

Photo J: the point at which the proposed path would start from this crossing—



Closing

13. I understand that under the legislation, the alternative route has to be suitable and convenient. Where a path is used for leisure walking (or mainly for leisure walking), the alternative route needs to be enjoyable (or enjoyable for the most part) as a leisure path as well, for it to be 'suitable' as an alternative. It needs to be perceived to be *safe* in order to be suitable—recreational walkers as far as possible do not choose to use routes where they do not feel safe—and the alternative path needs to actually be safe (so that it is safe in road safety assessment terms) in order to be suitable and convenient.

14

The alternative route involves using the road bridge at a point where the road narrows and curves with poor sight lines to the north in regard to the speed of the traffic. In this proposal there are too many elements of danger: the narrow over bridge with no foot way or refuge, and the sections of road with little or no verge and no foot way. For these reasons we ask that the proposal be rejected.