

Public Consultation Feedback

Coastal cycle route phase 2 (Swalecliffe to Whitstable)

Final analysis

The advertised public consultation period was from 23 January to 21 February 2012.

Comments continued to be received after 21 February and so the closure of the online survey was delayed until 2 March. Paper questionnaires continued to be received up until 13 March and have been included in the analysis.

Please note that:

Comments received up to 9 February are shown in black

Comments received between 9 and 21 February are in red

Comments received after 21 February are shown in green

Additional items of correspondence that were submitted by local groups and individuals are shown at the back of this appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Total number of questionnaire responses: 410 (Final analysis 13.03.2012)

Paper	128	31.22%
Web	282	68.78%

Q1 I am a

Local resident	358	87.32%
Business	3	0.73%
Student	-	-
Visitor	20	4.88%
Other	22	5.37%
No reply	7	1.71%

Q2 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route along the promenade between Swalecliffe and Whitstable?

Yes	330	80.49%
No	78	19.02%
No reply	2	0.49%

Q4 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route between the harbour and Stream Walk, and improvements on the Crab & Winkle Way between Stream Walk and Whitstable Station?

Yes	357	87.07%
No	31	7.56%
No reply	22	5.37%

Q6 Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

Yes	31	7.56%
No	354	86.34%
No reply	25	6.10%

Q7 Home postcode

All Canterbury district postcodes (CT1, CT2, CT3, CT4, CT5, CT6)	313	76.34%
CT5 postcode only	215	52.44%

New Swalecliffe to Whitstable cycle route

CT5 respondents only

Number of responses: 215 (Final analysis 13.03.2012)

Paper	99	46.05%
Web	116	53.95%

Q2 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route along the promenade between Swalecliffe and Whitstable?

Yes	165	76.74%
No	50	23.26%

Q4 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route between the Harbour and Stream Walk, and the improvements on the Crab & Winkle Way between Stream Walk and Whitstable Station?

Yes	187	86.98%
No	17	7.91%
No reply	11	5.12%

New Swalecliffe to Whitstable cycle route

Respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q6

Q6 Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

Number of 'Yes' responses: 31 (Final analysis 13.03.2012)

Paper	9	29.03%
Web	22	70.97%

Q2 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route along the promenade between Swalecliffe and Whitstable?

Yes	28	90.32%
No	3	9.68%

Q4 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route between the Harbour and Stream Walk, and the improvements on the Crab & Winkle Way between Stream Walk and Whitstable Station?

Yes	28	90.32%
No	2	6.45%
No reply	1	3.23%

Q7 Home postcode

Postcode	Number of respondents	Percentage
CT1	2	6.45%
CT10	1	3.23%
CT2	4	12.90%
CT5	14	45.16%
CT6	4	12.90%
ME13	2	6.45%
No reply	4	12.90%

Summary of additional comments received

Full responses are located at the end of Appendix 2

Councillor Jean Law is in favour of the scheme.

Councillor Jeanne Harrison is in favour of the scheme but has pointed out that the Harbour Access road can become busy at weekends and investigations should be carried out to ensure that it would be safe for cyclists. As the promenade is narrower in front of the council owned beach huts, she would like to see 'cyclists dismount' signs introduced for this section.

The Port Manager and Harbour Master (Mike Wier) supports the scheme.

The city council's Foreshore Manager (Matthew Young) supports the scheme. Recommends a number of enhancements including provision of 'A' boards for Tankerton Sailing Club and Lifeguards for gentle warning type signs, signage to nearby cafes, cycle parking, repositioning of water standpipes to help reduce congestion on the promenade and for health and safety reasons, improvements to slope paths, provision of information board to direct cyclists away from Longrock and away from SSSI, additional 'no cycling' signage to discourage cycling through the Harbour.

The city council's Outdoor Leisure Manager (Richard Griffiths) supports the scheme.

The Whitstable Beach Campaign (Nick Dewhirst) is broadly in favour of the scheme. Suggests segregation by a white line along the promenade, doubling the width of the grasscrete track at Longrock, additional cycle parking provision.

The Conservation Advisor for the Kent Team of Natural England (Phil Williams) supports the scheme. The positive signing of the route along the grasscrete track at Swalecliffe will help to encourage some people away from Longrock which is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest and a RAMSAR site (the area is a sensitive inter-tidal habitat for over-wintering and migratory birds).

The Secretary of the Canterbury Group of Kent Ramblers (Ian Wild) has stated that their Group does not object to the proposals. Mr Wild is also personally in favour of the scheme. This is possibly the only promenade in Kent where there is no provision for cyclists, tourism value of allowing cycling, the scheme will make all users (ie pedestrians and cyclists) more aware of one another's presence.

Matthew Banbury (Whitstable resident) is in favour of the scheme. Whitstable is spoilt by traffic congestion, cycling should be encouraged as an alternative to the car, people already cycle safely along the promenade of all ages, promenade is flat and motor vehicle free unlike Tower Hill, encourage respectful cycling along the promenade, cycling ban would be ineffective.

Stephen Guy Wall (Faversham resident) formerly a Tankerton resident and a regular walker along the promenade is opposed to the scheme. Concerned about the unregulated nature of cycling, potential for high cyclist speeds, witnessed near miss incidents, need for independent safety review of scheme, concerned about swarms of cyclists including club cycle events claiming right-full ground and general conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and beach users.

The Whitstable Society (Kath Gill, Graham Cox, Maureen Smith) is opposed to the scheme. Concerned about the lack of options being put to public consultation, that the public consultation only promotes the benefits and not the disbenefits of the scheme, the lack of warning of public consultation, lack of pre-consultation to the public consultation, the seasonal cycle route (as described in the Local Plan and Walking & Cycling Strategy) was

not the scheme put to public consultation, will damage peace and safety, the potential for conflict between criss-crossing movements of children, beach hut users and cyclists during busy summer months, proposed signing will not help, want the public consultation to be re-run, consultation is defective.

Concerned about cycling along the promenade in the summer when it is heavily used by pedestrians, children and disabled people along and across it. Fast moving bicycles along a busy promenade coupled with a significant number of unsuspecting young children randomly dashing down to the water across the cycle route is a dangerous cocktail. Opposed to a full access cycle route carving up and making less usable and pleasant this treasured amenity space especially at busy summer times. Bad behaviour of cyclists will be exacerbated. The consultation process was improper and faulty. Consultation should have focussed comments on 24/7 cycle route versus summer restrictions. Council staff can enforce the byelaw as well as the Police. Funding is available from Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Fields fund. A contra-flow cycle lane on Tower Hill would not result in the loss of on-street parking.

Guide Dogs is opposed to the scheme. Guide Dogs does not support non segregated cycle paths. As this is a promenade, it might not be possible to segregate thereby posing a safety issue and problem for blind and partially sighted pedestrians. Adjacent or shared cyclist and pedestrian facilities should never be permitted within the following types of location, which are totally inappropriate for cycling; pedestrianised areas, promenades and shopping areas and footways. Where a cycle path is required in these situations, a totally separate route must be provided. Without defined segregation incorporating signage, tactile warnings and use of colour contrast, blind and partially sighted people would be at risk from potential collisions in a shared environment. Consequently making it a 'no go area' for visually impaired people and other vulnerable people.

Mrs Sue Pellegrino (Chairman, Canterbury Development Advisory Panel) generally welcomes a scheme that has significant health and well-being benefits for local communities, visitors and tourists, and a reduction in pollution and congestion. DAP believes that some accommodation is essential between all user groups. DAP welcomes the improvements to the Crab & Winkle Way particularly at Whitstable Station and the improved crossing points. Overall, the Panel considers that a conservative approach that is likely to have the least adverse impact on disabled people is best, with the proviso that monitoring is undertaken across the seasons, particularly along the promenade and at the new crossing on Tower Parade. The proposals meet that objective although some refinements may be advisable at the new crossing on Tower Parade. Good information should be provided through good signage and plans/leaflets available locally and online. Enlist the help of Spokes and others to raise awareness for the need for a more prominent 'User Code'. Short term path 'monitors' to assist with monitoring.

The DAP's submission demonstrates that there is some variance of views within the Panel which is likely to happen as people will have different priorities. Some members believe that some people will be frightened to use shared routes. The most critical clash of interest is likely to be between fast moving cyclists and pedestrians with a hidden sensory impairment. Some Panel members believe that this is more of a perceived risk rather than an actual risk. It is likely that clashes occur on narrower pathways or where there are poor sight lines, poor surfaces and where there is high ambient noise levels. Specific concerns relate to areas of the promenade where footfall is excessive in summer and where there are higher levels of ambient noise preventing elderly and disabled people from hearing cyclists. The Panel recommends: that the clear width on the promenade is 3m minimum; highlight the edge of the promenade; introduce a speed limit of 5mph; provide 'give way to pedestrians and wheelchair users' signs; provide CCTV on promenade to monitor activity in the first year; undertake monitoring; raise awareness amongst cyclists.

New Swalecliffe to Whitstable cycle route

Number of questionnaire responses: 410 (Final analysis 13.03.2012)

Paper	128	31.22%
Web	282	68.78%

Q1 I am a

Local resident	358	87.32%
Business	3	0.73%
Student	-	-
Visitor	20	4.88%
Other (please specify)	22	5.37%
No reply	7	1.71%

Other (please specify)

A social cyclist from Ramsgate.

Assistant Director of Public Health.

Canterbury resident wishing to use this route for pleasure.

Cllr and local resident.

Cyclist living in Canterbury.

Former residents and visitor; family in the area.

Frequent cyclist in Kent and own a property in Canterbury.

I live in Petham.

I'm not sure how local local is – I live in Kent but not north Kent.

Resident from Wye.

Thanet cyclist.

Used to live in Whitstable.

Visit friend on a weekly basis.

Weekend home owner.

Co-ordinator, Ramblers Association Kent Area (East)

Former resident

Guide Dogs - campaign and access

I am a Whitstable native, lived there from 1934 to 1959 and have visited regularly ever since.

Keen walker who lives outside the area but visits frequently

Live locally but not in proposed area.

Q2 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route along the promenade between Swalecliffe and Whitstable?

Yes	330	80.49%
No	78	19.02%
No reply	2	0.49%

Q3 Please state your reasons.

'Yes' responses

1. It will complete the 'missing link' 2. It will finally legitimise the de facto shared use - reducing any sense of guilt (for cyclists) and aggressiveness (from some objectors)

1. Those who don't take care ignore the current ban anyway. 2. Notices could be displayed urging cyclists to be careful. 3. There is a shortage of good cycling routes in the vicinity. 4. It is important to promote the health and fitness of the community.

A dedicated cycle route will encourage yet more people to cycle. Cycling has well established health benefits and is a means by which the general public can maintain physical fitness in a normal setting. Furthermore this provides an additional public amenity that makes further use of local open space.

A great solution. Cyclist already use the promenade although it is not legal. An almost complete safe ride can now be carried out from Chartham to Swalecliffe

A great way to encourage people to explore on their bicycles safely.

A much needed mainly off road link (already unofficially used by many cyclists) which should prove safer for all cyclist, particularly children.

A pleasurable flat off road route for walkers and cyclists.

A traffic free cycle route around the north Kent coast from Seasalter to Margate would be a welcome amenity. This would be a start.

A well controlled route well for shared use by cyclists and walkers. With consideration for beach hut owners along those sections as proposed.

Acknowledges most of what already happens and therefore represents the most sensible addition to the existing Oyster Way route.

All pedestrians AND cyclists benefit from a safe and motor traffic free environment.

All ready used as a cycle path. The only thing is to make cyclists aware of the pedestrians ands vice versa. Care from both will make it workable (including beach hut owners not using the path as a picnic/bbq stand).

All should be encouraged to use their cars less and walk or cycle more. Current cycling facilities are hopelessly inadequate and dangerous and discouraging for potential cyclists.

All/any improvements/extensions to the cycle network are extremely important in encouraging cycling for leisure and transport

Allow cyclists to enjoy sea front. Safer for cyclists. Should not be a problem for pedestrians. Will encourage people to cycle rather than drive.

Any additional off road cycling is ideal I have three children and it is an excellent way to get them active and keep them safe

Anything that enhances rides out of Whitstable must be good

Anything that helps people to cycle safely is worth doing.

Anything to keep me away from traffic

Anything we can do to get the public out on their bikes or walking is good. Separating cars from bikes is always good. I cycle regularly weather permitting from my home through to Herne Bay and Whitstable, weather permitting. 100% in favour of this scheme.

As a leisure cyclist & pedestrian I can think of nothing negative about this proposal

As is restricted to no cycling but as no one including local police seem to be bothered to stop cyclists even during busy summer months seems ridiculous not being able to use to cycle on. I feel that would need to have designated cycle lane painted with line preferably nearer to beach than wall and huts so that at least cyclists and beach users can see each other approaching safely also possible speed humps at points where steps are approaching.

As noted in the consultation, many people already cycle along the promenade. In my experience the vast majority of both cyclists and pedestrians show consideration and courtesy to other users. By removing the ban you would be removing both a potential source of friction (from pedestrians who regard the cyclists as in breach of the law) and a potential risk arising from visiting pedestrians who see the current signs and assume that they have the promenade to themselves. In addition, it would mean that it is possible to cycle from Canterbury to Margate (via Whitstable) with only minimal time on public roads.

At the end of the day cyclists have been using the promenade for years and sharing it with pedestrians with little mishap, so why not make it legal. There are more benefits than negatives and it is a win, win situation. Allowing cycling on the promenade will provide a continuous route along the North Kent Coast joining on to the Viking Coastal Trail in Thanet. Viking Coastal Trail has been very successful at attracting tourists and leisure cyclists and there is no reason why Oyster Bay Trail shouldn't do the same. Cyclists and pedestrians use shared use paths with little conflict all the time and the promenade is no different!

Avoids traffic; wonderful views; easy cycling on the flat promenade; plenty of room for pedestrians. Will encourage cycling, which might decrease traffic in Whitstable/Tankerton. Ideal for children.

Because I use the existing cycle route from Thanet to get to the Crab & Winkle route, and this completes a substantially traffic free run to Canterbury.

Bike is my main form of transport for work and recreation. I am unwilling to break the current byelaw and the road route involves a hill and busy traffic. I am a considerate rider and I believe most other cyclists I see are responsible and aware of pedestrians/dogs etc. This proposal completes a very popular ride that's already a cycle route.

But there should be segregation along the promenade. Cycles should not but do use the promenade at the moment and it is a case of pedestrian get out of the way. The cyclists act as if they have the right of use for the whole width of the promenade. Splitting the prom so that cyclists were along the wall/land side and pedestrians beach side would stop this and prevent pedestrians from walking in front of bikes when trying to reach the beach, and cyclists could dismount and walk across to the beach. If you make this mixed access and I get injured by a bike who do I sue - the council or cyclists??

By encouraging off road cycling, there will be greater health benefits for many more people. Cyclists will be safer away from traffic along Tankerton seafront. Parked cars can pose big dangers if passengers open car doors in front of an approaching cyclist without thinking first. Clearly, with up to 400 cycles using the prom on a busy summer's day, the current byelaw, which dates from 1916, is a farce and needs to be sorted urgently. It hasn't been enforced by anybody for a period of nearly 15 years, partly because the poorly worded byelaw contains a double negative which makes it all unenforceable anyway. While it tries to prevent cycling along the prom, it doesn't outlaw activities such as roller-skating? Cars are permitted along part of the promenade too - so why not allow cycles?

Canterbury resident wishing to use this route for pleasure

Care must be given that cyclists and pedestrians will be safe on shared routes with correct signage as on Deal seafront, ie cyclists take care and give way to pedestrians

Common sense.

Convenience - because easier to access, more people will ride so good for health and the environment. Also, if I've read it right, an alternative to the Clare/Station Road debacle.

Cycling is a sustainable form of low carbon footprint mass transport that should be encouraged at every opportunity.

Cycling is beneficial to both health & the environment & so any proposed expansion to cycle routes which will get people moving & also mean less fumes from cars on the roads can only be a good move.

Cycling is such a wonderful pursuit, particularly for families but it is very difficult in the urban areas to find safe routes.

Cyclists already cycle along this route. As there is no dedicated cycle route this causes a hazard to walkers and other users of the promenade, especially near the beach huts.

Cyclists already use this route on a daily basis, I have heard no detrimental comments regarding the completed route from Herne Bay to Swalecliffe. It is a much safer route than the main road. The wave wall is wide enough to accommodate all users, though it will need to be properly marked.

Cyclists and pedestrians can and must co exist. We are responsible adults, many with our own children. We know how to cycle considerately when the beach huts are busy. An outright ban is ridiculous- most of the time the promenade is very quiet.

Cyclists need joined up routes and this joins existing stretches which stopped in awkward places. The promenade is labelled as usable by vehicles and some with boat trailers go there. It should be clear that priority is to pedestrians (as long as they aren't 5 abreast) then cyclists then motor vehicles. It is already used in this way.

Cyclists to dismount end of May to 1st October along promenade.

Cycling is a very healthy activity and should be encouraged for all in a safe environment, traffic free.

De Facto use already. Safe teaching of kids to cycle. Journey to Swalecliffe Primary from Whitstable (I took my daughter to school this way). Journey to Margate - the missing link - a great day out.

Encourage fitness and outdoor activities

Encouragement of safer cycling and alternative transport modes.

Encourages cycling and people exploring the local area. Good for general health as well as local business

Enjoyment of being able to cycle along the sea shore.

Families can all ride together in safety without any traffic also know it is healthier with no car fumes I cant understand why you can cycle all the way to Herne Bay and through to Margate using the promenade and yet we are not supposed to cycle on the promenade at Tankerton it is the same width It doesn't make sense. We cycle & walk on the promenade in Eastbourne a line is painted for Pedestrians /Cyclists and it works fine so why cant this be done here Perhaps its because the Beach hut owners consider the promenade to be theirs as well !!!

Feel this is a safer option for cyclists than the road from Swalecliffe to Whitstable as there are many narrow parts with a lot of on street parking which is not always a safe option for cyclists especially children.

First and foremost this is a great community project and will promote healthy living all year round. Moreover, cyclist traditionally are very aware and will act in a considered manner to all other pedestrians. It will also be another tourist attraction.

For maximum use of existing cycle routes need joined-up links, and this is an essential part of routes on the coast and connections inland. I regularly walk along this route and it is wide enough to be safe for both pedestrians & cyclists.

Frequently use route both as cyclist and walker. The scheme would further our enjoyment of the route.

Give cyclists a safe route.

Gives people a safe cycling route.

Good exercise, safe cycling, reduces congestion and air pollution

Have used the promenade for cycling for 70 years. My husband and myself really enjoy riding our bikes along the seafront, and it would be impossible to walk now. We are always most careful and respect people who are walking.

Having to cycle through Whitstable is extremely dangerous due to jams that often occur due to inconsiderate drivers parking on the main road. This makes it very difficult for lorries and buses to get through, thus having a knock on affect.

I already commute to work this way once each week by bike as I travel from Whitstable to Herne Bay. It is a lovely route and safe for cyclists and walkers. I am aware it is currently not allowed but can vouch for its safety. I suspect it would increase the use of resources and facilities in Whitstable as currently cyclists are discouraged from going to the town centre.

I already walk and cycle the beach and roads at Tankerton and the Harbour area and often cycle to Whitstable from Herne Bay along the front. It's a very pleasant ride that I think would benefit from designated cycle/pedestrian signage as seen in other areas.

I am a cyclist and lived in Whitstable for 33 years and have ridden the front for that time. It would nice not to be growled at by trippers at all times of year and make them aware that the front is for all to enjoy. Besides having been nearly knocked off my bike 3 times in as many years on road it is a far safer way to ride along the prom. So after a lot of campaigning by various people over the years to ride the front it would be nice to do it without being moaned at.

I am a keen Cyclist and this new linking route would open up a 'Safe' route along some of the most beautiful parts of the East Kent coast. This part is already extremely popular with families on bikes... it would now make it legal to cycle where only walkers (and dogs) got the full pleasure of the wonderful sea view. Not only that- but in this time of stress and financial uncertainty, to encourage families to cycle out together MUST be good for the whole populations health and well-being.

I am a regular user of the cycle path from Swalecliffe to Herne bay and beyond, having the ability to ride from Whitstable without having to use the road will be a great improvement. I think it may also reduce traffic coming into Whitstable if the residents of Swalecliffe and Herne bay have a pleasant and easy cycle journey to the centre of Whitstable

I am a regular visitor to the lakes at Zell am Zee (Austria) and Lake Geneva (France/Swiss), both have equal size promenades and I walk and cycle both. One has a designated cycle path, the latter has 'Fair Play' signs depicting walkers and cyclists. I have never seen any difficulty with the two using the same path.

I am an advocate of cycling on both health and environmental grounds.

I am in favour of any new cycle routes in the area. Good for local cyclists and visitors alike

I believe this new cycle route plan will be successful because it will increase the tourists visiting Whitstable. Also being allowed to cycle along the promenade is a

great idea as cyclists can enjoy the scenic route while having their own cycle section of the walkway.

I currently do not cycle between Whitstable and Herne Bay - too much on road - but will do if this new route is opened. It will be much appreciated.

I cycle around Kent quite a lot and particularly enjoy the Kent coast. I cycle from Dungeness to Whitstable 3 or 5 times a year and a safe off road route along the coast would improve the offer at the end of the journey. I also think that it will encourage more people to cycle as the roads get quite dangerous on sunny weekends and this is off putting to less confident cyclists.

I cycle daily along the proposed route from my home to and from Whitstable. I have lived in Tankerton for 29 years. I cycle to Whitstable, Herne Bay, Minnis Bay and further along the seafront. I use my bike to get my shopping. I also use the Crab and Winkle cycle route to Canterbury.

I enjoy cycling along the promenade and think it should be made enjoyable for cyclists and pedestrians alike to be able to enjoy a safe environment

I enjoy cycling, and I think it will be a good addition to the current cycle network.

I have been a cyclist for over 50 years and have lived in Tankerton for over 29 years. I would like to see more cycle routes in Whitstable, to promote cycling as a healthy and sustainable activity for all. Local roads are often dangerous because of fast and heavy traffic. Cycle routes are much safer. I always cycle with consideration for other users and give way to pedestrians on shared pathways.

I have been cycling along this route for over 40 years: it is a pleasant and safe ride for all ages, and the best route from Whitstable town to Swalecliffe and Herne Bay.

I have cycled along this promenade since I was young and it is about time it was made legal! If cyclists and pedestrians are sensible and caring there should be no problem, put in cycle lane and pedestrian crossing points if necessary.

I have cycled along this route many times as have many others without mishap or causing annoyance to walkers. Why not make it legitimate? It's a great way to get exercise and enjoy sea views.

I have lived here for 15 years and see no reason why the promenade should not be used for both pedestrians and cyclists. No dedicated cycle path needs to be introduced, I walk the promenade almost daily and cyclists are no problem. Caution when passing the beach huts must however be strictly implemented.

I have lived in Tankerton for over 29 years and am also a cyclist. I think cycling is a healthy and enjoyable outdoor activity which can be enjoyed by people of all ages at relatively low cost. I am in favour of promoting dedicated cycle ways in Whitstable to ensure that people can do this in safety. I think it is perfectly viable for pedestrians and cyclists to share use of the promenade, which is easily wide enough to accommodate both activities.

I have walked the Crab and Winkle line, in full 3 times now and found the last part of the walk from near Tesco supermarket, far less enjoyable and not very well marked. I also wanted to go further, but did not know my way round Whitstable and the coast line well enough to go further. This will open up more walks for me and my dog to enjoy.

I learnt to cycle on the prom and it is the safest traffic free route to reach the coast. I am a walker and cyclist

I live in Broadstairs and cycle for leisure. To be able to cycle along the coast - traffic free - is great. I use the Viking Trail often. Your plan would enable me to come to Whitstable by train and then join the new path.

I live in Clare Road, and although disappointed that the proposed cycle route along the disused railway has been seemingly scuppered, this is a good alternative. It means my wife, children and I can cycle safely up to the current cycle route.

I live South of Canterbury and as a family we visit Whitstable and many other coastal towns in East Kent regularly for walks and scooter rides with the kids. I fully support conversion to allow cycles to use this too and we would use it as such ourselves. Coastal cycle routes are a real asset for any tourist destination, even better when they are long, uninterrupted, car free and go from town to town.

I make good use of the promenade between Herne Bay and Whitstable for both walking and cycling. I also own a beach hut in HB so can see all sides. Cyclists have always cycled too fast along the narrow path behind our huts and we have always been afraid for our children. However I remain in favour for all the good reasons mentioned. Perhaps in Tankerton occasional zebra-type crossings could be placed at key points. Though perhaps not quite as contentious as the beach hut-prom issue at Tankerton, shared use seems to work well on the prom in Thanet.

I often cycle between Whitstable and Herne Bay for recreation and frequently the trip includes bird watching. The road route along Marine Parade is difficult because of cars wanting to overtake or park, and you cannot stop safely when many cars are parked, let alone watch birds. No one has ever objected to me riding on the prom and I can stop there whenever I like.

I often use the Crab & Winkle, Oyster Bay Trail and Viking Coastal trail and any improvement is worthwhile and welcome.

I regularly cycle from Canterbury to Whitstable on the Crab & Winkle Way, then continue along the coast to Herne Bay, Swalecliffe, Birchington, Ramsgate and Deal. These improvements for cyclists like myself would be a big benefit and encourage more people to cycle. Cyclists use local facilities such as pubs, cafes, B&Bs etc and this is a great way to improve commerce in the area including attracting visiting cyclists from further afield for holidays and short breaks.

I regularly cycle this route and this would benefit not only myself but also the other users of the route. It would create a safer proposition for all.

I regularly cycle to Whitstable and would prefer that a proper cycle track was in place. Many people already use the promenade to cycle on and it makes sense to legalise it.

I think it is an excellent idea. There are many other areas in the country that walkers and cyclists share space safely. My only concern is that the promenade in front of the Tankerton East Beach Huts can have young children running out from between the huts onto the promenade. Currently some cyclists do not slow down in that area. Signs requesting cyclists to 'slow to walking pace' would be very helpful.

I try to cycle whenever I can within Whitstable and the roads are set up exclusively around cars, pedestrians come second, cyclists are mostly ignored. People use the promenade as a cycle path anyway, people of all ages, so why not put in the infrastructure to make it safer. On that note there is not really any danger anyway I doubt the current by-law has any positive impact on safety as the type of person who is likely to run someone over would not obey the law anyway.

I use the route many times and the more off road I can ride the better

I use this route on a regular basis for all the reasons you are proposing to extend. It is frustrating that cyclists can not currently use the promenade (although they do) as it is much safer and a lovely route to take.

I use this route regularly and would like to cycle it.

I use to cycle on the prom, and it was one of the reasons to prefer to live in Whitstable.

I used to cycle there as a child nearly 40 years ago so remove the by-laws and let everyone enjoy the seafront.

I walk up and down between Seasalter and Hampton Pier and I think walkers and cyclists can co-exist and use this route if both (but mainly cyclists) are considerate to each other.

I was in favour of the Clare Road/Crab and Winkle development which never happened so I will support this route too. We must encourage cycling, it is a great route along the esplanade and we all cycle along this area and are mindful of pedestrians - both rd users can work together.

I welcome all new cycle routes but am more interested in south Kent than north

I would love to be able to cycle between Swalecliffe and Whitstable but the roads are potholed and too heavily trafficked to be safe for cyclists and yet I don't want to be prosecuted for cycling on the seafront. The new scheme means I would be able to get to Whitstable to go shopping much more easily.

I would love to see a cycle route around the whole of the Kent coast. As I'm now approaching retirement my husband and I try to keep fit by cycling on flat, safe routes. Promenades and routes at the side of waterways are excellent for this.

I'm regularly cycle from Chartham to Canterbury (Regional route 18) and Canterbury to Whitstable (National route 1). I'm in full support of improving the existing cyclist network.

Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists away from roads and traffic - so much safer for everyone including motorists

Improved access for pleasure trips to/from/through Whitstable by sustainable transport means

Improved amenity of "flat cycling - encourage outdoor activity and exercise. Scraps unrequired, unenforced and widely broken no-cycling bylaw. Stops ridiculous and dangerous situation that council has forced "legal cyclists" to go on busy Tankerton Road because of combination of promenade bylaw and one way system with no westbound cycle provision in Tower Hill. Will need "Cyclists please respect Pedestrians" signs or a white line down prom.

Improved cycle links are essential to encourage non car journeys

It encourages sustainable transport. It is recreational and enjoyable. It is safer than using trafficked roads. It is a healthy pursuit for all age groups. My only criticism is the section at Swalecliffe, where a combination of a path in the middle of grass crete is inadequate, potentially dangerous and will create inevitable conflict between users. I consider this section should be paved and for segregated use only. Sorry my other criticism is this form that does not encourage comments like this and is therefore in danger of misrepresenting the public view.

It is a natural extension to the existing Oyster Bay Trail, completing the connection to the Crab and Winkle trail. The promenade is already unofficially (illegally?) used by cyclists to link the two cycle trails/routes. It is also frequently cycled by local families for leisure purposes. It will enhance the tourist and leisure facilities of the area.

It is a safe place to cycle with children

It is a very sensible route, and one that I use almost daily (along the Promenade at least) as a cyclist. I am careful, however, at busy times during the summer, to either slow to almost a halt, or else dismount. I know some people (mainly men of a certain age, who should know better!) do not do this, and so delineated areas for pedestrians and cyclists would be an excellent idea. There is plenty of room on the Promenade for both users.

It is already widely used and safe for shared use.

It is an invaluable and safe connection for residents commuting between Whitstable and Tankerton or Swalecliffe. Cyclists will enjoy healthy fresh air and picturesque views. It will encourage more people of all ages to exercise on their bikes and will add to the attraction for tourists.

It is less dangerous on the roads and shorter. Also it is a very beautiful cycle ride. Cyclists use it anyway and always will so may as well make it legal.

It makes sense to continue the cycle route along the sea front making the route even more enjoyable and accessible to families. It also neatly connects up the Skate Park

It officially opens up a much used and practical cycle route for residents of Whitstable, Tankerton, Swalecliffe and Herne Bay

It opens up the coastal routes, promotes the wonderful area and encourages healthy exercise.

It will allow safe cycling access along the route for all types of cyclist from young to old

It will be a beautiful route to cycle

It will be an excellent extension to the invaluable Viking Trail and be another step to a complete coastal trail around Kent

It will be another part to travel away from traffic

It will be fantastic to be able to cycle from Canterbury, right down to the coast and along it. Well done for proposing this.

It will be great for us cyclist to have our own cycle path at last I just hope it will work, as in the holiday periods cyclist have to compete with skate boards, people in groups spreading across the promenade having picnics playing ball games etc and worst of all dogs running around loose all over the place sometimes aggressive and chasing cyclist so you have to be constantly aware of what is going, to see a law brought in to have all dogs on leads along the sea front would be wonderful but I don't expect it will happen, I have seen some people with up to five dogs so it's a safety thing as well

It will be great to be able cycle this route

It will give us a save route to cycle

It will improve the safety of cyclists, encourage more cycling for local people and resolve a situation that already exists whereby many cyclists already use this stretch of promenade for cycling. I appreciate the promenade is busy and relatively narrow but it already seems to be in mixed use in practice and signage would help encourage responsible cycling in the way you have done on the Eastern Herne Bay promenade. I wondered whether consideration had been given to creating a cycle path on the beach side of the sea wall at Beach Walk in front of the Hotel Continental to avoid crossing onto the road, although I appreciate this might not be possible, and the cost of this might be disproportionate to the safety benefits, Beach Walk being a cul-de-sac.

It will make cycling into Whitstable safer and more enjoyable as you will be separate from the traffic. I am a regular user of the section from Swalecliffe to Herne Bay and would enjoy cycling into Whitstable with my daughter who is too young to use the road.

It will make it easier and safer to cycle to the beach for cyclists of all ages. It will complete the cycle route from Canterbury all the way to the Viking Coastal trail, providing an excellent tourist and leisure attraction. It will promote sustainable transport in Whitstable and beyond, reducing traffic and pollution.

It will mean safer cycling for all, especially children and families and there is more than enough space.

It's a nice place to cycle and safer than the surrounding roads

It's a beautiful route to cycle along and can be enjoyed by all ages, and all users if appropriately signposted.

It's a beautiful stretch of coastline that should be enjoyed by both cyclists & pedestrians.

It's a brilliant place to ride and links up with other seafront bike paths

It's a route that is responsibly used by many cyclists throughout the year. I believe that there will be perceived conflict between cyclists and dog owners who have

animals they cannot control. I'm not talking about dangerous dogs biting people but those that fail to respond to calls to return to their owners and jump up at cyclists. These are the same dogs that are a nuisance with pedestrians and young children.

It's an amenity everyone should be able to enjoy

It's an ideal safe cycling route for families avoiding busy roads

Keep cyclists off roads for their safety.

Lots of people cycle, both locals and visitors. It's never bothered people outside busy Saturdays and Sundays in the summer. It's a great attraction and asset to the district

Makes perfect sense - have always thought so! Room for all if an allocated space was marked. Why would anyone choose to use the overcrowded and pot hole ridden roads instead. Cycling is to be encouraged!

Many other towns, ie Deal, have bikes on the promenade which seems to be a success. It is flat with out traffic making it great for families. My only concern is the drop onto the beach.

Many people like to cycle for leisure but are put off by having to mingle with traffic. More tracks, more people, more money. Every track provided for cycling is an investment in the local economy and in the health of the population. Previously there have been constraints on cycling which have undoubtedly spoiled enjoyment of the area and restricted the growth of tourism.

More cycle routes and less annoying traffic 'calming' road litter, please!

More people should be encouraged to explore by bike, for ecological and health reasons

Most of these routes are used already. As there is no section for general comments I'll comment here. At 76 and fit I walk a bit every day BUT very few, if any, have a bell or hooter. Please deal with this problem.

Much needed extension of current route.

Natural extension of existing Viking cycle route; route often used anyway by cyclists, and would encourage pedestrians and cyclists to walk/ cycle together safely; more families would be able to cycle with children; more people would be encouraged to cycle; there is plenty of room for both cyclists and pedestrians

Provided there are large signs requesting cyclists to ride at the appropriate speed and not as they do now, some use it as a race track, never ring their bells or call out when they come up behind. Also there are two highway signs which depict no cycling across the area known as 'the rock' but they are ignored by cyclists and the path gets churned up. It needs no cycling written signs.

Reduce the likelihood of people using cars for short journeys

Reduction of car use potentially, health benefits of more walking and cycling, better and safer access to Whitstable, children can use the route to walk/cycle to school in a traffic free environment.

Safe cycling is a benefit to all of us and especially for those of us in the tourism industry.

Safe links are needed between existing routes. The more 'off road' cycle paths the better.

Safe places to cycle are vital for families. I also think it is great for tourism and I believe it can be done safely for everyone.

Safer for families. Brings more tourism.

Safety, encouragement to those travelling to work and school and will result in more leisure use with health benefits and tourist use with economic benefit

Seems sensible as cyclists have been using it for years anyway. Used to cycle with my son when he was very small along the promenade. It's very safe and the scenery is fantastic.

Should have been done years ago. It provides a safe direct route from Herne Bay and Whitstable. The prom is for everyone to use and enjoy not just the beach hut users. Many people use it already and adopting it and marking it would make it safer for everyone to enjoy

Since this route is already being used by cyclists (probably illegally) then the new proposals will rectify the current situation to everyone's satisfaction.

Thanks for asking, at the moment it is crazy to have to try & cycle up the hill past the castle as we are not allowed past the beach huts. Kids trying to use the bike/skate board park or cycle safely to Herne Bay & back can use it & families, disabled, tourists etc. The council could even make money; hire bikes each end of route & have cafe/ice cream shop half way!?

The anomaly of the 'accepted' significant use of this promenade for cycling contrary to Bye-laws has gone on too long and needs to be resolved. Also - it is a great place for sensible cycling and will very properly extend the coastal route into Whitstable itself. HOWEVER, the key issue is the nature of the signage in general and in particular in the areas of the beach huts. There is no point making any cycling behaviour compulsory eg 5mph limit or "must dismount" as this will simply not be policed / enforced (as previously with the Bye Laws) but there must be some monitoring of the extent of compliance with the requests. Presumably CCC will indeed monitor reports of flouting / accidents / near misses and review as necessary.

The area is already utilised as a cycle route. Link to the existing routes. Increased tourism. Health benefits. Natural/safest route to follow. Most cost efficient.

The coastal route is currently being used by cyclists in any case. Formalising the use of the promenade would make for a much safer environment for all.

The current route (on-road) is always very busy with traffic and therefore more dangerous than a shared cycle path along the promenade would be.

The cycle route will encourage cycle commuting to work and school. As well as being environmentally friendly and helping to create a healthy lifestyle this will reduce motor traffic volumes and consequently save people money that they would otherwise have spent on fuel.

The promenade is sufficiently wide to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists, and provides a safe traffic free option for cyclists wishing to avoid the road. It is also a rather pleasant location for cycling

The proposed route will provide cyclists with a safe and scenic route to negotiate a busy part of their journey from Swalecliffe to Whitstable and beyond.

The route is already used by hundreds of cyclists for commuting, leisure, ie visiting the bmx area built, touring, shopping etc. We lag behind our continental neighbours. Have you tried the Dutch cycling provisions for example. Everybody uses cycling as a way of life over there. Here we pay lip service and provision for cycling in the UK and our local area is simply dire in comparison. We need to promote cycling as a key method of transport for the future, for all local people where possible. The reasons why I do not need to restate, the Government has already outlined them in detail.

The route will be an attractive and safe route around the coast joining up with existing schemes.

There are already a lot of cyclists that cycle the route as is without any problem. Compare this if you will to the government's plans to raise the national speed limit on UK motorways to 80mph. Many politicians have said that as many motorists already break the speed limit and do 80mph it is simply bringing them back onto the right side of the law. If we follow the government's example with regard cycling on the

promenade then the council is simply bringing cyclists back onto the right side of the law.

There's no good reason why one class of users should be excluded from using and enjoying this space. As a cyclist myself, I know I and fellow cyclists (many, if not most, of whom are mature people) are sensitive to the needs of others and wouldn't dream of hurting or frightening walkers. Allowing cycling along here would also enhance visitors' enjoyment, bringing increased prosperity to our town.

This is a safe route for cyclists and mobility users and for children who can avoid the normal traffic problems and can view our lovely coast.

This is a very valuable open air amenity. It should be freely available for any public use that encourages healthy exercise and safe family access to the sea front of Whitstable. It should be a part of the full round Britain coastal cycle route.

This is an off road safe route already used by both pedestrians and cyclists without a problem. It is a joy to see young children cycling along the promenade without the worry of vehicular traffic.

This proposal would just recognise the fact that the promenade is the favourite (and safest) road for cyclists to use. By not recognising this fact, the council has allowed a de facto breach of non-cycling regulations (almost impossible to enforce and if so, by whom) to go on in any case. Signposting and streamlining would certainly help especially visitors not familiar with the area.

This route is already used by many cyclists and especially in the quiet season is often nearly empty of pedestrians making the current byelaw ??? cycling a ??? to the majority.

This route is already well used by cyclists and I think this form of transport (and use of promenade) should be encouraged

This takes cyclists off the road and thereby separates them from vehicular traffic. Subject to pedestrian users of the promenade being suitably 'protected' I think this offers a good solution to encourage more cycling/cyclists to visit Whitstable and surrounding areas

This will make access between Swalecliffe and Whitstable easier and safer for cyclists thus encouraging more use

This will make cycling safer than using the roads and will encourage greater use of cycling

This would greatly encourage me to cycle to work thereby relieving congestion on the roads.

Traffic free cycle routes are key to encouraging more cycling - for fitness, leisure and reducing car usage. There are not nearly enough routes in the area, and joining up as many routes as possible obviously makes sense, they won't be used if they stop at certain points.

Traffic free, scenic and unofficially used without incident. Other proms in East Kent are cycleable, eg Sandgate Hythe, Margate.

Traffic in Whitstable town centre is unbearable, especially during the summer. Prohibition of cycling along the promenade should be replaced by a shared cycle/pedestrian arrangement. People aren't stupid, nobody will try and ride a bike along when there are hundreds of people in the way, but it would be nice at less busy times to be able to use the beach as a route into town. Leave it to the cyclists and pedestrians to use discretion as to where and when it is safe to ride/walk rather than banning an activity which it is impossible to effectively police or manage.

Use the Viking Trail on a regular basis and have always disappointed of lack of route locally

Very good idea - we do need this to making cycling much safer.

We are a keen cycling family and would like to encourage our children to cycle in a safe environment. At the moment cycling and walking is not always safe on the Tankerton promenade. This proposal will hopefully resolve issues between cyclists and pedestrians.

We need more cycle routes and the seaside ride is so popular! safety for cycling families. More cycle routes pls !!

We need to promote cycling as a healthy way of life and this route will allow us to do that safely and with the minimum of disruption to other local activities. In addition, it formalizes an already existing practice and in doing so will allow the council to put in safety measures in the future (if necessary and appropriate.)

We should be encourage schemes like this and would also be a great tourist attraction

We should do everything we can to encourage cycling and this is an ideal safe and pleasant route which has ample space to be shared with pedestrians.

Well done and along promenade is what occurs now.

What a wonderful idea - a great way to cycle from Swalecliffe to Whitstable avoiding the potholes!

Whitstable excellent location to promote cycling. No other safe off road cycling option available.

Will be a brilliant route that will help locals and tourists explore the area safely.

Will make a safe accessible cycle route for all ages - only concern would be busy times by the beach huts!

With this in place the cycle route will no longer be disjointed which is a major thing for me. I think that this will encourage more people to cycle and possibly stop using cars between Whitstable and Herne bay. In my experience people do cycle responsibly all along the existing route and I think this will continue along the new route

Would provide safe level cycle route through Whitstable to Herne Bay, scenic as well as being beside the sea and the roads are now too busy for safe cycling.

A joined up path makes lots of sense

A long held aspiration to regularise a route that has been cycled for years. Being up to 7M width and with a modicum of goodwill this should soon become a regular and safe feature attracting more visitors to this already popular route. Compared to the 'pavement parking' in the local High Street, which currently forces Mothers to mix with Buses and HGVs etc, this will be heaven!

All types of users should be allowed to use it. We should never discourage health exercise and other uses instead of cars.

Any cycle path is a positive path, however these are some dangerous plans and impractical suggestions. The path on Plan 1 needs to be dual purpose and have safe sides to avoid children or others going down the bank. Plan 2 is dangerous, widen the path/change the parking - DO NOT put the cyclists on the road.

Any measure to alleviate non-bicycle and non-pedestrian traffic and increase accessibility and safety for cyclists should be absolutely welcomed. This is a good, well thought out scheme and there will be safeguards for current non-cycling users.

Anything that would get people out of their cars and lead a more active life would have a dramatic effect on everyone

As some one who has regularly used and cycled along the prom, I feel I can say its dual use to be an excellent idea. I have rarely had any problems, and any I have had have been dealt with, with a few polite words and a smile. I do hope the dual use gets the green light.

Because cycling is a healthy activity for all ages, which should be encouraged. Also the route would be an added attraction for visitors. As a voluntary tourist information 'giver' at the WIT shop, I'm often asked about cycle routes. As a non-sporty middle-aged cyclist, this is my only form of exercise! I think most cyclists, like me, use common-sense in giving way to pedestrians at busy times and often the prom is empty.

Because I'm a cyclist myself and rode this route all my life. I have always thought it should be shared with pedestrians.

Because it allows you to go along the seafront which most people do any way and take away the stigma of breaking the flow.

Because it will be a good route for family cycling as it is flat and off road.

Because it would encourage people around the areas to cycle as commuters and as leisure. It would reduce pollution and congestion. I cycle to and from my school in Oxfordshire but I think it would be great to have other county's cycling! It would also possibly decrease the amount of people that get injured by cycling on the road.

Because it's fun and healthy and you get a nice view.

Because we have limited safe cycle routes compared to other areas

Because we urgently need as many places as possible where people of all ages can travel and exercise safely. This route is a small piece of the big picture; an environment with less air pollution and a fitter, healthier population.

But have concerns about children and or dogs running from beach hut and grassy areas between Swalecliffe and Tankerton and not being seen by cyclists causing accidents.

Convenience for cyclists, protection for pedestrians.

Convenient for cyclists, protection for pedestrians.

Cycling along the promenade is no more dangerous than having a dog off a lead, or indeed an invalid scooter. I feel that the cycling restriction is discriminatory towards cyclists. Families with children are also inconvenienced by the cycling prohibition. It spoils a lovely family ride! Perhaps a marked cycle lane?

Cycling is an enjoyable and healthy sport enjoyed by people of all ages and many levels of fitness. This proposed cycle route, in particular, is a lovely stretch and it would be quite unreasonable not to allow or encourage the locals and visitors to make the most of it. I have been to other towns and countries where cyclists have happily and courteously shared routes with pedestrians, dog-walkers and skaters. The people of (and visitors to) Whitstable are no less capable of doing so.

Cycling is great for body and soul.

Cycling on the Prom has long been the norm and banning it has always been nonsensical. The route is flat and wide, ideal for shared use and suitable for all cycling abilities whereas the alternative roads are hilly and poorly surfaced. I personally cycle by road as it is quicker but the new route would encourage less confident cyclists.

Cyclists use promenade anyway. A good idea to have signs telling them to give way to pedestrians to stop it becoming a race track. The views of the Whitstable Society are not those of all the town, as sometimes interpreted by the council.

Encourage people to exercise more - because can cycle on beautiful route. Protection for cyclists and pedestrians.

Encouraging cyclists improves health.

Everyone cyclists across the seafront and it gets congested - safe access is desirable for everyone. (To note most cyclists are residents, including me!) Also cycling great for young and old as simple exercise. And attractive to holidaymakers to enjoy the whole coast yet attract business to the town.

Excellent "green" idea for very little capital outlay

Fitness. Away from traffic. (Health and safety).

For many years I have cycled along the seafront. Very careful of other users. I do not cycle on August bank holidays etc, unless very early in the morning. This is a safe route for cyclists.

Formalising a shared route would improve safety/awareness of cyclists and pedestrians. Maybe a speed limit can be implemented. Signs to enforce safe riding would be good. Cyclists should be able to use the route and not be forced onto busy roads.

Good for cyclists, green transport

Good for environment - will use cycle more, rather than car. Good for health. Safer use of cycles (not on main roads). Good for tourism - visitors bring their cycles or hire them. Extends and improves current cycle routes.

Good for the environment - will use cycles more than car. Good for health. Safer user of cycles (not on main roads). Good for tourism.

How many people already cycle it! Safer access for walkers and cyclist. Why have a BMX park which will attract a large number of users and ban them from the obvious route to it.

I am a cyclist and feel this would be a good and safe route for cyclists.

I am a cyclist, it's good for the future image of Whitstable, it's good for promoting healthy leaving in the community

I am a regular cyclist and enjoy cycling to Herne Bay from Whitstable with my family (husband and two children aged 9 and 12). The option of cycling along a safe path, rather than along Marine Parade, where we are constantly on the lookout for opening car doors, would be great. Our family also owns a beach hut on Tankerton seafront, and it would be fantastic to be able to cycle all the way there.

I am a regular cyclist between Whitstable and Herne Bay and this route is the safest, most pleasant, shortest route. I am one of many committed cyclists, aiming to reduce car usage and reduce emissions - we as cyclists need safe routes. Look at Holland - bikes are encouraged and co-exist with pedestrians.

I am all in favour of any scheme that provides safe cycling routes where people of all ages can enjoy the local area, without having to worry about the danger of traffic. The more safe routes that can be opened up the better.

I am one of the volunteer Sustrans rangers looking after the Oyster Bay route. It is clearly very unsatisfactory that this route, westbound, officially ceases at Swalecliffe, and I am delighted to see the proposed extension, and the improvements at the Crab and Winkle end.

I believe there is enough space for cyclists and walkers, however, there need to be clear signs to cyclists to take care and to give priority to pedestrians. The promenade is already used by cyclists and it would be better to acknowledge this and regulate cycling.

I commute by bike to work in Canterbury and cycle during my leisure time.

I commute from Herne Bay to Whitstable by bike as often as I can, but hate the road sections, I 9and many others I see) 'illegally' use the prom to avoid the road. In busy times I dismount and walk (could you consider signs suggesting that for all cyclists in busy times?). Generally road feels very dangerous - I am regularly cut up, and cars parked on Marine Parade often open their doors without looking. The only prom 'crashes' I have seen are tiny children with new scooters. Considerate cyclists will not be a problem - inconsiderate ones will be regardless of the law. Ban BBQs on the prom!

I cycle quite a lot and a proper cycle route would be a great idea.

I cycle the Crab and Winkle line regularly in my travels from Canterbury to Reculver and welcome any changes that reduce my exposure to traffic.

I live in Whitstable and use Herons Swimming Pool three days a week. In the spring and summer I cycle there and will use this route.

I regularly cycle locally and will use it.

I think it is good to promote cycling routes - especially those that offer safety to cyclists

I think that cycling off road should be encouraged, my only concern is that a small number of cyclists go extremely fast behind my beach hut on West beach by the fishing club, and I am concerned that a child will run out from the gaps between the huts and be killed. Therefore more action to prevent this speeding is needed.

I think the promenade is wide enough to accommodate walkers and cyclists though cyclists will need to be cautioned especially aware of children and elderly people. Many people already break the rules and cycle anyway so it would be best to regulate the situation.

I thought there always had been one! Except when cycles were banned. It's a cycle!

I use it anyway and would like to do so 'legitimately'!

It is a safe and pleasant place for my children to cycle. They can learn to cycle with consideration in a safe environment. It supports a healthy lifestyle and means they have the simple enjoyment of being out by the sea. It must be said that they already enjoy cycling on this route as do many others.

It is a very sensible traffic-free route which also forms the only level route between these points (I have commuted along here on a daily basis for many years). This also completes a cycling trail that encompasses most of the Kent and Sussex Coasts.

It is already used by many cyclists, and as long as they take care, it shouldn't be a problem. A line dividing pedestrians and cyclists (like that on Walmer seafront) might make it safer.

It is good for tourism and health. It will also cut some car traffic into Whitstable. Much safer for families to cycle together

It is long overdue as people will cycle along the promenade for their own safety. Marine Parade, particularly during the summer is a death trap for cyclists. An off road route is needed where pedestrians and cyclists can co-exist as they do on the section from Swalecliffe to Herne Bay.

It is wide enough for all to use safely. Moreover, I currently cycle along this route recreationally between Herne Bay and Whitstable because it makes sense to me for my own safety as a cyclist to do so, while also being considerate to pedestrians. The real danger is uncontrolled dogs forcing cyclists off their bikes as I have experienced. CCC will only be rationalising widespread current custom and practice.

It keeps you active and it's safer. Especially for children like me!

It makes a lot of sense to allow something which is harmless and should be promoted. Why waste time and resources trying to enforce a pointless byelaw especially as the promenade further up is specifically marked up as a cycle route. People will cycle along there either way, why penalise them?!

It provides a safe traffic-free environment for cyclists, many of whom using this route are young children or elderly. The alternative proposed route along Marine Parade is hazardous, particularly in the summer months when cars are parked nose to tail along the length of it. I have regularly cycled along this road with my young son en route to Tankerton Bay Nursery and vehicles pulling out and carelessly opened car doors are a constant danger.

It will be easier to cycle to Whitstable and avoid the roads which are too busy to cycle on safely

It will be good for the local area as it will bring more business (cyclists generally have a lot of disposable income). It is also good for families, who will be able to spend time together outdoors, doing something that will keep all family members healthy. And it's good for the environment too.

It will be safer for children. However, I think there should be some restriction during the summer months, from say the end of May to September, such as asking cyclists to get off and walk past the beach huts. There are short stretches like this in the Thanet area.

It will enable me to cycle to Whitstable without using the busy (and dangerous) main roads.

It will give cyclists and pedestrians a safer route around and through the town, and would be most welcome, if not before time. However it must be said that the council needs to control dog walkers further. They have taken to walking dogs on every public footpath, sometimes dogs are off the lead, and free to chase or attack cyclists and walkers, and poo where they like. I would recommend that dogs be kept on a lead on cycle routes and footpaths. Don't get me wrong I like dogs, but quite a few dog owners seem to think they, and their animals can do as they wish.

It's a much needed link on the coastal route to the Crab and Winkle Way. It is a missing piece in the jigsaw of the cycle network of east Kent and will be most welcome. It gives access to disabled users too. I hope that the continuation west to Seasalter can soon be considered as I surveyed a traffic-free route back in 1995 for Sustrans, which avoids Joy Lane and is much needed too.

It's good for anyone, kids and adults. As long as it's marked out. I have never taken any notice of the seasonal rules. Fresh 'free' air, go for it!

It's good to have cycle path and it's good for the kids to have a path without causing a nuisance

It's safe and scenic away from traffic on the narrow roads of Whitstable, Tankerton and Swalecliffe. Many cyclists already use it anyway and I haven't heard of any accidents caused by this use.

It's safer to cycle away from the traffic on Lea Street/Tower Parade. Cycling home from work in the evening the racing around the streets is most dangerous for those of us on bikes.

Joined up cycle paths are a really good idea for the safety of cyclists. Some routes such as between Seasalter and Graveney and Faversham are dangerous. Very much in favour of the Swalecliffe section. Most cyclists are careful and conscious of pedestrians and numbers of bikes are very much exaggerated. Living on Preston Parade we see perhaps between 6 and 12 cyclists a day!

Makes it safer for pedestrians wheelchair users and cyclists alike. Create more tourism & interest to the local area by making accessible & joining up the beauty spots of the area, which are also pollution-free. Great all round!

Makes sense.

More cycle routes needed in this area

Most safest place to cycle. Big enough for people and bikes. Why can't cyclists, walkers, runners and dog walkers all respect each others opinions!

Most straightforward option. Safest option for cyclists. 'Touristy' so good for visitors and thus business. Connects up existing routes.

Much needed. Everyone cycles there anyway.

Need to increase opportunities for safer cycling, especially younger children away from the roads.

Obvious route but should be marked clearly for pedestrians and cyclists.

Off-road cycle route with excellent sea views will extend existing cycle route and attract more visitors.

Opportunities to improve health and well being are welcome. Safe cycle routes away from main roads will always prove popular to all users. Cycle routes will also be used by wheelchair and hand-cycles. It is the mix of pedestrians/cycles/wheelchair users that gives us some concern regarding blind/partially sighted and Deaf/HoH people who difficulties and feel insecure in mixed use routes.

Pedestrians and cyclists already share the promenade. People just need to be considerate and courteous to one another, which most people are. Please just get on with it!

Pleasant and safe

Plenty of room for cycle/pedestrian route

Plenty of room for sensible cycling/pedestrian route, with cycle speed restrictions

Proper signs would create a better respect between the general public and cyclists. The old signs on the promenade have caused problems because they contradict the hand out leaflet from the cycle hire unit. Remember cyclists are pedestrians as well.

Provided cyclists give priority to pedestrians the promenade can be shared by both quite happily. It is safer to allow cyclists to use the promenade than the road above it,

Providing there are adequate safeguards, signing etc, shared use by pedestrians and cyclists promotes better use of this route removing cyclists from the road improving road safety

Safe access for all to enjoy fits in with the nature of Whitstable. Retirees and children frequently use it now. The seafront should be for everyone and all types of use. Makes it attractive to visitors and holidaymakers in the area as well so encourages tourism. Fits in government plans to keep children active if have a pleasant route to cycle on. It would cost more to police and have no cycling - where would money come from?

Safe for cyclists and lovely route. Cyclists have to be on look at anyway for pedestrians/cars etc other obstructions. Signage important to inform that it's shared usage. Works in other seaside places.

Safer cycling for my family.

So many people cycle there now, making it safe is better. Also, fitness, family use, and encouraging an exercise that is lovely to do outside on the front. Make good, healthy choices easy!

Suggest using Marine Parade for part of the route leaving a section of promenade for pedestrians only.

The new route will give me a safe and direct way to cycle to work in Whitstable. This will mean my car comes off the road, reducing congestion and freeing up a parking space in town. Also, I'm sure the new cycle way can only be good for tourism in the area.

The proposed route will open up the town and amenities to local residents without increasing traffic and parking congestion. We are an outdoor town and to exclude outdoor activities whatever they may be is ludicrous. The health and wellbeing of locals will also increase as will the sense of community.

There is a skate park but no cycle path to get to it

This is the logical route, and can be signposted to make it safe for pedestrians and cyclists in the busy season. The cyclists don't want to go up the hill to get to Swalecliffe. Other towns like Margate can manage cyclists and pedestrians, and so can Whitstable.

This route is already being used by cyclists adults and children alike I have even seen police officers cycle along the promenade, so this bylaw is ineffective anyway.

It's also a much safer route than using the road above as this gets very busy during the summer months and includes a line of parked cars at the road side, making it harder for other road users to spot cyclists.

This route is already being used by cyclists adults and children alike I have even seen police officers cycle along the promenade, so this bylaw is ineffective anyway. It's also a much safer route than using the road above as this gets very busy during the summer months and includes a line of parked cars at the road side, making it harder for other road users to spot cyclists.

To encourage people to get outside and cycle, as long as they take care of pedestrians.

To make it easier to cycle around

To open up the area for all (pedestrians and cyclists) to enjoy. At the Tankerton prom issues between walkers and cyclists has always been an issue, maybe warning signs for all to take care along this stretch.

Wanted to cycle from Whitstable to Herne Bay and couldn't without going onto dangerous roads - not good and takes much, much longer. Bad for the cars that have to slow down and avoid cyclists too. Really dangerous roads between Whitstable and Herne Bay. Not a trip I would do again. I think the extended route would be really good for tourism/visitors in the area.

Waymarked routes benefit walkers as well as cyclists; however we recommend consideration of an alternative along the top of the Tankerton Slopes to avoid conflict between cyclists, walkers and beach hut users (as has been done at Minnis Bay in Thanet). We also urge the use of eco matting wherever a cycle route crosses grass.

We need to encourage cyclists and families

When I first came to Whitstable, over 50 years ago, I went everywhere on my bike which was a great joy to me. In recent years I've had to give up cycling because the roads are too dangerous. It is so good to see young families, parents and children, cycling slowly along the promenade. I don't think there is anywhere else in Whitstable they could do this. I am an elderly lady - I love going down to the beach and I have never ever been worried by cyclists.

Will formalise what actually happens every day of the year now. In so doing the additional signage and markings should help reduce risk of accidents occurring.

Will hopefully cut down on some car congestion and bring more cyclists into Whitstable.

Would like to see more safe cycling opportunities for families going out together.

Yes, I'm in favour of anything that promotes cycling and helps separate cyclists from motor traffic. I didn't know there was a cycle route ending at Swalecliffe. I cycle there frequently and it is not apparent at all.

Access should be for all users including pedestrians, bicycles, and mobility users. I suggested some time ago a "blue path" route to be made available on ALL routes with an exception to "dismount" in High Streets. A blue pathway could be created, and used on one side of ALL pathways, (coloured blue) for cyclist and motability vehicles. The opposite path remains exclusively for pedestrians.

I am strongly in favour of the provision of comprehensive cycle routes. At present the provision through the District is patchy, and this is a classic example of a cycle route which at present comes to an abrupt end. The promenade route needs to be made continuous and connected with the Crab and Winkle Way.

I frequently cycle from Herne Bay to Whitstable and welcome the proposed improvements to the cycle route. This would provide better cycling opportunities from Whitstable all the way to Thanet. I find shared use of cycle/pedestrian routes can work as long as all users (not just cyclists!) are considerate

I live in Swalecliffe and would love to be able to cycle to and from Whitstable. At the moment, I can't do this because I risk being fined if I use the promenade. If I use the roads I have to cycle much further, the roads are in poor condition and dangerous to cycle on. The roads are also quite congested and narrow and the presence of cyclists causes more congestion as well as putting their safety at risk. All in all, I can't think of a better solution than allowing cyclists to use the promenade - better for cyclists and better for other road users. The promenade, although busier in summer, is very, very quiet in comparison with other cycle-friendly areas like Cambridge - and the residents of Cambridge seem to have adapted quite comfortably to cyclists and pedestrians sharing the common spaces. I would also hope the improvements will lead to an increase in tourism and hence revenue & employment in the affected areas.

I think the roads are so dangerous that people prefer these safe routes not to mention the views are so relaxing. This is great for local business

I think the system works fine as it is, i.e. everyone using the promenade from cyclists, to dog walkers, to runners to pedestrians. I often cycle from West Beach to Reculver and have never encountered a problem with cyclists and pedestrians. If the promenade is crowded, cyclists always give priority to pedestrians. I have no idea why anyone would want to oppose it and to suggest cycling along Marine Parade would be ridiculous when there is plenty of room on the promenade for everyone.

It will benefit a high proportion of users of the route, especially during the summer months. Health and safety is the only potential issue; although I agree there should not be a dedicated cycle track, there should be adequate signing making it perfectly clear that pedestrians have the right of way and cyclists should travel at low speed and in single file.

It will make access safer and, more importantly, easier for cyclists and wheelchair users. Improving cycle routes will take cyclists off the roads.

Use it or before you know it will be fenced off.

I am disabled and need to use my recumbent trike for exercise and a coastal route is ideal, there are too many hills near Blean where I live. My trike is just over three feet wide so any mechanical blocks for motor cycles etc would have to be negotiated. Having had a stroke it would be impossible to lift the trike over such barriers. Might I suggest the use of a Radar Key to open any gates etc.

It would be good for the young people of the area. My only proviso is that they will all have bells and that they use them.

'No' responses

Although at the moment this area is supposed to be cycle free, cyclists used the promenade almost running down people - they act as if they have right of way. At the moment if I or anyone else is injured by a cyclist we can sue the cyclist. If the council give permission for cyclists to ride in amongst pedestrians would the council then be liable for any injury claims? A dedicated cycle path should be marked along one side of the promenade; preferably the land side and pedestrians would walk on the beach side. This way pedestrians wanting to go on and off the beach would not have to keep walking in front of cyclists.

As a parent and grandparent I love to have my family and friends around all year round. I and all of them love the freedom of the slopes and prom (Children from two years to my disabled father-in-law). All feel safe, with no (worry of) rush and tumble! But later in the year (2011), there seemed to be more and more cyclists, who ignored the no cycling signs. Riding at speed and in large groups. My son keeps his dog on a lead and off the beach as do most dog owners. As the signs request. His dog was struck by a cyclist, going to fast. Also hit by a skateboarder who said "I'm not cycling, I can do what I like".

At present cyclists not allowed on the prom - regulations seem to have no meaning to them! Where there are beach huts, there will be children, but the cyclists do not care - if you are lucky they might warn of their presence by ringing a bell - if they have one! people who get in their way, get abused! This applies to all footpaths. There is a perfectly good road at the top of the slopes, if they do not like that, then a cycle track could be built adjacent to the road, using Sustrans cash, not the council's. If cyclists are allowed on these footpaths, then a law should be passed, that all cyclists over the age of ten should be insured against injury to pedestrian injury and should display an insurance disk.

Cycles are currently banned on the Tankerton promenade. This is ignored by cyclists which makes it dangerous for pedestrians, especially the elderly. Making this a cycle way will make it impossible for pedestrians. A promenade should be a promenade! Cycling should be banned and enforced,

Danger to walkers, old people and children from reckless cyclists. The cost to the council tax payer and legal costs for injuries to pedestrians and holiday makers, promenade is too narrow.

Every morning my wife and I walk our 2 dogs along the promenade from the skateboard park to the street and back, cyclists also use this route and I don't have a problem with this because most of them know its not allowed and therefore they take more care ,if they hit us or the dogs they could end up in trouble, but there is always the speed merchant who rushes by, one had a close miss with one of our dogs and we received a torrent of abuse and when I pointed out that he was in the wrong as there was no cycling allowed he turned and came back and waved his fist at me ,my wife was very upset and I cannot say that I was all that happy, week ends are the worst of course, there are 2 guys on racing bikes with drop handle bars etc who must hit 30 mph (I joke not) and I worry that if you turn it into a cycle route it well may be that cycle clubs etc would use it and it would just become a cycle route ,to dangerous for us dog walkers and little kids to use, leave it as it is please, bikes use it and I would not like you to stop them or police the route as it is a nice route for a gentle bike ride, but if its advertised as a coastal cycle route I think the clubs etc would use it and it would just get to hectic.

I am a cyclist but NEVER cycle on the promenade in the summer because there are far too many pedestrians including young children. It's quite unlike the prom between Long Rock and Hampton which is much less used. The prom is simply not wide enough for large numbers of pedestrians and the likely increase in cyclists. Many cyclists take no notice of requests to slow down or walk on certain parts of the Coastal Route (even when doing Charity rides) and will ignore proposed requests to ride politely on the prom.

I am against Canterbury City Council's proposal to convert the Promenade to a shared cyclist/pedestrian route for the following reasons: (a) The Promenade is not merely a route between Whitstable and Swalecliffe, it forms a large part of a recreation area which is heavily used by pedestrians including adults, older people and children. This route is being (illegally) used by an ever growing number of cyclists. (b) Residents of the beach huts need to cross the promenade to gain access to the beach and sea. In addition it is used extensively as a play area by many children particularly in the area adjacent to the Tankerton Yacht Club. (c) A suggestion that the Promenade be divided into a cycling/pedestrian area, presumably laterally along its length, would only divert the fastest traffic head to head into one lane, and make crossing it even more hazardous. (d) Even though cyclists, particularly local ones, are aware that there is currently a by-law prohibiting cycling on the promenade this is consistently flouted and does not indicate a likelihood that they will obey any laws which the council decides to introduce. General - There is a perfectly good road running along the top of the slopes which should be used by cyclists. Note - I believe that public opinion was sought several years ago and a similar proposal was rejected. I am disappointed that the council has bowed to

pressure groups and spent money on financing a further consultation. Can we expect further exercises until they get the vote they require?

I am registered deaf, have 2 hearing aids and cannot hear anything coming up behind me. On more than one occasion when walking along the promenade I have been shouted at by cyclists I did not hear approaching as they swerved by me. The promenade is very busy in summer with walkers, children, dogs, beach hut owners etc. Anyone who has experienced the behaviour of cyclists on the promenade will tell you that it is useless asking many of them to extend courtesy to other users, they just charge along shouting "coming through" and the rest of us are supposed to leap out of the way. This is a very bad idea.

I don't agree with cycling along the promenade full-stop. My daughter (then aged 8) was knocked down by a speeding cyclist outside the Kings Hall. I know of at least a couple of accidents and think there will just be more. I don't think it is wide enough to code with both pedestrians & cyclists - it is already busy especially in summer months.

I walk from Tankerton to Herne Bay with my grandchildren to the playground there and I don't find it particularly 'safe' with the cyclist on that path. In the summer with lots of children around it will be even worse!

If non-segregation leads to accidents who will pay for extra expenditure - if no funds are available in that event are you prepared to ban cyclists. I fear the increase in cycling will lead to the increase in danger to the many elderly users at the Tankerton stretch - especially as it links up with the skate park, well used by youngsters on bicycles. If you are prepared to revoke permission to cycle (and police the ban) then a trial period will show if it is practicable.

I'm not in favour of shared pedestrian/cyclist routes. In my experience it always compromises pedestrian safety; especially the deaf & blind, elderly people and young children.

It will make it much more difficult for pedestrians. More and more over the last few years pedestrian pathways have been made accessible to cyclists. In my experience when this happens cyclists are not generally considerate to pedestrians, but act as though they have sole use of pathways, using excessive speed and ringing bells to force access. This makes walking very unenjoyable; you simply cannot relax because you are always on the alert for cyclists approaching from behind. I am not opposed to cyclists but I do think they should realise that they are in charge of vehicles and use the public highway. I do not think they should be encouraged by these schemes to behave towards pedestrians as car drivers behave towards them on the roads. I sympathise but feel that if they find the roads too dangerous to use they should not ride bicycles! It is not fair to pedestrians to have pathways cut in half (as has happened at the University of Kent and St Stephens) and the pleasure in walking quietly and in safety disrupted.

It would go between beach huts and the beach which could be very dangerous because children and elderly people would be crossing the path to go onto the beach. The path would not be wide enough for people with prams and toddlers alongside them and for cyclists to pass. This promenade is very busy in the summer months (at weekends and bank holidays especially) people do not come to Whitstable, have their pleasant stroll by the seaside spent dodging bikes. If cyclists do share paths in this way - they should be insured and have bells and keep to the area allocated to them.

My reservation is that I gather that cyclists would be permitted across the width of the promenade. I have been forced off the promenade in front of Studd Hill by cyclists using this section. I was passing by a group of dog walkers standing and talking on the promenade when faced with cyclists (three abreast) coming in the other direction. I had to move to the edge of the promenade and they did not give way. I lost my balance and fell onto the shingle. They were not kids and did not stop. Fortunately, although I fell on my side I was seriously injured. I am 61 - if I was 71 I might not be

so lucky. Please can the cyclist section be lined off so us walkers have some space to walk.

Not along the promenade. Would consider seasonal use but too much traffic during summer. Danger with cross traffic to and from beach. Beach hut owners use prom for seating as there is little space between beach huts and prom. A national cycle route will attract more cyclists than a prom.

Not in its present form at the point where beach huts are present. In fact am amazed beach hut owners association were not involved in initial discussions. We as a family who own a beach hut have witnessed many near misses when ours and other children have tried to cross the promenade to go on the beach. Believe me a significant number of riders travel at SPEED with no consideration for PROMENADERS crossing, or otherwise. That was when there was a supposed ban in certain areas! There is no way you can under existing proposals expect all riders to be considerate. I suggest the only way is to insist riders dismount in beach hut areas .this would be the only safeguard against any accident serious or otherwise.

Plan 1 - cycle path needs separation from pedestrian path - not a shared central path. From skate park to west beyond the beach huts by Tower Hill - NO cycle path along promenade - alternative route along top of slopes adjacent to pavement to Marine Parade to be provided. So - NO cycle path in front of huts and Tankerton Bay Sailing Club - or any of the paths down onto the promenade. Plan 2 - no cycle path along promenade from leisure centre to harbour. Alternative route along road in front of Kia Garage.

Shared pedestrian/cycle paths are a very poor alternative to real cycle infrastructure. Trying to cycle on a footpath, however wide, with walkers with dogs, prams etc reduces cycling to little more than a walking pace. If you are serious about getting people to cycle more and leave their cars at home, routes need to be direct, preferably in a road cycle lane, failing that, reduce the speed limit on direct cycle road routes to 20mph. look at <http://www.copenhagenize.com/> to see how cycling should be done.

Take a clue from the word promenade. It's for walking. It is already congested. Build a new cycle path. They would anywhere else in the UK. I use this space daily.

The Promenade along Tankerton Beach is, at present, used mainly by the elderly and family groups. To permit cyclists to use the same walkway would be most unsuitable especially during the summer months. Although many cyclists would be cautious in cycling along the promenade, there are those that would be a danger, especially to the elderly and children who would be forced to move out of their way. By falling, an elderly person can be severely injured. Please find a route along Marine Parade.

The route already exists (I have cycled it myself many times) - I see very few additions or changes in the proposals to existing infrastructure. The cost is far too high for such pathetic changes.

Where there are beach huts the promenade is obscured to all but more relevantly to children who currently feel free to run out and across the path. To ask all cyclists to act courteously is untenable. Whilst many cycle slowly and watch out (as best they can) some who take cycling more seriously (crash hats, uniforms etc) speed along and shout at pedestrians. The language and aggression is not appealing. There are the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act to be taken into account and you will have records from Inspectors during consultations agreeing that this is a danger. I appreciate it is a popular place to ride but the areas where huts are constructed should remain no cycling. The final point is that some would say these signs would mean that cyclists would take account of them...the evidence is to the contrary as the bye law evidence identifies. Who will monitor cyclist behaviour? The police do not see it as their responsibility and the Council most certainly does not want to get involved. In other coastal towns all bye laws, dogs, cycling etc are monitored by Council Wardens. The only acceptable compromise I could envisage is that cycling

could be allowed between October and March when limited danger to pedestrians is obvious. This is in line with Dog byelaws

Whilst I favour a formal cycle route along the promenade, I am not in favour of a non defined shared cycle and pedestrian route along the promenade. My experience of walking (and occasional cycling) along this route indicates that most cyclists have little or no consideration for pedestrians along the promenade, believe they have the right to cycle (even though the byelaw prohibits it and the signs on the promenade show 'no cycling' icons), and cycle at excessive and dangerous speeds. My view is that there should be a distinct cycle lane along the promenade separating the pedestrians from the cyclists.

(1) Because where cycling on the proposed route is already being used, because it is not policed, the problems are already highlighted, ie the dangerous mix of pedestrians, children, dogs and cyclists and all the aggravation this causes. No, I think a dedicated cycle track is the answer perhaps along Marine Parade. (2) More beach huts are going to be built, more holidaymakers, more aggravation.

(A) Potentially dangerous. Existing cyclists (illegal!) show disregard to pedestrians. (B) Not (despite what you assert) wide enough to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians. Tankerton to Whitstable is already a very busy area and the cyclists (which will use more if your plan is agreed) already have to weave in and out. (C) Face 400 cyclists already disobey law/byelaw is not a good reason to change it. (D) Tankerton to Whitstable is a promenade for walking. Full of small children, families and elderly, also some disabled, very poor idea to subject them to cyclist.

As cyclist, since I retired use the prom often, only between late summer and early spring. It is a lovely ride. But in busy times it is not fair to visitors, strolling sometimes three or four abreast accompanied by small children.

At present most cyclists take care on the promenade as they know they do not have a right to be there. If cyclists were to share legally there should be a very low speed limit imposed or there is a potential for a high increase in collisions and inconvenience for walkers especially those with dogs and children.

Because it will be a danger to all pedestrians using the beach especially children who frequently run across the prom, it is a disaster waiting to happen.

Children playing, walking or just sitting in groups or alone SAFE!!! Old people walking alone or in groups or pairs SAFE!!! Families enjoying walking or playing, stopping and talking SAFE!!! My family have enjoyed this for 60 years. Cyclists at speed NOT SAFE!!! Not all are bad - just wait and see the first accident.

Cycling's should not be permitted during the summer season as the bad cyclist will disturb severely and may injure the vulnerable that frequent the area in large numbers (eg children and the elderly and hard of hearing/blind with dogs). The current route along Marine Parade is good enough when the promenade route present such a threat due to bad cyclist that no signs will prevent. The area will become less attractive to non-cyclist if this proposal goes ahead. The Council should enforce the current ban in summer.

Cyclists often have no care for pedestrians, they should keep away from foot paths. Cyclists can ruin the ground making it hard for pedestrians

Danger to children. I feel that even though there are people who currently use the prom to cycle if it were legalised then this will increase the potential for children and or adults to be injured!

Dangerous to have this as could be a potential hazard. Especially for young children. No need as plenty of roads in area. This should remain pedestrian only - otherwise will be constantly dodging bikes. Accountability issues if accident - how can we report an incident as no number plates on bike.

During busy periods the number of pedestrians/tourists/children etc would make it dangerous for cyclists to have a right to cycle through. Better to have a separate cycle route along the top of the Tankerton Slopes. There seems to be no proposed demarcation of the promenade to separate pedestrians and cyclists. This would make it safer.

Fast moving bicycles of the inconsiderate or arrogant minority along a busy promenade coupled with a significant number of unsuspecting young children randomly dashing down to the water or back to the Slopes or huts across the cycle route is a self evidently a dangerous mix. It is reckless for the Council to encourage this propensity in the summer time and the Council would be responsible in at least some part for accidents (knowing how dangerous some illegal cyclists are now there) and wholly responsible for the increase perception of fear of most non-cyclists user who are in the vast majority user of this wonderful Slopes/promenade, beach amenity. The cyclist can go along the top of the Slopes in summer and walk down to the beach and prom if they want to. On top of that they will get better view up there!

Guide Dogs does not support the proposed plan to introduce non segregated cycle paths. As this is a promenade, it might not be possible to segregate thereby posing a safety issue and problem for blind and partially sighted pedestrians. Adjacent or shared cyclist and pedestrian facilities should never be permitted within the following types of location, which are totally inappropriate for cycling; pedestrianised areas, promenades and shopping areas and footways. Where a cycle path is required in these situations, a totally separate route must be provided.

Having been a Whitstable resident all my life and spent a large proportion of it on the beach the thought of a cycle path on the promenade fills me with horror as I already witness so many near misses of children and the elderly being in collision with the cyclists that already make use of the promenade.

Having spent time in submitting a detailed objection to phase 1 and getting no reply, and there being no alterations to the scheme, I see little purpose in doing the same for phase 2, as what ever is said in consultations, the decision has already been made. This is confirmed by the fact that in phase one it was stated that the route to Whitstable would not go along the sea front, but along the Old Thanet Way.....but not any longer. It seems that cyclists, as a minority group, now have the rights to get an excessive amount of money spent on them, whilst the rest of the Community have to accept a lower standard of service from the Council. The £20,000 that we are putting into this scheme could have been better spent in saving some of the cuts or increase in fees, such as has been agreed for car parks from 1 April 2012. I believe that there is a byelaw on no cycling on the front past the sailing club, but presumable as with stage 1 this will just be done away with. Notices past the beach huts will have little effect as cyclist seem unable to consider others - this from my own experience of regularly walking at Long Rock. Do we really have to put up with another yellow line along the front to warn cyclist that the sea wall stops and the beach begins?

High Volume of Summer Traffic along prom during Summer Months: Four way traffic on prom especially in the vicinity of the Beach Huts. People gaining access to and from the beach. Beach Hut owners spill onto prom with chairs because there is little frontage especially for those near Swalecliffe Yacht Club. Because of High Volume usage in summer months, concern for the Blind and Deaf. We are not opposing the original route as described in the Local Plan 2006, for seasonal use only. If cyclists dismount and walk along the busy section it would be quicker to cycle along Marine Parade. Alternative route for summer months could be along or adjacent to Marine Parade and a cycle track on one side of Tower Hill. This response was the result of a vote at our January meeting 25/1 against the route along the prom. Circulation of that decision to all 250 members via Newsletter and also via email (where Possible) Only one response received against our objection. Finally the route is not in keeping with the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy 2003 and the Local Plan 2006.

I am a beach hut owner and I feel it would restrict our use of the hut and be extremely dangerous. Lots of children on the prom and free access for cyclists does

not mix. At present most cyclists are considerable as they know they don't have right of way. If they did there would be fast cycling and cycling clubs meets with less consideration. Put in on the top - on the grass.

I am a regular walker on the promenade. It is often very crowded with walkers and I do not think there is enough room for cyclists as well. It would be dangerous for elderly people and children, including those crossing from the beach huts to the beach.

I am terribly worried that speeding cyclists could cause injury and even death to pedestrians along the promenade. Young children will be at great risk as they will run across the promenade from the beach huts to the beach. I also worry that the proposed route will be used for races, of great danger to pedestrians, hut owners and beach users alike.

I believe that currently cycling is banned on the promenade, however this is never enforced. I am 71 years old and last year I was hit and knocked over by a cyclist on the promenade who then denied that cycling was banned. Please just enforce the law and make it safe for everyone to enjoy a stroll along the promenade it is not just for the enjoyment of the cyclists.

I believe the option of a cycle route along the top of Marine Parade would be a safer option for cyclist and pedestrians.

I consider it unsafe to mix cyclists and pedestrians, particularly when there is an alternative route. Indeed parts of the proposed route already have a ban in place and not without good reason. My wife is deaf and already regularly suffers abuse from arrogant cyclist on the crab and Winkle Route approaching from behind. Accidents with children and the elderly in particular could easily prove fatal, would the council really want this issue to deal with. Cyclists are rarely insured and it is virtually impossible to control or monitor their speed. The proposal is ill conceived and has been greatly influenced by the very strong cyclist lobby in the name of green and healthy travel. The PROMENADE should remain just that, a place to walk. Cyclists cannot safely mix with pedestrians.

I do not wish to have this new cycle route - reasons as follows, in particular: (1) We have very young grandchildren, who have already had to endure speeding cyclists whilst visiting us at weekends, when we walk along the Tankerton beach path, narrowly missing them several times. (2) Father who is disabled and uses a wheelchair, often stretches his legs on our weekend walks along the front, but last year was actually hit by a cyclist who was speeding along. Cyclists already use this path - it is so dangerous!!

If a national cycling trail is allowed along the promenade, how can families safely use the promenade at busy times in the summer, especially those with hearing and sight problems. There is 4 way traffic on the promenade. There is a well known cycling lobby and if it gets its way to overturn the byelaw, will Canterbury City Council pay compensation to anybody hurt by an uninsured cyclist and will they put in pedestrian crossings and traffic lights?

I have already had to avoid cyclists on the stretch by the beach huts at Tankerton. I know from other areas that the majority of cyclists will not dismount when the paths are busy although I presume pedestrians have the right of way.

I have experienced as a walker of shared routes some wider than the promenade at Tankerton. The latter I consider to be dangerous as a shared route. No matter what signboards might indicate the majority of cyclists do not give way or dismount for pedestrians. They rarely have bells or use them and off road cyclists tend to cycle side by side so that they can talk to each other. Has consideration been given to the extra use by cyclists of a long distance trail? Surely it would attract large numbers at weekends. I suggest that a cycle path is created beside the pavement on the north side of Marine Parade and down Tower Hill. My four sons spent six weeks every

summer and other times at Tankerton and still visit with our grandchildren. They share my views.

I object to the use of the promenade for cyclists as the whole point of a 'promenade' is for walking. I feel that children should be able to enjoy the beach as a vehicle free environment (including bikes). I strongly believe it will be unsafe to mix pedestrians and cyclists in this way.

I think the cyclist route should be along Marine Parade from the point of the beach huts which would make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians. The route could rejoin the option at the Hotel Continental.

I walk on the promenade every day. I have had many episodes of being borne down upon by cyclists in an aggressive manner. My two year old niece was knocked over by a cyclist on the promenade (by the bottom of the steps leading down from the Pier Ave shelter), thankfully she was not badly hurt but this was not even a cyclist going fast. My mother who is 77 no longer walks along the prom because she is concerned about being knocked over. Part of the problem is that all access to the beach is ACROSS the prom from the steps and the beach huts, turning this into a bike track will mean any trip onto the beach will have to cross the path of the bikes. On a flat smooth surface it is fun for bike riders to go as fast as possible, and getting off or giving way to walkers and dogs is a nuisance. They do not give way to pedestrians, they ring the bell and expect you to get out of the way. I have experience of this on the crab and winkle way. On Sunday 19 Feb I had to get out of the way when a cyclist was cycling up the slope by Tankerton sailing club at speed. In my view shared use is not a viable solution, because it is NOT equal. Pedestrians do not have accidents, crash into each other and have to take rapid action to avoid danger; add bikes to the path and this is exactly what happens. If there is a need to have a round Kent coast route then a separate path should be made for the cyclists, or make part of Marine Parade for cyclists and cut down on cars NOT pedestrians. This is not a rant about the BMX boys using the skate park, they are generally courteous and give way to walkers and dogs, but then they are not using the prom as a route from Whitstable to Herne Bay and are limited on how fast they can go by the nature of their bikes.

I was initially in favour of the idea but now in Tankerton and a member of Tank Bay Sailing Club, bicycles at the moment are very vigilant of children and dogs along the promenade because they travel at a safe speed. With this proposal and the location of beach huts on one side of path and beach the other there are many blind spots with steps and the unpredictability of children. Cycles will use as a speed trial between Whitstable and Herne Bay without insurance. To sail my boat I have public indemnity insurance of £m for the reason of injuring someone, most cyclists DO NOT and when and it will be when someone is injured or killed the family can't sue for insurance money as there is none.

I'm in favour of there being a dedicated cycle route but feel this should take a different route avoiding the promenade (via Marine Parade and potentially cutting back to Beach Walk from behind Beacon House). There is too little space for both pedestrians and cyclists and I am often forced off of the promenade to walk on the beach especially when cyclists ride two or three abreast. The current 'no cycling' byelaw on the promenade is not observed by cyclists and they would continue to ignore any new signs asking them to take care and dismount at busy times.

In the summer months with large numbers of pedestrians/dog walkers etc there is a risk of collision. This could be avoided by installing a cycle 'channel' - a kerbed thoroughfare for cycles only (as in King Street, Hammersmith, W6). In winter months, the possibility of accidents will be less likely. I write as a keen cyclist. When my parents were alive they were alarmed at the speed cyclists passed them as they enjoyed a seaside stroll!

In the summer, the path along the promenade is packed with people, and problems with cyclists trying to get through the walkers and holidaymakers are inevitable, given the relatively narrow width of the path. If another route - on the top of the slopes

would be just as attractive - cannot be agreed for the cycle route, then I suggest that the seaside path be restricted or closed in the summer months only. This might involve a rerouting as mentioned, or requiring cyclists to dismount for the busiest sections from Whitstable under the Tankerton slopes. I do appreciate that there might then be a problem of enforcement, but I am quite sure that people leaving the beach do not want to be continually looking out for cyclist.

Isn't there an alternative option to be explored here with the cycle route running parallel with the promenade but along the top of Tankerton Slopes instead. Could be achieved by widening pavement or putting cycle lane on roadway along Marine Parade.

Large volumes of pedestrians meandering along the promenade particularly at week ends in the summer, children running across the path to the beach and beach huts would not be safe from cyclists. I have used this for 40 years. It works fine as it is and allows for dangerous cyclists to be dealt with

Many children play between the huts and the beach running across the proposed route. Currently cyclists tend to move at a slow pace as they weave between pedestrians - if there is a dedicated cycle way there is a high probability they will ride at speed with the obvious increase in the possibility of collisions.

Other similar schemes I have experienced result in cyclists dominating route, travelling at speed, ringing bells & shouting at pedestrians to get out of the way which is intimidating particularly to older walkers & families with small children. How can this be avoided?

Some parts of the proposed route would not, I think, cause problems for pedestrians e.g. Cromwell Rd. Reservoir Rd, but the promenade by beach huts at Tankerton is NOT suitable for cycling. I have observed (prohibited) cycling there already causing inconvenience, even danger, to children and others using the beach. "Shared" use of walkways gives the advantage to those on wheels over walkers. Most cyclists expect pedestrians to move out of their way, often arrive silently (no bell!) and quickly. The cycling lobby is considerable but footpaths should be for people on foot. Cyclists will not dismount if entitled to use the promenade; they do not even do so now though cycling is not allowed.

The cycle route is used by too many pedestrians to make it a formal cycle route. There is no way to stop children running straight from their beach huts to the beach and colliding with cyclists. The deaf and blind are also incredibly vulnerable to areas where traffic is likely to mix in such a haphazard way and a considerable amount of cyclists certainly do not think about whether the person can hear them coming I would suggest. Have you contacted the relevant bodies regarding this disabled access and what is better for them? The current rules prohibiting cycling within the hours of day when the promenade is used most by pedestrians seem fair, as they allow cycling, but not at peak times, so the mixing of walking and cycling is limited. With the new proposals there is also not a speed limit if cycling is granted, so potentially there are major issues with this, as cyclists not knowing the area would be unaware of the fact they are about to hit a heavily used area, so may not necessarily slow down.

The path is only wide enough for pedestrians. There is a perfectly good road to be used. Cyclists have no manners and would literally stop people walking on the promenade. This is a dreadful plan. If you must have a cycle path build them a separate path like they do in any other sensible district. Scotland has fabulous cycle routes. We should seek the best not really BAD compromises.

The promenade is not wide enough and is far too busy in summer to accommodate a cycle route. It would be far better to build it on the top of the slopes where there is plenty of space and mixed use is much easier. At the moment cyclists are usually sensible among the crowds although there are regular 'near misses' especially as children run about from the huts. A cycle route would encourage cycle clubs and

racing on the promenade as they would feel it their right. Keep the promenade for walkers and keep us all safe please.

There are few areas in Whitstable where pedestrians are safely segregated from other traffic - the promenade (and the clue is in the name) is an outstanding exception. The cycle route (which I agree is desirable) could be provided on Marine Parade by widening the footway on the north side - cutting into the grassed area. People should be able to wander between the attractions on the slopes/beach huts and the beach without having to worry about crossing a cycle lane.

There are lots of families and children using the huts along that stretch and encouraging lots of bikes would, in my opinion, be dangerous to children running across the promenade, and a difficulty for parents trying to ensure safety for their children.

There are serious safety concerns with this proposal. The promenade is not just a footpath, it is heavily used by beach users and hut owners in the summer including many small children. As an almost daily user as a dog walker I have seen and experienced many near misses involving cyclists. Although many cycle with care at a moderate speed, a high proportion behave in a reckless and arrogant manner, all too often being abusive to pedestrians they perceive as being in their way. That is the situation when cycling is prohibited, so the 'bad' element among the cyclists are hardly likely to take any notice of signs requesting courtesy and shared use would be an accident waiting to happen. I am in favour of promoting cycling and am an occasional cyclist myself, but I am strongly of the opinion that the promenade is unsuitable as a cycle route.

There is not enough room for cyclists on the promenade especially in summer. With more cyclists than at present there will be accidents. Health and safety will be ignored for pedestrians.

When we visited the woman behind the counter, in the course of a conversation with a pro cyclist said something to the effect that we would have to wait and see how many people were killed. She then said that she shouldn't say that, but it is not far from the truth. Brighton has a cycle path, but Brighton had a wide promenade. The path between Whitstable and Swalecliffe is not wide enough for cyclists. The cyclist yesterday was talking about the safety of cyclists, but what about the safety of walkers. Cyclists are already inconsiderate. Families cycle along at least two abreast. I am 70. Cyclists do not use bells and I am afraid of stepping (stumbling sideways) and being injured by one. There is a very bad plan!

As the council has previously stated, pedestrians and cyclists do not mix safely. Therefore, putting a cycle route on the promenade would not be safe for beach users especially small children. It may only be a minority of cyclists who are a problem but it is a significant minority. Since this is a long distance cycle route much of this traffic will be fast.

I am a frequent user of this promenade with my young family, and at other times with my dogs (on leads). The cyclists that currently use this route (even though they are not supposed to) are frequently rude, and dangerous. They travel at high speed, and expect pedestrians to move out of their way. I would be concerned that if they had a legal right to use the paths their behaviour would be even worse. As the council are currently unable to enforce a complete ban, I fail to see how they would be able to enforce courteous use of the shared space. This beach is very popular with families with small children and I fear that this scheme would reduce the appeal of Tankerton Beach to this group.

I don't think this idea would serve cyclists or non-cyclists very well. The promenade is very busy in summer and especially where it runs adjacent to beach huts there are always a lot of families and small children crossing the promenade to get from beach huts and the slopes to the beach. This would make it unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians alike. I do feel there is another option that hasn't been mentioned. Why

can't the cycle route run along the top of the slopes between Tankerton and Swalecliffe. This would mean the route would run parallel to the promenade and the pavement area could be widened to accommodate a route for cyclists. A cycle lane could be in place from the harbour/Tower Parade area up past the tea gardens and up to the slopes.

There are many children using the beach in the summer and the cyclists already behave inconsiderately towards them. If the cyclists then have a right of way they will race even faster, with less regard for families who use the promenade. It is a problem for anyone walking along the promenade or crossing from the beach huts to the beach and at the moment at least the cyclists have to be careful.

We've nearly been run into by cyclists on many occasions, even in the areas where there are "No Cycling" markings on the promenade, having to quickly grab the children and bunch up to get out of the way.

Q4 Are you in favour of the proposed new cycle route between the Harbour and Stream Walk, and the improvements on the Crab & Winkle Way between Stream Walk and Whitstable Station?

Yes	357	87.07%
No	31	7.56%
No reply	22	5.37%

Q5 Please state your reasons.

'Yes' responses

A good cycle route between the Oyster Bay Trail and the Crab and Winkle can only improve things generally. As we used to live in Whitstable we know all the back ways.

A logical idea to connect the routes together, helps to keep cyclist safe.

Access is very desirable in my opinion

I cycle and encourage my children to do so. Roads in Whitstable are often gridlocked and not a safe/ enjoyable way to get around. This green method of travel would be taken up by more people more often if this was available.

Again, it should be enjoyed by all & safe.

All the improvements will help safer cycling and perhaps encourage more people to "get on their bikes" and so lead to a healthier population and at the same time save them money.

All the reasons you mention.

Although it is quite involved, it is hard to see any alternative route.

Another small move towards an integrated network of cycle routes in this part of Kent.

Any improvement to cycling safety is good

Any improvement will hopefully attract more cyclists and hopefully more visitors. Shame the original line cannot be used from the harbour.

Anything is better than at present

Anything that improves local cycleway and aids this cheap healthy lifestyle is very welcome.

Anything that improves safety is to be recommended

Anything that would make the Whitstable end of the Crab and Winkle Way more accessible and easier to find would be most welcome.

Anything to improve access to the Crab and Winkle Way from the town is welcome

Anything to improve cycling routes (and I'm not a cyclist).

It is a safe option for cyclists and would make the route even safer for pedestrians, dog walkers and cyclists. it is a safer route than on the busy roads which is dangerous for everybody on a bicycle, children etc. it is of course the 'green and healthy option' which we should be promoting as much as possible if we are serious about all of our future needs. Money is provided for the scheme already. So is cost effective. As we are just scratching the surface of the provision for cycling common sense should prevail. Hundreds of people have been using this route as standard for years and years without incident.

As long as it is wide enough and specific for cyclists and pedestrians separately.

As Q3 for route links, but especially for link to Crab & Winkle Way as I live in Tyler Hill and this provides a route to the coast.

As Q3, plus:- This would extend the cycle route to Canterbury. Also the Crab & Winkle way is an important part of our heritage.

As stated above, traffic in town is unbearable. Any construction or development which made it more attractive for visiting tourists to come by train with a bicycle, hire a bike whilst in town, or indeed, made it easier for residents to travel around town without taking a car would only be for the good in my opinion.

At the moment, so many people on foot or bike stop to ask me the way (if I'm on my bike or not) many get lost & end up so far off course! So long as the route is well

sign-posted it should be good & made easier to get up the steps & steep slope near station. (It's a shame the bridge over the road & rail can't be finished as planned, I hope it will be soon!)

Because it will mean that cycle traffic will be able to safely commute from Canterbury to Whitstable Harbour and beyond (and reverse) without encountering a congested harbour and Whitstable high street

Better segregation from traffic. Many families with young children use the route.

Completion of a full cycle and pedestrian route right through from the coast to Canterbury will enable non vehicular travel between the two towns.

Current layout is awkward and confusing to visitors.

Currently this area cannot be described as cyclist friendly and the proposals overcome this

Cycle route to link with crab and winkle route

Cycle routes and signage in Whitstable is a mess. I hear many complaints from people. Improvements between the Harbour, the Station and the Crab and Winkle will only improve things for local residents and tourists. Providing good quality infrastructure has never been more important and at these cash strapped times better value than throwing money away on slip roads. Cycling in Canterbury District is increasing year on year with a 16.8% rise in the last 12 months. Providing routes like this will only encourage more people to cycle and show there is an alternative to car travel.

Cycle routes are safer for all cyclists than congested roads with bad parking and driving

Cycling is a healthy activity and this route would be safer for all cyclists, young or old and would take them off the very busy roads especially during the summer months.

Cyclists are in danger on today's roads with the hateful attitude of some motorists. The more dedicated space they have, the better, especially for children.

Encourages cycling and provides a safe route.

Feel the improvements will encourage more people to use these parts

First and foremost this is a great community project and will promote healthy living all year round. Moreover, cyclist traditionally are very aware and will act in a considered manner to all other pedestrians. It will also be another tourist attraction.

For most of the above reasons and also the improvements will assist pedestrians, disable people and parents with push chairs. Better signposting will ensure that any increase in traffic is well directed.

For the reasons stated previously - provision of a missing link to give route continuity. A healthy and safer means of access to the popular harbour area for local residents and visitors alike.

Formalising the shared cycle/pedestrian route along Tankerton is very sensible. Plenty of width for all users if people take consideration for others. These shared schemes operate well in other areas of Kent and across the country.

Having cycled the Crab and Winkle line any new areas appeal to me as long as signage and directions are adequate.

Help to make it clear which parts are cycle friendly

Hopefully the bridge will come back faster rather than later. This would be a far better (and far more expensive) and safer option.

How much use it gets will be debateable as most people will probably not use this route but Cromwell Road instead. Additional comment - Better signage required of route from railway bridge to All Saints Close needed as many people miss ???

I am in favour but some of these changes may become redundant if/when the Crab Winkle route build the bridges over Teynham and Old Bridge roads.

I am in favour of any new cycle route where cyclists can feel safer and more relaxed

I am in favour of the plans as an interim measure prior to the planned extension of the Crab & Winkle Way along the Clare Road embankment. This extension must remain as a medium term objective for CCC and KCC and the local community.

I am open minded to an alternative route although the current route emerging onto the high street is very pleasant but less practical for getting over the sea defence wall.

I find this one of the most interesting rides in Kent .This will remove one of the most confusing parts of the ride

I fully support this extension.

I have enjoyed using the Crab and Winkle Route and your plan will link it to the coastal rides

I like to ride my bicycle, and appreciate a decent cycle route.

I regularly cycle from Canterbury to Whitstable on the Crab & Winkle Way, then continue along the coast to Herne Bay, Swalecliffe, Birchington, Ramsgate and Deal. These improvements for cyclists like myself would be a big benefit and encourage more people to cycle. Cyclists use local facilities such as pubs, cafes, B&Bs etc and this is a great way to improve commerce in the area including attracting visiting cyclists from further a field for holidays and short breaks.

I think it would help make the final link from the end of the Crab and Winkle Way into Whitstable itself. As someone who only started cycling relatively recently it is not well signed at the moment and would help a lot of touring cyclists who I've frequently seen stopping to ask for directions.

I think the new crossing at Tower Parade and the new surfacing would be a great improvement.

I welcome all new cycle routes but am more interested in south Kent than north

I work from the beach area at Tankerton with the N.C.I.

If the bridges were rebuilt then it would have linked in perfectly to the crab and winkle, I would argue that stream walk should also be connected as people on bikes want to travel to different places not just be limited to the single destination of a token cycle route. Going up Reservoir then back on itself down that diagonal alley seems a little odd. Could it not go inside the Gorrell Tank? and or borrow some of the on-street parking from Cromwell Road? I tend to follow cycle paths only on the parts that go direct but for tourists a wiggly path might be fine.

I'm in favour of this, providing that it is not used as an excuse to give up on the bridges at the station.

Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists away from roads and traffic - so much safer for everyone including motorists

Improved cycle links are essential to encourage non car journeys

Is part of the overall route.

It creates a safe link between Whitstable and Canterbury for everyone to use and enjoy

It is a good way to link to the existing route

It is better than nothing though not as good as a route using the old railway track over a bridge, but this fell at planning stage which I regard as a great shame. I think replacing the steps at the station is a very good idea, and will give better access for wheelchairs too (I don't use one myself but often push one).

It is logical to complete the section from the Harbour and the Crab and Winkle Way. It is a pity that the original route of the old railway cannot be used.

It is not on the beach. I am all for cycle paths but not combined with pedestrians (which includes toddlers, young children and elderly and disabled people)

It is probably the best that can be done at present

It keeps cyclists away from busy roads and makes it easier to cycle to and from the station. I often make combined cycle/train journeys and think people should take bicycles on trains to visit Whitstable if they can - it reduces traffic congestion and pressure on the car parks.

It makes sense to continue the route between the Harbour and Stream Walk and to make improvements to the Crab and Winkle Way between Stream Walk and Whitstable Station. It will be a safer route for cyclists and pedestrians and for people with young children.

It should be an improvement on the existing scheme.

It shows joined-up thinking. The problem we have in this country is that too many cycle trails lead nowhere or don't take cyclists safely all the way to an obvious destination. This deters many would-be cyclists from taking to their bikes and parents from allowing children to cycle.

It will be more convenient for cyclists and safer too.

It will enhance the Crab & Winkle way to be able to start or finish at the Harbour: bringing more people into the town, and making a healthy walking and cycling path for families in Canterbury and Whitstable.

It will give us a safe place to cycle

It will make it easier and safer to cycle to the beach for cyclists of all ages. It will complete the cycle route from Canterbury all the way to the Viking Coastal trail, providing an excellent tourist and leisure attraction. It will promote sustainable transport in Whitstable and beyond, reducing traffic and pollution. I also live on this route and use it to cycle to work at the University of Kent.

It will make this area much more accessible

It would be nice if the cyclist used the cycle route from the station to stream walk. Because at the moment most cyclists use the alley way at the end of millstream close and the cyclist use this at speed and an accident will happen. This needs to be addressed asap. Maybe a sign informing cyclist that the alley in millstream is not a cycle path and that no cycling permitted. This route is becoming very much used by cyclist as it seems to be a quicker route to use than the proper cycle path from the station. I live at number 14 millstream close and my daughter and I have had many times close incidents of cyclist racing though the alley way with no consideration for the walking public, this as I said earlier needs to be addressed as making the improvements to the route between the station and stream walk a waste of time. I believe that a lot of the cyclist are local, not all as new cyclist to Whitstable soon hear of the easier route though millstream close. Thank you for reading my concerns.

It would create a safer route and protect cyclists, pedestrians and road users

It would have been nice to have the option that was going through with the bridge and use of old railway line that is waste ground at moment

It would provide a neat and largely traffic-free connection between the Crab & Winkle Way and a superb coastal route running almost exclusively off-road as far as Margate.

It's a great way of linking up the Crab & Winkle with the Oyster Bay trail and makes it so much safer for families and less confident cyclists.

Keen user of the crab & winkle

Less need to use the roads when cycling

Linking cycle routes to railway stations makes perfect sense.

Linking the routes together is a great benefit.

Looks like a good compromise given the needs of both walkers and cyclists.

Makes access easier for all. However the C & W extension must be retained.

More cycling can't be a bad thing.

More cycling means less car use and more healthy outdoor exercise. Cycling is an activity accessible to a large number of people. Safe cycle routes are what Whitstable needs. I have campaigned for these for many years.

More people should be encouraged to explore by bike, for ecological and health reasons

Much needed improvement - although it would be even better to have the off-road route of the Crab and Winkle way behind Clare Road and over the railway to join up with the existing well-used and much-loved path

Need to better connect current Crab and Winkle Way with Harbour.

Not everyone is Confident about cycling on main/busy town centre roads. So, anything that improves the novice experience or creates a more 'user friendly' option for the more experienced cyclist would be a great asset to all in the local vicinity.

Obvious extension to join the routes. A safe route for everyone, both cyclists and walkers, young and old.

Often cycle down the C&W and would like to go along the seafront in the summer but end up getting off my bike so would be a great addition. Also I have friends that live in Whitstable that say they would like to cycle to work in Whitstable but can't.

Once again, safer cycling environment.

Only in principal - I do not know this section in detail so cannot comment

Particularly the improvements to the steps by the railway station.

Provides a safe route for cyclists in and around the local area.

Provision of pedestrian crossing near Health Centre, removal of brick walls where stream walk crosses Hamilton Road and provision of ramp at Whitstable Station will ensure safe negotiation of busy main road and current hazardous walls and steps

Reasons are stated above - also off road cycle routes tend to benefit those who have to use wheels for transport -e.g. young children in pushchairs or people in wheelchairs.

Regular bicycle user between Whitstable Harbour and Canterbury. Better than the current system, appears to be safer

Regularly used to make use of bicycle. Lots of potential to expand usage with flat area.

Relieving congestion

Route looks a little circuitous but a good idea as it promotes the use of quieter roads and paths.

Safer for cyclists. Will encourage people to cycle rather than drive.

Safer than cycling on the roads

Safety

Safety

Safety for cyclists, especially for small children.

Taking the steps at the station are awkward especially when going up the stairs. Could you please consider making the two barriers along the crab and winkle slightly wider so you can cycle through them.

The Crab & Winkle Way has always seems to me to be an awkward, complicated route, with no real "beginning" as such, at least until you get to the old railway line area. Proper signage etc. would correct this.

The Crab and Winkle way is a fantastic resource for the people of both Whitstable and Canterbury, taking the cycle route into the centre of Whitstable will greatly improve access to the route for the people of Whitstable and my also reduce the number of people that drive from Canterbury to Whitstable as they have a very pleasant and scenic route to the heart of Whitstable

The Crab and Winkle Way is great, until it reaches Whitstable. This improvement is essential.

The current arrangement is untidy, poorly signposted and many cyclists don't realise it's there and use alternative routes instead.

The current C&W is immensely popular, but needs to extend into heart of Whitstable - better for users, better for local businesses - people will come right into the town. I live near the current end of the C&EW and lack of signage means people are often bewildered and I am often stopped by cyclists and asked for directions.

The current cycle route, especially around the Station, is not sufficient.

The improvements will make the journey simpler and the addition of the new route will add to the enjoyment of a wonderful facility without disrupting the local community.

The more cycle routes that are available, the more people will take up cycling, as it will be safer, for the cyclists, and pedestrians.

The proposals will achieve a much needed link between the cycle route along the coast - connecting then with the Thanet-based Viking Coastal Trail and also with the well-established Crab and Winkle Way. It will then be possible to cycle from the coastal towns of Thanet and Herne Bay through the City to Chartham on dedicated cycle paths. This would be a huge amenity to the area.

The route will cause less aggravation to motor traffic and to cyclists. Access to the station would be rationalised and encourage people to use bike/train journeys.

The small tunnel under the railway station is not a great route option.

The steps by Whitstable station are very difficult for any cyclist, especially if they have heavy panniers or trailer. I try to do as much shopping etc as possible by bike.

The steps next to Whitstable station have long been a bugbear to cyclists, wheelchair users, and people using mobility scooters. Changing the steps to a Disability Discrimination Act compliant graded slope will help all of these classes of user. For wheelchair and mobility scooter users it will significantly shorten the distance between the railway station platforms. For cyclists it will greatly aid people cycling with young children, whom may be located cycle trailers or child seats (with the current steps children need to leave their trailer / child seat whilst the steps are negotiated).

There is no direct path from the harbour to join up with the Crab and Winkle Way path at Church Street. The proposed new cycle route between the Harbour and Stream Walk will go a long way to provide a safe route for cyclists. Improving the path between Stream Walk and Whitstable Station will also provide a safer route for cyclists away from the road. I hope one day that the bridges will be built which will provide the missing link and give Whitstable its much needed 'green' cycle way.

There is very little traffic through that point and I think it would be good for a healthy lifestyle to encourage safe cycling for families.

These improvements are long overdue

This area has previously been a great disappointment at the end of the Canterbury - Whitstable route and I am delighted that this may finally be resolved, and provide a workable and much safer option for negotiating Whitstable.

This development would give easy and safe cycling access between the different parts of the town be served by these routes. This might encourage more people to cycle rather than use cars to access the station and shops, which would ease motor traffic congestion and pressure on car-parking space as well as providing an opportunity for safe and healthy outdoor exercise.

This is a great idea and will promote cycling but what if the Connect 2 bridges ever get built?

This is a very popular route that cuts down vehicles going into the over trafficked Canterbury roads - need the link to crab and winkle.

This is currently quite a dangerous route for cyclists. A dedicated cycle route would make it far safer.

This is my way to the pool, where I go frequently by bike.

This will give a safer route into Whitstable and anything that may reduce the numbers of cars driving through the High St must be a good idea.

This will improve cycle and passenger safety. Stream Walk is heavily used by school children and cyclists and Hamilton Road is surprisingly busy with some heavy vehicles using the builder's yard. I wondered whether consideration had been given to creating parking restrictions either side of the Hamilton Road crossing to avoid parked cars blocking the view of pedestrians/cyclists crossing. I agree that the walls at either side of the Hamilton Road crossing need attention because of their state of repair, but I would be concerned if the replacement with bollards compromised the safety of children cycling/scooting to school: a large number of young children (infant school age and younger siblings) use Stream Walk as a safe way to school and this allows scooting and cycling. I would be happier instead of bollards with a replacement railing which was perhaps designed in a way to provide a bit more space for cyclists to cross without dismounting but also provided a reassuring barrier for children. Finally, I wondered if consideration had been given to improvements to the route from Whitstable Station to the old railway line at the end of Ivy Hatch Road, perhaps a route that runs down from Whitstable Station, along Old Bridge Road and then along the path connecting Old Bridge Road to the corner of All Saints Close.

This will make the journey to the station so much easier, less disjointed and will reduce the need to cycle on busy roads. The rest of the crab and winkle way is of really high quality and very clearly posted. I think the proposed improvements will add the finishing touches at the Whitstable end

To be able to cycle from the Harbour through to Canterbury safely would be wonderful. Cycling is increasing and any cycle routes can only improve the environment and perhaps encourage more people to take up cycling

To help alleviate problems for drivers from having to look out for cyclists.

To improve bicycle links with a safe route

To make a safer route between Canterbury and the coast

Very much - a missing link at present and will improve tourism and cycle/train use.

We cycle this way many times and trying to go down the steps at the station is always very difficult also being grandparents trying to take a pushchair down those steps is not easy

Well overdue improvements needed as per the proposals. However the route from All Saints Close to Northwood Road across the bridges needs finalising to act as the main route with the proposed one as secondary, being totally off road in a highly dense residential area.

Whitstable can get very congested in the summer months, and having a cycle route that is mainly away from the roads will add to both the safety and enjoyment of the cyclists.

Whitstable needs more cycle routes. We should be encouraging more people to be cycling, especially to school and work. How else are we going to address serious issues like child obesity and peak oil crisis. We are a transition town with great tourism potential. The Crab and Winkle route is something to be proud of. Let's develop its full potential as a resource through the town that reaches the harbour and centres of bike rental in the town.

Why not.

Will be safer for all. Will be clearer for all especially cyclists (from UK and abroad) to have much clearer indication of the route.

Will make a pleasant and convenient access between Canterbury direct to the Harbour. Bridge should never have been removed in the first instance, sheer vandalism on council part.

Yes, as I think it would be a safe route

Yes, for the same reason as above.

Again connecting up with Crab and Winkle a good idea. It would be better if it could all be off road, really. Why will you not continue to Seasalter - Joy Lane/Canterbury Road is very dangerous for cyclists and bus services are not good into town.

All improvements are welcome especially to the steps at the Station which C & W research has shown deters many people especially Mum's with prams, young children and old people. However the ultimate improvement is the 1 km extension of the C&W planned from All Saints Close to the Harbour. This will provide a safe traffic-free route dedicated to all the green modes of transport. May these present improvements hasten the next stage!

All improvements are welcome. I don't believe many cyclists will bother with section between Cromwell Road and the Harbour. Plan 6/5/4 if involved too many road crossings. Instead you should improve road/cycle safety along Cromwell Road and Harbour Street. With the addition of cycle path along Harbour Street and speed limit measure along Harbour Street.

Already a bike route and updated will be safe and 'known' cycling zone. Not a pedestrian area.

Although it does concern me that when the plans for the proposed bridges by the station are raised again it will be said that there is not need for this route because another route has been prepared. Both are needed as it would be safer for cyclists to stay on the C&W rather than have to come off it.

Always awkward to get onto Crab and Winkle line from centre of Whitstable.

Any route that again gives a separate area for cycles is welcome.

As above plus it will encourage all age groups to use and help to stay/get fit

As above with more notices threatening speeding cyclists and perhaps human deterrent on odd occasions.

At present families have to navigate busy roads to get from the harbour to the rail station and beyond. This deters some from using cycles

Because I also use these routes myself on my bike anyway as have many others without any problems.

Because it will not have people crossing the cycle path as a matter of course.

Best route from Harbour to existing Crab and Winkle path near All Saints Church.

Better access between Canterbury and Whitstable without extra fumes and congestion etc.

BUT don't want this scheme to be a substitute for providing safe road surfaces for cars and bikes, which are appalling around Whitstable, ESPECIALLY the road

outside the train station (non-ticket office side). I am very concerned about the guise of the new bridge which is proposed.

Complete the traffic free route to the sea

Cycle routes should be kept up to date and user-friendly for all cycle users

Dedicated cycling and walking routes in urban areas are vital to encourage increased local communication without cars.

Don't mind this at all.

Easier to get around Whitstable and safer, especially with children eg cycle to school and station.

For the same and similar reasons, as above at 3. All this work will encourage people to use cycles and avoid creating more pollution in this already over-run-with-cars small town

For the same reasons as above. The Crab and Winkle Way is excellent all through so far but this will be a good culmination at the Whitstable end.

Good for the local economy

Haven't used this route but improvements sound good.

I am a local cyclist.

I am definitely in favour of cycle tracks, but in the right places. These sections are unlikely to be thronged by pedestrians, even in high summer.

I am for anything that gets cyclists off the roads and onto safe cycle tracks. Cycling around the town with young children (our children have been cycling on the roads since they were 6 as the narrow pavements are not really an option) can be at times hair-raising, so anything that makes cycling safe for them would be appreciated, and regularly used!

I am not against it but I do not see why the route cannot be joined together at Harbour Street rather than having to go 'around the houses', along Lane's Walk and Cromwell Road etc It just seems silly.

I do hope that these routes, along existing roads, can be made cyclists safe.

I just think it is an improvement.

I regularly cycle along the Crab and Winkle Way and the current situation at the Station is confusing and difficult for cyclists, wheelchairs and push chairs. The proposals seem like a good alternative to the original idea of a bridge.

I regularly cycle locally and will use it.

I regularly use the Crab and Winkle Way and find the existing situation at the Station difficult and confusing. The current proposal seems to be a good alternative to the original plan to build a new bridge and would benefit wheelchair and pushchair users too,

I support cyclists.

I think it will make the area more attractive to tourists and bring more money to the town.

Improve links from the station to the town. Clear signposting is needed. Ensure good links to Crab and Winkle line to Canterbury - when is the link to the Harbour via Teynham Road bridge due to be built?

In favour of improvements generally

In light of the problems standing in the way of the route proposed by the Crab and Winkle Trust, this offers a suitable alternative and any improvements to the current options are most welcome. I would hope, however, that this would not affect the future chances of the CWT route being proceeded with.

In principle I am in favour of improving cycle routes and encouraging more people to cycle (I am a cyclist myself). These improvements would be beneficial.

Increased accessibility to the town - great idea.

It avoids the roads where the surface is not in the best of condition.

It gets cyclists off the busier roads and connects the cycle route up.

It is already a popular designated cycle route. Minor improvements will be a cost effective enhancement to the existing link between Canterbury and Whitstable that enters into the heart of the town.

It is very important that people stay healthy and that they live a healthy live style. By creating this cycle route it should get more people involved in keeping fit. It is a very useful way of commuting and it would be helping people over Whitstable get to and from work/school.

It just makes sense and will be much safer.

It makes sense to complete the traffic free cycle route on the original route to the seafront

It makes sense to link the cycle routes so that families and others can enjoy lengthy cycle rides in safety.

It needs to go somewhere.

It promotes cycling and health lifestyle. Safe for children.

It represents joined up thinking.

It should make crossing the roads easier for people on bikes. It should make the residents of Clare Road happier, though I was in favour of the original route along the old railway line. It should be much cheaper than building a new bridge, and have less impact on the environment.

It ties public transport to the public realm

It will bring cyclists into Whitstable easily and clearly, at the moment I often meeting people 'lost' trying to complete the Crab and Winkle to the Harbour. It will be fantastic to complete this.

It will get the bikes off the road and in a safer environment.

Keeping cyclists away from main roads is always a good idea. Cyclists can safely share with pedestrians.

Keeping fit without the health and safety risks of traffic.

Less congested area.

Long overdue to get this gap finished

Looks good for all users - continuous route for cyclists that is relatively safe - even for those of us less confident cyclists.

Mainly because I have tried existing alternatives and they are difficult to negotiate

Making access easier for both cyclists and pedestrians can only make the existing narrow path safer for all users.

Much more needs to be done to increase cycling and make it safer. Incidentally the existing Crab and Winkle to Canterbury falls far short of being an acceptable standard.

No great choices to be had, so best to have signposted and designated cycle route. All necessary to connect Crab and Winkle with Oyster Bay Trail.

Not as bad because less pedestrians and existing area seems to work reasonably well.

Path goes along route which is used to travel anyway and not a recreational area.

Protection for cyclists, increased functionality.

Protection for cyclists.

Providing there are adequate safeguards, signing etc, shared use by pedestrians and cyclists promotes better use of this route removing cyclists from the road improving road safety. Adequate Lighting to reduce vulnerability to crime on parts of the isolated route are key

Safe cycle routes are entirely consistent with the nature of Whitstable.

Safe passage for residents and visitors to the town. Could also alleviate some of the parking problems in town. Are we having cycle racks for people to lock their bikes up?

Seems a sensible route.

Seems much the most sensible option for linking the station to the town/harbour. Would like to suggest looking at putting in lift access across platforms of station, would Network Rail work in partnership? This would really help.

Should be good for families, tourism and safety of cyclists.

Some slight concerns re busy times (eg parents walking children home from school). Suggest signs asking cyclists to dismount at busy times. Otherwise good to get us cyclists away from cars and lorries for all reasons given in Q3.

Sounds a good way to get through the town without a car. Much more useful.

The majority is in a safe environment - unlike the seafront Stream Walk should be ok as well.

The new route will be safer and more straightforward than the existing route and will mean that cyclists will not have to dismount and carry their bikes downstairs at the station. Other user should also benefit.

The reasons above. Separating vulnerable cyclists from heavy traffic is clearly desirable.

The removal of steps by the station is a good idea but it's important to keep a surface with grip for walking on icy conditions or put a narrow stepped edge next to the slope.

There are already too many cars on the roads especially in Whitstable which at times can get very congested, so encouraging cycling is no bad thing!

There are already too many cars on the roads especially in Whitstable which at times can get very congested, so encouraging cycling is no bad thing!

There were no objections from our membership to this section of the route

This is already a car-free environment (at Stream Walk) and I feel that utilising this route causes the least disruption to green areas of Whitstable whilst also being cost effective.

This is already an existing route and if it were upgraded then it would be a far better use of resources and would mean no destruction of wildlife habitats as would be the case if the Crab and Winkle line were used.

This is long overdue as it will complete the Crab & Winkle way.

This is needed

This route is not used by so many pedestrians, but anywhere where there is a mix of foot and cycle use should have something to highlight careful use by both parties.

This route will mean visitors to Whitstable via the station and the existing Crab & Winkle route will go into the town and enjoy the delights that the unique town of Whitstable has to offer.

This sounds fine. Good use of currently available routes and relatively safe.

This will bring people into the area and add to the local economy

This will promote trade and the town's wealth as Canterbury residents will come to enjoy Whitstable rather than vice-versa.

This will provide a safe link from the Harbour to the town and station.

This would fill "the missing link" in the C&W route to the Harbour without causing undue problems, in contrast to the grossly over-engineered proposal to use the old railway track route with new bridges.

To make it easier to cycle around

To speed journeys thro. Whitstable away from pedestrians and motorists.

Using Stream Walk is a good idea. The route needs improving. Ramping the slope from the station to the tunnel needs to be very gradual so that it is safe for cyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair users. Reservoir Road is shown as being red. Should the path on the Cromwell Road side be widened to be a shared pedestrian/cycle path for parent and child cyclists?

We need more joined up cycle routes

We should be encouraging other means of transport. We are too reliant on cars.

Will be good for tourism bringing extra visitors safely along the route.

Will help cyclists get to station with less traffic, make it safer and more attractive. Suitable signage at station can lead visitors to the other cycle facilities eg sea-front.

Will improve the existing route.

Yes because it will create a safer and better defined cycle route

Yes it is a good continuation and will offer a longer family ride/trip on sunny days.

Yes, the cycle routes need to be joined up better

Any improvements to this route are always welcome.

Anything which draws people to the area and promotes our local amenities is great.

Days out with family

I sometimes use the Crab and Winkle Way to cycle from Canterbury to Whitstable, and have always found that the final section, in Whitstable itself, is unsatisfactory and way below the standard of the rest of the route.

I would anticipate the improvements will lead to an increase in tourism and hence revenue & employment in the affected areas.

It will make access safer and, more importantly, easier for cyclists and wheelchair users. Improving cycle routes will take cyclists off the roads.

The Crab & Winkle is a lovely route and being able to finish at Stream Walk or the Harbour would complete it.

This is a really good idea because it utilises an existing popular route that really works and really does help to link the station with the rest of the town. It's a cost effective option and the obvious thing to do as improvements could be made to stream walk for a relatively small amount of money. I'd also really like you to look at whether there is an opportunity to approach network rail to see if they would consider working with you in partnership to put in lift access across the platforms at Whitstable Station. This would really help cyclists who come to Whitstable by train and want to cycle when they arrive, but not only that, it would be such an improvement in terms of access for disabled people and also for families with small children and buggies. Access across the platforms is poor currently and this would be such a good opportunity to do something positive that would benefit the whole Whitstable community.

Welcome improvements that would make these routes safer, and encourage cycling by providing better and safer links to the station.

Any cycle route would be safer for cyclists by separating them from motor vehicles.

It would be good for the young people of the area. All bells to be used to warn pedestrians.

'No' responses

Cost to council tax payers and accidents to innocent walkers from reckless racing cyclists.

Feel Stream Walk is too indirect and ??? for a high use cycle path. Should keep open the Crab and Winkle extension. Costly indeed but far more likely to encourage cycle use in district and could help dissipate traffic congestion.

It will encourage even more cyclists at the expense of other users.

It's too convoluted and narrow in places. A more direct route would be preferable.

Plans 5 and 6 - avoid use of Reservoir Road and Cuckoo Down Lane - this is a pedestrian path. From sea end of cycle path continue along Westgate Terrace, turn left along Cromwell Road, turn right into Stream Walk proposed route. Both Westgate Terrace and Cromwell Road are wide enough to have a dedicated cycle path established.

Route is all wrong. Why invent another on road cycle route to Whitstable Station when we already have C&W way - but poorly signposted?? The destination for most is the town not the station. The requirement is to provide safe cycling to Harbour St and C&W. Added bonus is that you then get continuous connection to 10/20 mph limited Island Wall/Saxon Shore/prom at West Beach. Seasalter next destination! We almost had this last month until the CCC Sea Defence team re-erected the obstructions on the beach "to stop motorcyclists". What a shame.

Stream Walk and Crab and Winkle Way, cyclists should dismount if pedestrians around. Other roads on this route, cyclists should be banned from footpaths.

The route will never reach the Harbour because of buildings in the way. It will damage the 'green lung' behind Claire Road. The 'Crab and Winkle Way' is in dire need of improvement at several points along the route (flooding and narrowing for instance). This should have priority over extending it further.

These paths are well used by pedestrians - especially school children and mothers with toddlers and dog walkers. Whilst there is, at present, an acceptable number of cyclists also using these paths - to actively encourage an increase - especially to 'out of town' hobby cyclists could present a lot of problem. Presumably these cycle routes will be two-directional - will they be safe and comfortable for all concerned. Will they be wide enough for people with prams and toddlers going in both directions - being passed by cyclists also going in both directions. If the action of cyclists in the High Street and Oxford Street are anything to go by - many of them will have little or no regard for any restrictions. They regularly ignore traffic lights, 'one way' streets, cycle on the pavements etc.

Those residents in Station Road and Clare Road would lose all privacy in their back gardens to the individual who would be a "Peeping Tom". I lived there many years ago and know the situation.

What has happened about the new bridges across Bridge Approach and Teynham Road. I know there was an issue with the time frame and the money.

With a map, it is possible to navigate the same way. Better signs are all that are needed. These signs would not waste £150,000.

A rather indirect route, crossing a number of roads which could become hazardous if cyclists fail to slow down or stop in time when approaching. It would however be a good alternative if the original railway line can't be re-opened. Proposed new

crossing in Harbour Street would result in excessive number of pedestrian crossings in that area.

Briefly - I think signposting this meandering route would be a waste of time and money. Most cyclists would use the alternative road routes which would be more direct, quicker, possibly safer. Far better would be to rebuild the demolished bridges on the Old Railway Line, preserving an historic local feature and providing a safe and level route suitable for all cycling abilities - the cost would not be great as a proportion of the overall council spend and the long term benefits immeasurably greater than the alternative. The biggest risk to cyclists is poor driving by other road users and this proposal does nothing to address this risk.

Guide Dogs would oppose any plan to introduce a non segregated cycle path. Without defined segregation incorporating signage, tactile warnings and use of colour contrast, blind and partially sighted people would be at risk from potential collisions in a shared environment. Consequently making it a 'no go area' for visually impaired people and other vulnerable people.

I am a road cyclist. While I favour improving the Crab and Winkle for other cyclists and making cycling safer for my family, I also want to see my taxes going towards the improvement of road services and better regulation of traffic. I would prefer the consideration of better use of existing road and path infrastructure. For example, have you considered the introduction of lights that can allow different road users (e.g. Cyclists or motorists) to have access to the Church St/Castle Rd railway bridge in a staggered way?

I don't agree with shared use walking and cycling routes and quiet on road alternatives should be explored.

I have no views on this.

I would only support the changes if they were to be for pedestrian use only. I have explained my reasons in Q3 above

Should this horrendous plan go ahead who will police it. Cyclists have flouted all the regulations currently in place for the past decade. It will be war.

Too much of our resource are being spent on this minority activity. What is the purpose of Q6 as this has no relevance to this consultation

Yes and no, the tunnel on stream walk: if this is painted in a light colour, it will only encourage more graffiti .It is bad enough now and rarely gets cleaned. The path leading from tunnel to station is not really wide enough especially when walking here. Because it is so concealed, one has to walk eyes down all the time to dodge the muck. A better route would be using the small short path leading into Millstream Close. This has only a little residential traffic. I often recommend it to strangers on bikes, because one can miss the steps at the station end.

The road part of Stream Walk is quite busy and a main route into the residential roads between Cromwell Rd and the High St. It is narrow and used for parking by residents and visitors (it is now apparent what the real reason for the proposed parking restrictions previously announced was). Significant cycle traffic on this narrow road will be inconvenient for local residents and be a danger to cyclists.

Q6 Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

Yes	31	7.56%
No	354	86.34%
No reply	25	6.10%

Q7 Home postcode

Postcode	Number of responses	Percentage
CT5	215	52.44%
CT6	37	9.02%
CT2	30	7.32%
CT1	19	4.63%
CT4	11	2.68%
ME13	8	1.95%
CT10	3	0.73%
CT11	2	0.49%
CT14	2	0.49%
TN26	2	0.49%
TN4	2	0.49%
CB4	1	0.24%
CT12	1	0.24%
CT19	1	0.24%
CT21	1	0.24%
CT3	1	0.24%
CT7	1	0.24%
DA1	1	0.24%
EH11	1	0.24%
ME3	1	0.24%
OX3	1	0.24%
TN25	1	0.24%
TN27	1	0.24%
TN29	1	0.24%
No reply	66	16.10%