

**MOVEMENT AND PLACE STUDY**

**Notes prepared for the Initial Workshop meeting MARCH 21st 2016**

**1.0 General requirements** for a project of this national/European significance

**Brief** (similar to a consultant team interview) - to include

Terms of reference

Time scale

Project stages

Reporting procedures

Criteria including all user/uses

**Project team** to include

Socio economic planner

Movement engineer/planner

Biologist

Urban designer

Landscape planner

Historian

**Project Governance**

Downs Committee or independent group ? and to include enforcement and implementation

**Proposed options/stages** to consider

a **Short term measures** achievable **within existing legislation and funding**

**b Medium time scale** measured against aims and objectives

**c Long term visions**

***( Certainly NOT the current A,B, or C – these have no sound planning basis plus individuals, groups will like bits of each )***

**General ethos and Social history** to include

Natural historic landscape. Certainly not Hard municipal detailing ? '

**2.0 Specific comments on the presented report**

**Apparent assumptions** on cycling - (all incorrect)

Cycling is compatible with the unique natural environment

Cycling is legal on the Downs

Cycling is compatible with other already accepted users

**Contacts/consultations**

No contact appears to have been made with

Ramblers, schools, elderly, disabled, tourist groups, disadvantaged etc

**Hard surfaces**

No mention of loss of any ' rural natural' landscape and compensatory areas

Additional comments on present document

**Places**

The references to Sea Walls and the Water Tower area are certainly not consistent with European status site

**Segregation**

The opportunity for a vertical segregation of pedestrians and vehicles is dismissed without reason
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The bridge over bridge valley road future planning application is dismissed . NOT objective or within any assumed terms of reference!

reference to too expensive? Is unsubstantiated and subjective

Channelling all forms of access through one junction ( BVR ) is certainly not good practice particularly when other options have not been explored

Only one access zone has been considered setting a possible precedence for other access areas. The question of precedence also applies to the proposed lighting of an area around the Observatory

AJP – FOD+AG

**references** FOD+AG Constitution

Uses/users – Downs and Avon Gorge

summary

Must be compatible with the 'natural environment'.

Must be compatible with other accepted users

FOD+AG FOD+AG policy statement

Cycling/cyclists on the Downs and Avon Gorge