may be within those trees?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - Over recent years The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - When TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 are very rich in Ash trees and when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year they are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users. - Will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and a more robust species.
22	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against 20mph. - Supports 30mph. - Against to the speed humps - Supports the Redway route. - The Redway should continue ahead rather than cross at the T-Junction - A new desire line will form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We looked in detail at the extension outside properties 1-3 Tudor Gardens and found that it was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. - This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road, which is not desirable. - The reason for the dog leg is that the proposals tie into the existing Redway Network and upgrades the existing crossing points. - The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speeds of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
23	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is dealing with landowners and working around utilities more important in your assessment than safety and green issues? - There is an extremely well-trodden path of convenience in constant use linking the existing footpath. - Green issues should be front and centre of all planning decisions. How can unnecessarily concreting over land be more important than 'landowner issues? You propose cutting down 14 trees only some of which are affected by ash dieback. - Planting new trees does not 'compensate' for the loss of mature trees unaffected by ash dieback. You use words like "best" and "most benefits" in your letter. The obvious alternative is to extend the existing footpath on the other side of Tudor Gardens to your proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.

- By far the most important issue with your proposal is safety. And this crossing is where the only traffic is for Tudor Gardens and where virtually no one parks. Your proposal would necessitate three road crossings.
- Wants double yellow lines on the bend and Ridgeway.

- For road safety, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads.
- A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speeds of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
- The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
- The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway traffic slowdown will be self-enforcing.
- The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
- The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations.
- Over recent years The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees.
- TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease.
- The H1 are very rich in Ash trees and when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park.
- MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted.
- TPT this year they are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users.
- Replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and a more robust species.
- Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.

24 Resident - Support Great news, will make a very welcome safe route from Fairfields into Stony Stratford and could improve trade in the town

- 25 Resident - Support**
- Can a light go nearer the road for new path crossing?
 - Can the pathway be extended to go up to the roundabout? I.e., right as you cross the road from Fairfields. Rowans Family Centre is Fairfields nearest family centre and we must walk along the road currently.
 - Would like the vegetation on the roundabout to be cutback.
 - Why is the fence on the new part only for a bit?
 - What is the future maintenance of this fence? Is there a plan for maintaining this?
 - Can there be dog bin installed for people using the pathway and who don't want to go across the muddy field to the nearest one?

- The exiting lighting will be upgraded to increase the current lighting levels. The proposed plan is showing the location of the new lighting to be installed.
- There are currently no plans for a footway link from Tudor Gardens to Fullers Slade. The best route to Fullers Slade would be by the pelican crossing.
- The vegetation around the roundabout, this is outside our scope of works.
- The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.
- For additional dog waste bins in the area, it would be best to contact our environmental health team.

- 26 Resident - Support**
- Against the speed humps
 - mph, the 30mph should move closer to the roundabout.
 - Supports the Redway link.
 - Supports resurfacing.

- For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads.
- We are proposing a limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speeds of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.

27 Resident - Support What about people that would like a bus?

This is not a bus route

- 28 Resident - Support**
- Against the 20mph.
 - Against the speed humps
 - Pedestrians still using the shorter route in front of the houses.
 - Would like double yellow lines on the bend near the crossing.
 - Clear view in both directions for 100m

- For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads.
- A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
- The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.

29	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the Redway link. - Oppose to 20mph. - Oppose to the speed humps, as unnecessary in a non-through route. - If the introduction of a 20mph zone is not considered necessary for these 2 crossings, then there can be no justification for the Fairfields proposal. - Opposed to road closures for re-surfacing. If access can be maintained for emergency vehicles, then it must be maintained for all traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require ‘emergency’ access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, there’s no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future.
30	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree with the 20mph. - Oppose to the speed humps. - Would like double yellow lines on the bend, in the summer when the grassed areas have grown high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.
31	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20mph for the crossing approach is sensible. - Against 20mph across the whole estate, particularly while Wolverton Rd, London Rd and most of the High Street inexplicably remain at 30mph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.
32	Resident - Support	<p>It would be beneficial to link into a bigger scheme of work in Stony Stratford. Currently the Redway ends at Milford Avenue. Also - the crossings should favour the pedestrian and cyclists not the road traffic.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This would be outside the scope of works.
33	Resident - Support	<p>The plans suit walkers and cyclist, especially school children. It’s a good link from Fairfield to Stony Stratford avoiding the V4.</p>	
34	Resident - Support	<p>It’s not just safety, it reduces noise and pollution and should encourage more cycling.</p> <p>I would like to see 20 mph throughout Stony. Also, improvements to crossing from Galley Hill to Fairfields.</p>	
35	Resident - Support	<p>Excellent scheme</p>	
36	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the 20mph. - Reducing speed limit is not required, the current limit is 30 mph and vehicles slow down for the bend. - Objection to the Speed humps. - Would like a crossing island instead. - Objection to the tree removal, replaced with double the numbers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we are proposing to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The road is not wide enough for installing any traffic islands. There are no safe locations at the new crossing points. Badly located island could the risk of an incident. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - Over recent years The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - When TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 are very rich in Ash trees and when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year they are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users. - The Parks Trust will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and a more robust species. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.
37	Resident - Support	Pathway is needed here, between the 2 areas, as well used for walking / cycling.	
38	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the redway, but it should connect to the existing footway. - To cross into Fullers Slade from Fairfields (path behind park along ridgeway) is very overgrown and poor visibility due to overgrowth when crossing road. Would be great to have easy access to Galley Hill local centre too, Fairfields has no post office, convenience shop or community centre so Galley Hill offers the closest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing the Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
39	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is only one set of 20mph boards shown in the plans. Will there be any other street furniture associated with that restriction and where will it be located? - Is the first set of traffic calming on the approach from Watling Street necessary? - The proposed Redway crosses the road 3 times which seems like it would increase risk rather than reduce it. People will either likely continue to use the existing path along Tudor Garden or continue along Latimer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There will be necessary signs to warn drivers of the speed limit and the new crossing ahead. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - The road is not wide enough for installing any traffic islands. There are no safe locations at the new crossing points. Badly located island could the risk of an incident. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The existing narrow path cannot be widened to provide the improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing the Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
40	Resident - Support	20 MPH zone not necessary for full length of The Ridgeway. Maybe just one speedhump before you get to the corner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed reduction is being proposed to slow down vehicles coming up to the new and existing crossing points, and in the local roads. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.
41	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for the 20mph - Against the flat-top hump - Would like double yellow lines on the bend. - Supports the resurfacing. - Against the redway being on the east side of Tudor Gardens <p>I know it means going in front of 1-3 Tudor Gardens but that is where people are walking, and people are creatures of habit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - The road is not wide enough for installing any traffic islands. There are no safe locations at the new crossing points. Badly located island could the risk of an incident. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
42	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Redway, but against the new crossing. - There is a route possible that would result in one crossing, which is to continue across the frontages of the houses, which is also already partly paved. This would make the route safer. - Support of 20mph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
43	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support of 20mph, however, this is not required over the whole of the long straight stretch from the Galley Hill roundabout towards the redway crossing. - I fully support the plans. I do not believe that a route on the south side of Ridgeway/ Tudor Gardens would be practical in view of the land ownership and utility constraints that have been identified. - I cannot see how a redway compliant with the Council's adopted guidance could be accommodated on the south side of the road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway traffic slowdown will be self-enforcing. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
44	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why does the proposed Redway cross access roads THREE times? If placed on the other side of the road it would cross only once, thus increasing pedestrian safety and reducing costs. - Vehicular access to Tudor Gardens and Latimer would appear to be denied during the three days of road resurfacing. Bearing in mind both roads are cul-de-sacs this is not an acceptable proposal since people will have no way of ingress/egress to their homes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway traffic slowdown will be self-enforcing. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - Works of this nature, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, there's no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, to save the need to close the road twice. - Advance notification of the works will be given so residents.

45	Resident - Support	<p>I think it is necessary to link Fairfield's to Stony Stratford.</p> <p>Many children from Stony Stratford attend school in Whitehouse and good, well-lit safe routes are required</p>	
46	Resident - Support	<p>I think it is necessary to link Fairfield's to Stony Stratford. Many children from Stony Stratford attend school in Whitehouse and good, well-lit safe routes are required.</p>	
47	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the redway route - Cyclists would use the roadway itself for the short distance between the two existing Redways. - Extend the existing path from the front of 1, 2 and 3 Tudor Gardens to meet the Redway. - Cyclists and scooter riders would be directed to the road, which is not a heavily trafficked, and if it were converted to 20mph it would be safe for cyclists to access at this point. - Against the speed humps. - Wants red lines/ rumble strips on the road, to highlight the junction to motorists and to slow the traffic at the point the cyclists and scooter users join the carriageway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - Rumble strips become difficult to maintain over time and would require closing the whole estate whilst the work is being carried out. - For road safety measure, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway traffic slowdown will be self-enforcing. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - The redways are bespoke to Milton Keynes and being dual purpose for both pedestrians and cyclists.
48	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the 20mph from the roundabout. - Sightlines are extremely good. - Against the speed humps, are very problematic for people with damaged spines. At most, one speed bump a little before the first crossing on the way into Tudor Gardens would be ample. - Redway is crossing the road three times, which seems unnecessarily convoluted and potentially adds more risk. - Why not continue the redway to cross to the right of the T junction and then join up with the existing one? - Also, it would be great for pedestrians from the Tudor Gardens side to be able to access the way through to Fairfield by a continuation of the existing footpath, rather than must cross the road several times. - Concerned that the road will be completely closed to through traffic at certain times. Could not the road be done half at a time, which is what usually happens? - would like a layby for visitors to the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - As a road safety measure, we are proposing to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway traffic slowdown will be self-enforcing. - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
49	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the traffic calming. - Have you considered how you are going to stop foot traffic utilising their existing route from Fairfield and walking on the grass area leading to the pavement in front of 1,2 & 3 Tudor Gardens - maybe some sort of barrier/posts on grass before pavement starts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The dog poo bin should be moved to the redway section, otherwise people will still be walking on the current side to utilise the bin. - Would like double yellow lines on the bend. - Would like posts/bollards, as cars continuously park on the verge to access the play park in Fairfield. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website. - For additional dog waste bins in the area, it would be best to contact our environmental health team.
50	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to the speed humps - Supports the 20mph zone. <p>This is the only traffic access in and out to Tudor Gardens and Latimer, and there isn't much pedestrian or bike traffic anyway. I welcome the redway along Ridgeway, and the road resurfacing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - The road is not wide enough for installing any traffic islands. There are no safe locations at the new crossing points. Badly located island could the risk of an incident. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists in the area. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
51	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about vehicle access. - The information provided says that there will be no through traffic for three days. I have health issues which mean quite frequent medical appointments while my husband is a volunteer driver for the NHS, taking people for hospital appointments. How are we supposed to manage with no road access? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents.
52	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be simpler to cross the Latimer once than crossing Tudors twice. - It would be safer as roughly 50-60% of residents are living at Latimore. Crossing Tudors once means all the traffic is presenting a risk and the crossing Tudors again with 40-50% of the traffic. Less crossings = less hazard exposure. I believe there is a simpler solution, but it might be limiting existing house owners and/or road related standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
53	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about cutting down mature trees despite the new planting planned. - Concerned about scooter traffic on the redway (all Redways) and about the amount of litter, can these be addressed. - Wants double yellow lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - Over recent years The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - When TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 are very rich in Ash trees and when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year they are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users. - The Parks Trust will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and a more robust species. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website. - The Redways are bespoke to Milton Keynes and are dual purpose for both cyclists and pedestrians. - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents.
54	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against 20mph - Against the traffic speed humps - There is excellent visibility at the proposed crossing point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, we are proposing to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway traffic slowdown will be self-enforcing. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
55	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the proposed Redway route. The proposed route introduces unsafe crossings over reasonably busy roads. Speed bumps acknowledge the risk and dangers involved. - Wants the existing footway widened and extended. The plan shows this is done on that part of the footpath connecting Latimer with Tudor Gardens before and after the road crossing. - The problem of access to and from Fairfield's is simply the mud and trees blocking the way forward from Fairfield's to the existing sidewalk. This could be solved quickly and cheaply by extending the existing sidewalk adjacent to the Tudor Gardens houses. - The grass verge adjacent to the road could be reduced a little to accommodate a wider Redway, if this was necessary? - Against the tree removal - Against the post and rail fencing - Against how the resurfacing is being carried out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - Over recent years The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - When TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 are very rich in Ash trees and when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year they are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users. - The Parks Trust will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and a more robust species. - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents. - The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.
56	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the proposed Redway route. - Pedestrians will still walk over the mud and then use the pathway. - It would make more sense to extend the pathway, therefore not having pedestrians crossing the road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the speed humps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety measure, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.
--	--	---

57	<p>Resident – Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Redway link. - Doesn't follow the existing desire line. - introduces two extra and apparently unnecessary road crossings. - It would be better (safer) in the long run to overcome whatever issues dissuaded you from proposing the more obvious southern route with no new road crossings. <p>The absence of a surfaced route disadvantages older or disabled people or young families with push chairs especially in muddy conditions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety measure, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users
----	---	--

58	<p>Resident - Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the speed humps - Against the 20mph - Against the post and rail fencing - Crosses the road 3 times. - Trees should be planted nearer to where they have been removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - Over recent years The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carryout tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 are very rich in Ash trees and when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. The new Redway gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year they are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity, and the park users. - The Parks Trust will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and a more robust species. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
----	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing
59	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the 20mph in vicinity of the crossing, but not through the estate. - Against the speed humps - Supports the replanting and reseeding. <p>Hopefully the new planting will be dense enough to encourage / direct people to use the redway rather than continue using the current cut through / desire line.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
60	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why is it necessary to have to cross the road three times when there is a black tarmac path in place going past the houses? - What is the purpose of the post and rail fence? Will kerb drops be factored in when crossing the road? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - All crossing points will have dropped kerbs and tactile paving. - The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.
61	Resident - Support	Great. Long overdue.	
62	Resident - Support	Potholes and resurfacing will be appreciated. Thanks.	
63	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linking Fairfields and Stony generally welcomed. - Not sure about 20mph being introduced to one small area, which is very light on traffic anyway, in isolation. - Speed ramps generally very cumbersome and noisy but I don't live near them so am neutral. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users.
64	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the speed bumps as proposed on the H1 Ridgeway section of the plan because of the increased noise level they cause, and they slow emergency vehicles to Tudor and Latimer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists in the area.
65	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposed plan seems an expensive solution. - use the existing path that starts outside number one Tudor Gardens. Which would not impact on any homeowner issues. - cross a road 3 times within a very short distance. - Against the Speed humps - Against the 20mph - Against the resurfacing <p>In summary a footpath link is a good idea but there is a more practical solution as described above that would save the council money that could be better used elsewhere in the city.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety measures, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents.
66	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the scheme - Object to how the resurfacing will be carried out. - Against Speed humps - Against 20mph limit. - Caution coming out of drives is always necessary. - Easier to pass the houses. - The existing path can and should be repaired and widened towards the road. - Wants double yellow lines on the bend. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require ‘emergency’ access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents. - For road safety measures, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. Slower speed of traffic will make it safer for Redway users. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.
67	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Redway route, would like the rout to continue ahead. - Against the 20mph zone - Against the speed humps - The sharp bend at the join of Ridgeway and Tudor Gardens is a natural slowing down point for cars, as is the T junction close to the post box. - Against the road closure for when the resurfacing is being carried out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require ‘emergency’ access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future. - Advance notification of the works would be given so all residents.
68	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the redway route, because of the 90° bends in the road. - Drivers have no choice but to slow to below 20mph. - Against the speed humps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For road safety measures, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
69	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the 20mph - Against the speed humps - There is existing good visibility along the whole length of the approach into Tudor Gardens and the sharp road bend already has the desired effect of slowing down traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Redways are a bespoke Milton Keynes City Council standard criterion with a width of 3m, we cannot deviate from this to narrow it at any point. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements.

- Existing 30mph sign is moved further up Ridgeway close to the roundabout.
- The proposed Redway link from Fairfields should be narrower to reduce impact on the trees.
- The new Redway should be of a similar width to the existing one to minimise visual impact on the green space.
- It would be far better to route the new Redway (at its point near the post box) in a straight direction across the entry road into Latimer, to meet up with the existing Redway leading to the play area, thereby reducing the new road crossing points from three to two.

- It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.
- There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.
- Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road.
- The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
- As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.
- A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.

70 Resident - Objection

- Proposed traffic calming can be improved if MKC's guidelines for new Redway are complied with.
- The proposal needs to be seen as a missing Redway link that was not included in the LCWIP.
- The LCWIP did not look at the Western Expansion Area at all.
- Proposed LCWIP schemes for Stony Stratford were rejected by the Town Council, the route and design must ensure that they can safely and efficiently be integrated into whatever cycling improvements are eventually made in the town.
- The proposal must incorporate the general recommendations about future cycling infrastructure made in the LCWIP, drawing heavily on Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 (Department for Transport, July 2020) and the Walking and Cycling Position Paper Technical Report (Milton Keynes Council, January 2020).
- The proposed Redway should cross Ridgeway at grade, with cycling and pedestrian priority (LCWIP Table 6.1 and LTN 1/20 Table 10-1, and WCPPTR, Section 5.4). The raised crossing will then become part of the traffic calming measures.
- At the Tudor Gardens crossing adjacent to the T-junction, the Redway should continue northwards at grade in a direct line to join the existing path north of the road (LCWIP Figure 6.1 and LTN 1/20, Figure 1.1). The opportunity should be taken at that point to raise the whole T-junction and create a table junction, clearly prioritising the flow of pedestrians and cyclists across the junction in all directions and further calming the traffic.
- The earliest opportunity possible should be taken to install appropriate signage and upgrade all the cycling and walking connections into the town from the south.

- The Redway link is not a cycleway and as such we use Milton Keynes standard specification for the installation of these which is the standard 3m width, although it is worth noting that LTN 1/20 allows the width to be dropped to 2m in a rural area. The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
- It is not possible to install a raised table to provide an at grade crossing point as it is too close to the junction and would have safety implications.
- As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.
- A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
- The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements.
- It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.
- There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.
- Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.

71 Resident - Objection

- Against the proposed route for the redway.
- Would like the redway to join to the existing footpath.
- Less work and materials. Would be safer as pedestrians don't have to cross the road three times to achieve the distance. Too many crossovers. Be sensible don't eat taxpayers' money.

- It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.
- There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.
- Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
- The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC.

72 Resident - Objection

- Against the 20mph zone
- Against the speed humps
- Excellent all-round visibility as you approach this bend and the proposed redway.
- Why is it proposed to have two crossings at the T junction would it not be safer to have one crossing?
- Make one crossing near to the post box and then to take the new redway at an angle to join the existing redway between Tudor Gardens and Latimer.
- Where is it proposed to have two crossings at the T junction would it not be safer to have one crossing?
- Make one crossing near to the post box and then to take the new redway at an angle to join the existing redway between Tudor Gardens and Latimer.

- As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.
- A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
- The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements.
- It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.
- There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road.
- The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
- The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.

73	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the proposed Redway route, due to crossing 3 times. - Would use the existing footway instead. - Speed limit of 30mph is already in force. - Against the speed reducing humps are not necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for Redway users. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
74	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the 20mph zone - Against the speed humps - The crossing is planned at a corner where drivers will be slow. - Wants double yellow lines on the corner, to stop people parking dangerously near crossing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
75	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the redway. - The proposed plans will detract from the visual appearance of the area and is detrimental to the existing tree population and soft landscaping. - It constitutes an unnecessarily costly option and will not guarantee that pedestrians will use the new route in favour of the current pathway, which is shorter, quicker and avoids having to make two additional road crossings, which increases the H&S risks. - Object to the road closure for resurfacing. - Object to the speed humps - Object to the 20mph change of speed limit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. This method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species. - Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used. - Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe. - Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime. - Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. - Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future.
76	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the 20mph zone - The 90-degree bend into Tudor gardens and Latimer acts as a natural speed limiter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The traffic calming measures seem like overkill. Surely, a simple "SLOW" sign on the road surface on approach to the Redway is enough combined with a speed limit sign? - I agree with this plan but feel that the traffic calming measures are excessive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
77	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the resurfacing of the road. - Supports the tree retrofitting. - Against the proposed redway route, cross the road 3 times, rather than once which is the current route. - No account appears to have been taken for the number of cars parking on Ridgeway/Tudor Gardens. People Park there to access the popular children's play park on Fairfields, as well as dog walkers. - Would like double yellow lines. - Would like to extend the existing footway to Fairfields. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website
78	Resident - Support	There should be a pathway from Fairfield to Tudor/Latimer as this is a very well used route, however surely a pathway would suffice?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There're utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
79	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Redway link. - Against the speed humps. - Against the 20mph zone. - Why does the planning committee deem it necessary to try and loop traffic calming and speed restrictions into what is otherwise the welcome development of the Medway? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. This method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
80	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the proposed redway route. - Extend the existing footway. - Against the tree removal - Is the developer paying for this work as the path was part of the planning application? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - here are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
81	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to the proposed scheme. The residents of Fairfields walk across the grass and onto the pavement. - The pavement is wide enough for push chairs, wheelchairs etc. - If this redway was built residents would have to cross three roads. - You don't say in your consultation how much this would cost. - Against the tree removal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species.
82	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to the whole scheme - Extend the existing footway. - Against the new crossing point - The speed humps won't work. - Against having 3 speed humps - Against the 20mph zone - would like to see the risk assessment and justification for the speed bumps at all. - The speed humps are rarely maintained. - Would like double red lines. - To allow clear sight down to the redway crossing and residential areas would be far more effective as a control measure than the installation of speed bumps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing. - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. This method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.
83	Resident - Support	<p>I am wanting to comment on this consultation in support of it, but I am unable to access the comments section. It takes me to a Microsoft online login and then says I need to login with a school or work account. Not sure if your link is set up correctly.</p> <p>Anyway, I am fully in support of this redway link. I am a new mother with a newborn and currently must trawl the pram through the mud or walk all the way round to the main road of the estate and go under the underpass to get too Stony. This has been needed to connect the estate to Calverton End for years, so you have my full support.</p>	
84	Resident - Support	<p>I'd like to register my support for the proposals. I'm grateful that the council is investing in our redway system. The plan will make it safer for my family to cycle to their schools and to see their friends. It makes much more sense taking the route over the Latimer side of the road to avoid crossing several driveways.</p> <p>I know quite a few children from Stony who attend Fairfields and Watling and this will enable them to travel to school safely by bike - brilliant. It will also make it easier for Fairfields residents to visit Stony - great for the independent retailers on our High Street.</p>	
85	Resident - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Redway link, but not the proposed route. - Concern for redway users crossing the road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would have liked the existing path to link up to Fairfields. Front of 1-3 Tudor Gardens which is currently used by Fairfields residents - although currently a muddy track. - A single Redway road crossing would probably have less than 50% of the traffic volume and traffic would naturally be slowed down by the presence of a T junction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
86	Resident – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wants double yellow lines on the bend. - Supports the scheme. - Supports the resurfacing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.
87	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the tree removal - Should extend the existing footway. - Against the proposed speed humps. - Would like double yellow lines on bend. - Cannot seem to find the proposed costing for this project. - Wants double yellow lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - There are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. This method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species.
88	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 groups that would benefit from the link. - Group 1 These are dog walkers who cross from Stony Stratford and travel outside numbers 1,2 &3 Tudor Gardens - Group 2 These would have no use of the link apart from using the access through the hedge / trees to access the required area. - Group 3 Pedestrians currently come through the hedge / trees and use the path in front of the driveways and only use a single road crossing to access their route. - Group 4 there are limited numbers of cyclists using the link. - Extend the existing redway. - Extend and convert to redway the path outside numbers 1,2 &3 Tudor Gardens to join the redway at the junction where it meets the Ridgeway. - The number of mature trees to be removed has been significantly reduced. - If the proposed redway extension is installed, how do we get pedestrians / cyclists to use it as the proposed solution will increase the distance being travelled and expose them to two additional road crossing. - Wants double yellow lines on the corner. - Against tree removal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton Keynes City Council is committed to improving walking and cycling facilities so that all residents can make greener transport choices. - We are proposing to create a Redway link between Fairfields and Stony Stratford which will allow cyclists and pedestrians to travel safely between these two areas and access the wider Redway network. - The scheme has been designed to bring the most benefits to the local area, looking at local traffic levels and speeds and how we can make improvements to the road environment. This is the best location for this Redway link as there are no landowner issues or utilities in the ground. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.

- The cost of the project would be reduced as all councils have to be aware of their budgets.

- At present there are no formal path for cyclist to use safely, this link will provide a safe path, this will also promote cycling in MKCC.
- The project is developer funded and no part is paid for by MKCC.
- The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations.
- The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees.
- TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease.
- The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered.
- This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway.
- MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted.
- TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity.
- We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species.
- Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.

89 Resident -
Objection

- Against the Redway route due to 3 crossings
- Against the 20mph speed limit.
- Against the speed humps, can cause serious pain and discomfort for persons with medical conditions such as fractures. Moreover, there is growing evidence that speed humps are responsible for increasing air pollution.
- Against the road closure for surfacing.
- Such action would be tantamount to imprisoning residents who have difficulty walking and rely on cars to get in and out. This could have serious repercussions if someone needed urgent medical attention that did not merit a 999 call.
- Against the tree removal.

- The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
- For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. This method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police.
- Works of this nature if required, we would adjust/stop our work on site to allow emergency vehicles access to any property within the area of our works. This could take a little time to move plant and materials being used.
- Should you require 'emergency' access to or from your property our contractor will do what they can they to facilitate safe access/egress. This may take a little time to make to make the road safe.
- Works would be carried during restricted times and access would be available during early morning, evening, and nighttime.
- Tudor Gardens is narrow and leads to a cull de sac, we have no alternative but to close the road for the shortest time possible, to safely carry these works. Tudor Gardens is in poor condition/with potholes. Combining resurfacing the road with our scheme, this will save the need to close the road twice in future.
- The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations.
- The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees.
- TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease.
- The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered.
- This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway.
- MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted.
- TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity.
- We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species.

90 Resident –
Support

- Supports the scheme but not the route.
- Route should pass the post box and join the existing redway.
- It seems less satisfactory or safe to cross two roads at this point.
- We accept this may be because of ash die-back but hope you will keep all possible.
- Would like to see replacement trees in the area where there is tree loss rather than in the grassy area by the first house on the estate. Extra trees in this area are welcome but not as an alternative.

- The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
- The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements.
- It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.
- In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.
- Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.

91	Resident - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the speed humps - Cyclists can join the carriageway. - The Redway from the Latimer cul-de-sac to Tudor Gardens is used extensively by walkers, including elderly and many dog walkers daily and if the proposed new Redway encouraged many more cyclists and possibly electric scooters and bicycles to use this route then existing regular users could be in some considerable danger. - we recently studied passer-by activity. During a period of approximately 2 hours, we observed a total of 42 people, some with dogs, some with children pushing prams, and others just individuals pass through but only 2 bicycles. I think this shows there is no need for a costly Redway extension. - Against the removal of the trees. - The existing footpath could be improved for just walkers hence not encouraging more cycles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. - The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. This method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - The redways are bespoke to Milton Keynes and are dual purpose for both pedestrians and cyclists. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The Parks Trust routinely inspects our trees and following one of these inspections Ash dieback was discovered on several trees within the H1 grid road plantations. - The Parks Trust has carried out tree work to remove many diseased Ash trees. - TPT carry out tree thinning on their sites they look to create diverse species mix and remove potential trees likely to fail due to poor form/health or have the potential for disease. - The H1 is very rich in Ash trees, when these trees were originally planted Ash dieback was possibly not even considered. - This scheme gives the opportunity to re-model a functional park entrance that feels welcoming and safe for its users approaching the road and using the Redway. - MKCC is increasing the number of new trees being planted. - TPT this year are planting 18,000 trees and shrubs across the areas they manage to provide a holistic view that suits the environmental changes, biodiversity. - We will be replacing all trees taken down with more suitable and more robust species.
92	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against the tree removal - If it's because of Ash die back, then that's a different matter. If the route is straightened up as we propose, there are only little trees that need cutting back and not the mature ones. A significant saving. - The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for Stony Stratford was rejected by the Town Council but any proposals undertaken now need to be able to have future cycling improvements to the town, integrated safely and efficiently. - recommendations from LCWIP and DoT, the new Redway extension should take as straight a line as possible. - It should be a raised crossing, with the Redway having priority, as it goes over Ridgeway, itself being a traffic calming measure and may negate the need for other calming measures proposed. - It should then continue straight and cross Latimer on a raised crossing rather than the dog leg proposed which has a crossing of Ridgeway and Tudor Gardens. The raised crossing, with the Redway having priority, will be a calming measure, of which there is currently none proposed for these crossings. - If you believe that a 20mph zone will negate the need for calming measures at this junction, you are mistaken. - The current Redway around Latimer is in a very sorry state and needs sorting. - Additional signage needed on the redway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Redway link is not a cycleway and as such we use Milton Keynes standard specification for the installation of these which is the standard 3m width, although it is worth noting that LTN 1/20 allows the width to be dropped to 2m in a rural area. The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - It is not possible to install a raised table to provide an at grade crossing point as it is too close to the junction and would have safety implications. - For road safety measures, we propose to reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs. - In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners. - Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road. - The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing.
93	Resident – Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retain the proposed new Fairfields Redway access point on the corner of H1 Ridgeway - The extension to the existing pedestrian footpath - Would like double yellow lines. - For pedestrian safety a single crossing point. - Good visibility for pedestrians crossing. - A greater understanding of both pedestrian and drivers' intentions due to a single crossing point. The original proposal indicates a contrived double-crossing point. - Additional fencing - Positioned for pedestrian safety and to stop the free flow of pedestrian traffic continuing to use the existing footpath. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - As a road safety measure, reduce the speed and introduce some traffic measures, speed humps. This will make the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The introduction of speed humps on Ridgeway will slow traffic down will be self-enforcing. - A limited number of Speed humps, this method of self-enforcement is favoured by Thames Valley Police. - The proposed is for the construction of 1 new crossing and upgrade of an existing crossing. - The Redways are bespoke to Milton Keynes and are dual purpose for both pedestrians and cyclists. - The existing unofficial narrow path cannot be widened to provide the above improvements. - It was not viable to upgrade the narrow footpath as we would need to encroach onto private land and trees. This would require purchase of the land and associated legal costs.

- An extension to the fencing to stop pedestrians using the shortcut between no's 73 & 75 Latimer.
- Repositioning of the speed hump -Revised position, just prior to the corner. The proposed position, allows drivers to recover speed before the corner, thereby rendering its purpose as negligible.

- In addition, there are utilities in the existing narrow footpath that would need to be diverted/lowered this would be very costly and subject to obtaining the extra land from the homeowners.
- Any maintenance/works required to these cables would mean closing any new Redway and providing a walking route in the road.
- The proposed route of the Redway has no services, therefore would not need to be closed for any reason by service companies.
- Requests for double yellow lines need to go through the Parish/Ward Councils, details about this can be found on our website.
- The post and rail fencing deters redway users from cutting the corner and give cyclist a visual to slow down as the Redway bends and as they approach the crossing.

7

Passenger Transport

8

Stony Stratford Town Council

1. The proposal needs to be seen as a missing Redway link that was not included in the MKCC *Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan* because the LCWIP did not look at the Western Expansion Area. The route and design must ensure that they can safely and efficiently be integrated into whatever cycling improvements are eventually made in Stony Stratford.
2. Redway Crossing - there should be a raised platform.
3. Tudor Gardens crossing adjacent to the T-junction - the Redway should continue northwards at grade in a direct line to join the existing path north of the road (LCWIP Figure 6.1 and LTN 1/20, Figure 1.1). The opportunity should be taken at that point to raise the whole T-junction and create a table junction, clearly prioritising the flow of pedestrians and cyclists across the junction in all directions this should be a raised table junction and the proposed route of the Redway should carry straight on across Tudor Gardens. In our opinion, pedestrians and cyclists will follow the desire line rather the dogleg shown in your proposed scheme (see map).
4. Tudor Gardens should be upgraded to a Redway.
5. The proposed design appears to ignore the council's own guidance including LTN 1/20 Section 6.2.1, which was extensively referenced in the LCWIP.

Please could the trees be replaced on a 2:1 basis i.e., 28 replacements?

As discussed, the project will include resurfacing the entire length of Tudor Gardens as part of the scheme to remove the potholes and renew the road markings. Completing these works at the same time as the other elements will minimize the disruption to the residents. Disruption will be once rather than completing one and coming back a few months later to complete the other works; the works can be completed at one time and left for a longer length of time before the need to return.

The missing Redway link was not included in the LCWIP proposals, as the missing link is only 44 linear meters, so LTN 1/20 will not fully apply. If LTN 1/20 is used to construct rather than MKCC Redway standards, then there would be a need to remove more trees and take away more of the green area as it would need to be 5m wide rather than the 3m that the MKCC standard uses, which isn't practicable or necessary in this area. Please note that this Redway is located on a cul-de-sac road in a housing estate with low levels of usage.

A raised table was initially considered at the crossing; however, it is not possible in this location because of the alignment of the road (bend at the bottom of H1 Ridgeway) and the location of the junction (Tudor Gardens/Latimer). However, there will still be a traffic-calming element with speed humps to slow down traffic and ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

MKCC will amend the alignment of the Redway to remove the "dog leg," and it will continue across Latimer to join the existing Redway. The Redway will still be on the north side of Tudor Gardens, as there is not enough width to widen the unofficial footway in front of houses 1 to 3. This extension will be constructed in accordance with Milton Keynes City Council Redways standards.

The new link will be designed and constructed to MKCC Redway standards.

The existing Redway network is approximately 350km of infrastructure, and it is a unique shared-use facility. The current standard is 3 meters wide, and there are only 44 meters of missing links; therefore, there is no justification to design a segregated cycling and pedestrian facility with very low usage.

MKCC will remove 16 trees and replant at least 25 new ones in the area which will be designed and installed by The Park Trust. This will create a diverse species mix and remove potential trees that are likely to fail due to poor form or health or have the potential for disease. Now, it is very rich in Ash trees, and when these trees were originally planted, ash dieback was possibly not considered.

9

TVP

There are no previous papers on this matter; there have been no injury collisions recorded for the five-year period 1/7/18 – 30/6/23 for the proposed area.

The traffic speeds will be lowered using speed humps.

If speeds do not reduce sufficiently MKCC will have to look at further measures to reduce speeds to within the National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) of not more than 10% + 2mph over the posted limit.