

# Hampstead Heath Pathways Review

## Shared Use **Pathway Improvements**

10053-LD-REP-101 V7

Prepared by LUC on behalf of The City of London  
March 2018



**Project Title:** Hampstead Heath Pathways

**Client:** The City of London

**Project ref:** 10053

**Link:** S:\10000\10053 - Hampstead Heath shared use pathway improvements

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by Principal
1.0	25.08.17	Incomplete draft issue for initial client review	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley
2.0	29.09.17	First draft for review	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley
3.0	06.10.17	Second draft for review	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley
4.0	21.11.17	Third draft	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley
5.0	23.01.18	Fourth draft incorporating comments	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley
6.0	02.02.18	Final draft	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley
7.0	16.03.18	Final draft	Andy Pringle	John Adams	Adrian Wikeley

**LUC Team Contributors**

Adrian Wikeley  
John Adams  
Andy Pringle

Director Landscape Architect  
Associate Landscape Manager  
Principal Landscape Architect

## Contents

1. Introduction	05
2. Methodology	09
3. Recommendations	15
4. Signage & Countryside Furniture	29
Appendix - meeting notes / feedback	31



# 1.0 Introduction





## 1.0 Introduction

**1.1** LUC was appointed in July 2017 by the City of London to undertake a detailed study of two of the shared use pathways on Hampstead Heath. These are currently used by both pedestrians and cyclists and would be intended to continue to support shared use. LUC was appointed to give advice on appropriate surface treatment options for the pathways as well as to give localised proposals and signage advice.

**1.2** Hampstead Heath is one of London's most popular open spaces, situated just six kilometres from and to the north northwest of Trafalgar Square and is managed by the City of London. It provides an area of countryside in an otherwise densely populated urban environment, with a rich mosaic of different habitats providing a home and food for a great variety of wildlife.

**1.3** As such it also provides opportunities for extensive recreational opportunities, both formal and informal hence catering for a wide range of users with differing needs and priorities.

**1.4** Access within the Heath is extensive and varied with a mixture of desire lines, unbound gravel and hardtop paths, some used by pedestrians and cyclists and others where cycling is forbidden.

**1.5** Within the Heath there is an existing shared use network of 5 kilometres for shared pedestrian and cycle use.

**1.6** Two of the more prominent paths, one running from Spaniards Road roughly easterly to Lime Avenue and part of the path running from Lime Avenue to Millfield Lane on the eastern edge of the Heath (**see Figure 1, Pathways Location**) are mixed use and surfaced with natural gravel. The choice of an unbound surface is deliberate with the intent to provide access which is felt to be appropriate for the rural feel of the meadow grass/heath and woodlands surrounding both paths.

**1.7** However, the condition of this surface is poor in parts, mainly as a result of water running down the path picking up the finer material which helps to bind the surface and then also in heavy rain washing the pebbles and stones forming the bulk of the surface down and off the path. This also creates gullies in the path surface. While this is perhaps not a major problem for able bodied walkers it can create problems for cyclists, those using buggies and wheelchairs and users who are less firm footed.

**1.8** The aim of this project is to suggest possible solutions which will still provide a natural surface in keeping with the location of the paths, but one which is more durable, less prone to rain damage and hence requires less maintenance. The surface should also be suitable for pedestrians, buggies and wheelchairs, cyclists and the occasional vehicle use by operators of the annual fair close to the path, by park maintenance vehicles and by emergency services vehicles.

**1.9** The following sections of this report provide details of the methodology used to arrive at recommended surfaces and path structures, design details and instructions for maintaining the paths. We have also considered suitable signage to inform users of the nature of the path and to guide them along the routes.



Pathways location




Figure 1 - Location of pathways



Existing Site Character

Pathway 1 - Spaniards to Lime Tree Avenue



Pathway 2 - Hampstead Ponds to Highgate Ponds





## 2.0 Methodology





## 2.0 Methodology

**2.1** The steps taken to arrive at the recommendations for improving the paths are:

- Walkover condition survey
- Research into suitable surface materials
- Designing suitable path construction details to deal with the issues found during the condition survey
- Providing a plan of the paths with recommended treatments for different sections of the paths
- Consultation with the City of London and key stakeholders on the proposals
- Finalisation of the proposals
- Providing detailed specifications for the repair of the paths, and their subsequent maintenance.

### Condition Survey

**2.2** The condition survey was carried out over two visits to the site on 12th July 2017 and 10th August 2017. Both visits were in company with representatives from the City of London and the August visit also included a Sustrans representative to provide input on the issues with the paths that affected their suitability for cycling.

**2.3** The results of the surveys and information provided by the City of London of the issues they have experienced with the paths are summarised in **Figures 2a, 2b and 2c; Analysis and Key Issues**. As part of the analysis we have divided the paths into sections defined by the nature of the path, its surroundings and condition and applied a priority to dealing with the issues based on the current condition of the path in that section.

**2.4** While there are a number of localised issues, the main cause of problems is that both paths run through an area of varying topography, with some sections relatively flat and others on a slope and this can cause problems with drainage.

**2.5** Where the path runs perpendicular to the slope, any water falling on the path as rain or running onto the path from adjoining ground will tend to run down the path, gathering the fine material which helps to bind the surface of the path, and eventually causing gullies and even moving some of the stones making up the path surface (see Section 4 of path 1 (**Figure 2b**) and Section 1 of path 2 (**Figure 2c**). This causes loss of path material, which then has to be replaced and locally soft areas where the washed out fine material gathers, which cause problems for cyclists.

**2.6** Where the path runs across the slope water will then tend to run across the path and into the surrounding ground with little if any gullying or wash out, unless the downslope edge of the path is higher than the path, in which case water will run along the path and cause gullies as above.

**2.7** Other issues noted included:

- Excessive path width, particularly on path 1
- Intrusive concrete signs in the path surface
- Lack of signage overall
- Lack of clarification at junctions with other paths, particularly between path 1 and Lime Avenue and at the eastern end of path 2.

**2.8** The following sections discuss proposals for dealing with these issues.



Figure 2a. Analysis & Key Issues - Pathway 1 - Spaniards to Lime Avenue



- Space A.**
- Large amount of signage is confusing
  - Wide timber gated entrance has narrow day to day pedestrian/cyclist openings that may heighten the chance of a clash
  - Gravel (grey in colour) surface in good condition

**Priority: Medium**



- Section 1.**
- Wide route 6 -7m in places with no clear edge
  - Gravel (golden in colour) in bad state of repair in places due to erosion from water run off across the pathway
  - Historically significant features such as granite cobbles related to fairground pitches

**Priority: Medium**




- Space B.**
- Large expanse of gravel surface undefined edge
  - Sense of hierarchy of pathway poor
  - This junction has an accumulation of loose gravel and presents a hazard to cyclists.

**Priority: High**



Figure 2b. Analysis & Key Issues - Pathway 1 - Spaniards to Lime Avenue



Section 2.

- Route 5m with linear defined edge
- Gravel grey in colour with underlying golden generally in good condition although showing localised depressions related to poor drainage. Overall a good even gradient.

Priority: Low



Section 3.

- Gravel/earth pathway of varying width which lacks definition

Priority: Medium




Space C.

- Gravel/earth pathway of varying width which lacks definition
- Signage is uncoordinated and toilets access not clearly signed

Priority: Medium



Figure 2c. Analysis & Key Issues - Pathway 1 - Spaniards to Lime Avenue



**Section 4. (Figure 2b)**

- Gravel/earth pathway of varying width which lacks definition
- Memorial seating along pathways length and varying angles contributing to route’s character
- Surface water channel apparent following the route of services

**Priority: Medium**



**Section 5: Route between bridge and Lime Avenue Junction**

- Route 5m wide with linear defined edge
- Gravel golden in colour generally in good condition although showing localised depressions related to poor drainage. Overall a good even gradient.

**Priority: Low**



**Space D.**

- Undulating earth/gravel surface with cross flows of pedestrians/cyclist making it a space with high risk of clashes
- Lack of definition of route/space
- Uncoordinated signage / wayfinding
- This junction has an accumulation of loose gravel and presents a hazard to cyclists.

**Priority: High**



Figure 2d. Analysis & Key Issues - Pathway 2 - Hampstead Ponds to Highgate Ponds



Space A.

- Surface, earth and gravel, even width with localised undulation
- Signage uncoordinated across the Heath

Priority: Medium



Section 2.

- Surface gravel golden in colour in good condition, even gradient and cross falls well defined edge

Priority: Low



Section 1. (Figure 2c)

- Gravel surface golden in colour showing evidence of fines being washed out. Drainage issue causing localised runs of water

Priority: High



Space B.

- High possibility of clashes due to partially hidden junction
- No current definition between routes

Priority: High



## 3.0 Recommendations





## 3.0 Recommendations

**3.1** The recommendations cover:

- Path surface
- Path structure
- Signage

### Path Surface

**3.2** While the appearance of the surface on both path 1 and path 2 is similar, both informal with unbound gravel, there are differences. Both are felt to be in keeping with the rural nature of the adjoining land. Following feedback from consultation the proposed material used to improve the pathways must be in-keeping with the natural environment that surrounds it and be of a brown colour.

**3.3** Path 1 has developed over the years and contains wide mixture of gravels, stones, hard core and the occasional brick, compacted into a relatively firm base but still prone to gullyng. While the surface is sound, it is not particularly smooth or even, particularly where the larger fragments protrude from the surface. Hence it is not an ideal surface for cyclist, buggies, wheelchairs or those with poor balance.

**3.4** Path 2 has been recently resurfaced and the surface is more uniform, largely consisting of a 'superior hoggin' with a relatively sandy fines content and even sized pebbles/stones. While this can provide a relatively smooth surface when laid, hot, dry weather causes the fine, binding content to dry which leaves it very prone to being washed out in wet weather. This then leaves loose stones at the surface which themselves can be washed away in heavy rains.

**3.5** If the resultant hollows are then refilled with hoggin and this rolled dry into the surface, the stones can crack and splinter, and if flint based can leave sharp shards which are capable of puncturing tyres on bikes etc.

**3.6** Hence the requirement is to find a new surfacing material which provides a 'rural' feel to the path and has an appearance similar to the natural soils and geology of the Heath but which is smoother, better bound and less prone to wash off and is easier to maintain than the current surface.

**3.7** There are a number of alternative materials and in Table 1 we describe four of these that have been used for similar paths, with Figure 3 showing images of the materials. They are:

- Breedon gravel, a grey/brown relatively smooth surface with good binding properties and small stone size. Formed from limestone gravel bound with a marly clay, the material is alkaline. Following feedback this material was highlighted as suitable yet efforts should be taken to soften its colour and ensure it is inkeeping with the natural environment it surrounds;
- Coxwell gravel, has a more orange colour than the Breedon, has a neutral pH, binds well forming a smooth hard crust but prone to wash off on slopes and the crust is easily broken by horse hooves;
- Hoggin, which is similar to the current material used on Path 2, but the fine binding constituent has a greater clay content and hence probably less prone to wash off. However the stone size in hoggin tends to vary and can include quite large stones causing a less smooth surface than the Breedon or the Coxwell gravels;
- Recycled Type 1 to dust, constructed from reclaimed building rubble and containing a variety of materials including brick, concrete and fragments of clay tiles. The binding element is a fine ground mixture of the constituent materials. While it is cheaper to purchase than the natural products described above, the variety of materials including clay fragments may not provide the smooth surface required and sharp fragments could cause problems for cyclists, wheelchairs etc. With a high content of concrete, the material is alkaline.

**3.8** While there are additional surfaces that can be explored it is felt that from a functional point of view, those with a smaller gravel, the Breedon and Coxwell gravel offer the following advantages:

- The smaller gravel creates a smoother surface;
- Both bind well although the Breedon is probably more tolerant to slopes;
- Both are relatively easy to repair, requiring the old surface to be scarified, dampened and then the new damp surface material rolled into the scarified surface of the path.
- However they do not resemble the local gravelly soil and surface geology.



Path Surface

Preferred surface material



**Breedon Gravel**

- Naturally occurring limestone gravel
- Attractive colour/finish
- Pedestrian / cyclist friendly
- Quarried material



**Hoggin**

- Mix of quarried clay, sand and gravel
- Attractive colour/finish
- Pedestrian / cyclist friendly but can become bumpy as the fine material wears and larger stones are exposed
- May become slippery in wet conditions as high proportion of clay



**Old English Self Binding Gravel**

- Attractive colour / finish
- Pedestrian / cyclist friendly but can become bumpy as the fine material wears and larger stones are exposed
- Must have a free draining sub base



**Coxwell Gravel**

- Naturally occurring combination of sponge gravel and grit sand
- Attractive colour/finish
- Pedestrian / cyclist friendly
- Prone to rutting and may migrate on gradients



**Recycled MOT type 1 to dust**

- Crushed recycled material
- Sustainable & inexpensive
- Consistency of appearance is variable and can be labour intensive to extract inappropriate material

Path surface - Figure 3



Path Surface

Name	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Breedon Gravel	<p>Naturally occurring limestone gravel with marl as a binding agent, quarried in Derbyshire.</p> <p>Case examples of surface:</p> <p>Chatsworth, Audley End and many other estates.</p>	<p>Attractive grey/brown colour/finish and suited to context of a woodland site.</p> <p>Durable &amp; low maintenance.</p> <p>Wheelchair and pram friendly.</p>	<p>A quarried product which would be transported 180 miles to site.</p> <p>Based on limestone and hence is alkaline, and as such would be unsuitable in areas such as acid grasslands.</p>
Hoggin	<p>A mix of quarried clay, sand and gravel.</p> <p>Case examples of surface:</p> <p>Commonly used within many NT properties in Southern England.</p>	<p>PH Neutral Attractive &amp; suited to context of a woodland site.</p> <p>Wheelchair and pram friendly when in good condition.</p>	<p>A quarried product which would be transported to site.</p> <p>The product has a high proportion of clay content and thus can become slippery in wet conditions.</p> <p>Prone to rutting on gradients if drainage not correct.</p> <p>When worn, the larger stones in the matrix can protrude creating a bumpy surface which can cause discomfort for wheelchair and buggy users and cyclists.</p>
Coxwell Gravel	<p>A naturally occurring combination of sponge gravel and grit sand, quarried in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Case examples of surface:</p> <p>Tamsin Trail around Richmond Park and Isabella Plantation in Richmond Park.</p>	<p>PH Neutral</p> <p>Attractive colour/finish suited to context of a woodland site.</p> <p>Durable &amp; low maintenance.</p> <p>Wheelchair and pram friendly.</p>	<p>A quarried product which would be transported 140 miles to site.</p> <p>LUC have experienced problems with use of the material including lack of compaction.</p> <p>If not well laid, the surface may not form a firm crust.The surface crust can be broken by sharp items, eg horses’ hooves.</p> <p>Prone to rutting on gradients if drainage not correct.</p> <p>Can migrate on gradients.</p>

Path surface - Table 1

Name	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Recycled MOT type 1 to dust	<p>A demolition by-product consisting of a mixture of crushed concrete and brick.</p> <p>Sizes range from 40mm down to dust.</p> <p>MOT Type 1 Crushed is graded according to the Specification for Highway Works 803 (SHW 803).</p> <p>Case examples of surface:</p> <p>Example at NT Sissinghurst, close to Kitchen Garden.</p>	<p>Inexpensive</p> <p>Sustainable, as it is a by-product of the building industry.</p>	<p>Appearance is very variable as it can contain crushed red brick, ceramic tiles, concrete and tarmacadam. There is thus a significant labour issue regarding extracting inappropriate crushed materials from the surface.</p>
Old English Self Binding Gravel	<p>An attractive light brown coloured, self binding gravel suitable for paths, driveways and car parks.</p> <p>The range of gravel sizes that make up this self binding gravel ensure it compacts firmly and resists movement when trafficked.</p>	<p>Attractive light brown colour and suited to the context.</p> <p>PH Neutral</p> <p>Durable and low maintenance.</p> <p>Wheelchair and pram friendly</p>	<p>Prone to rutting if not installed with correct camber &amp; crossfall.</p> <p>Must not be laid when wet as compaction will be lost.</p> <p>Quarried material that would have to be transported to site.</p> <p>Must have a free draining sub base (existing subbase would have to be surveyed for suitability).</p>



## Path Surface

### Path structure

**3.9** There are two components to the path structure:

- The profile from bare ground to the wearing surface
- Camber and slope of the path surface relative to the adjacent ground

### Profile (see figures 3A, 3B & 3C on opposite page)

**3.10** To provide the strength needed to support extended use of the path by pedestrians and cyclists and in the western areas of the Path 1, by large vehicles, the suggested full profile is:

- A geotextile layer to separate the path from the underlying ground
- Type 1 material like recycled concrete or flint pebbles, to provide a well drained but solid base. The depth will vary according to the underlying ground and in cases where the current surface is sound and compacted, and no additional height to the path is needed, could be left out;
- A sub-base (which would match the material choice of the wearing course) to help shape the path surface and provide a sound base for the wearing course;
- A wearing course (which would match the material choice of the sub base) of finer material to bide it together and provide a smooth surface.

**3.11** If the path is to be built up above the surrounding ground, to improve drainage or over tree roots, a wooden board edging will contain the path structure and stop lateral spreading under load. This edging will be disguised using planting or a similar method.

### Camber and slope

**3.12** Some of the problems seen on the current paths result from water, whether from rain falling directly on the path, or run off from the surrounds of the path, running along the path and gradually washing out fines, then gravel, resulting in gullies where material has been removed and deep soft patches where washed out material has been dumped.

**3.13** Four methods are recommended for alleviating this problem:

- Using a surface which binds well and is less prone to being shifted by water;
- Catching run off in wide shallow ditches or swales alongside the path, and then using these swales to direct water away to a suitable sump, eg local stream, potential pond areas in locations where the gathered water will not affect the path;
- Ensuring that in areas where there is a local cross flow, constructing the path surface so that it follows this slope and that the ground on the down slope side of the path is lower than the adjacent path surface and hence allows

water to drain away over the width of the path hence having less energy and time to gather material from the path surface.

- In areas where there is no cross flow, raising the centre of the path to form a camber, with swales on either side of the park to catch water from the path and lead it away, and also to catch water flowing into the path from surrounding ground.

**3.14** The surface treatment will be applied to the whole path, but the other three will be applied as appropriate for each different section of the path and as appropriate to address a local issue.



## Path Surface - typical details

Note in the below examples Coxwell gravel has been chosen as the surface material for illustrative purposes only.




Figure 3A




Figure 3B




Figure 3C



Figure 4a. Initial proposals - Pathway 1


Medium Priority



Space A.

- Simplify signage remove unnecessary signs
- Widen pedestrian/cycle entrance to allow comfortable passing point
- Define the margin between the tarmac pavement with the gravel path with setts or similar to mark boundary


Medium Priority



Section 1.

- Potential to reclaim 1m each side of pathway back to Heath and redefine natural edge
- Combat persistent localised puddling by building in cross fall where there is a lateral slope from one side of the path to the other, or through creating a camber to raise the path above surrounding areas where there is no cross fall.
- Introduce camber to pathway to assist with drainage
- Potential for drainage feature along southern edge

High Priority



Space B.

- Potential to reclaim Heath through reducing expanse of hard surfacing at fork
- Re-establish pathway hierarchy through route to the right being emphasised as main route
- Potential to introduce bench/bin/signage that acts as focal point to fork



Figure 4b. Initial proposals - Pathway 1


### Low Priority



#### Section 2.

- Where puddling regularly occurs, build in cross fall to path surface, ensuring that water can freely run off the path surface into the adjacent ground.
- Repair localised potholes by scarifying existing surface and then topping with chosen surface material, rolling in when damp to provide a firm surface.
- Redefine thresholds between main path and secondary paths to clarify changes in surface, eg from gravel to asphalt.


### Medium Priority



#### Section 3.

- Where puddling regularly occurs, build in cross fall to path surface, ensuring that water can freely run off the path surface into the adjacent ground.
- Repair localised potholes by scarifying existing surface and then topping with chosen surface material, rolling in when damp to provide a firm surface.

### Medium Priority



#### Space C.

- Where puddling regularly occurs, build in cross fall to path surface, ensuring that water can freely run off the path surface into the adjacent ground.
- Repair localised potholes by scarifying existing surface and then topping with chosen surface material, rolling in when damp to provide a firm surface.
- Where path width exceeds 4m, redefine margins to give path width of 4m, scarify areas of excess width and allow to revegetate, protecting with temporary fencing until vegetation is established.
- Remove hazards such as the concrete block signs, applies to all areas of the paths.



## Initial proposals - Pathway 1

### Medium Priority



#### Section 4.

- Where puddling regularly occurs, build in cross fall to path surface, ensuring that water can freely run off the path surface into the adjacent ground, using the existing gully to catch the water and lead it into adjacent ground.
- Redefine the southern boundary of the path on the upslope side of the existing gully, scarify areas of excess width and allow to revegetate, protecting with temporary fencing until vegetation is established.


### Low Priority



#### Section 5.

- Combat persistent localised puddling by building in cross fall where there is a lateral slope from one side of the path to the other, or through creating a camber to raise the path above surrounding areas where there is no cross fall.
- Repair localised potholes by scarifying existing surface and then topping with chosen surface material, rolling in when damp to provide a firm surface.

### High Priority




#### Space D.

- Raise the centre of the path to create a camber to allow water to flow sideways off the path to existing drainage channels.
- Where not well defined, deepen existing drainage channels, still retaining a gently sloping wide 'U' section. Clean out existing drainage pipes. Install subsurface cross drains under path where necessary to provide an outlet for water draining off the path.
- Use logs to define edge of path, but without impeding access or drainage off the path.



## Initial proposals - Pathway 2


### Medium Priority



#### Space A.

- Include in core signage improvement strategy ensuring coherence
- Reintroduce camber to allow for positive drainage evenly across pathway
- Create shallow swales on either side of the cambered section of to track water running off the hill, and from the path and lead the captured water to suitable drainage areas. Install cross drains at intervals to take water from the up slope section of the path and into the drainage area.

### High Priority



#### Section 1.

- Reintroduce camber to allow for positive drainage evenly across pathway
- Consider localised gully issues with topping up gravel and reintroducing even crossfall
- Create shallow swales on either side of the cambered section of to track water running off the hill, and from the path and lead the captured water to suitable drainage areas. Install cross drains at intervals to take water from the up slope section of the path and into the drainage area.


### Low Priority



#### Section 2.

- Pathway section in good order - continue regular maintenance

### High Priority




#### Space B.

- This junction is potentially hazardous if cyclists travel down the gravel path at speed and cannot stop for other users who step into their path.
- Keep sight lines to and from path junction clear.
- Clearly delineate the boundary between the incoming asphalt path and the gravel path, eg with granite setts. Place warning signs on the approaches to the junction from both the asphalt path and the gravel path




Space D - Lime Tree Avenue Junction Study  
Existing scenario






Space D - Lime Tree Avenue Junction Study  
Proposed scenario






Space D - Lime Tree Avenue Junction Study  
Supporting Details - Pathway & Edging



**Note:** Wearing course material is interchangeable and Coxwell Gravel is shown for illustrative purposes within these details.


Detail A. Pathway build up for poor drainage




Detail B. Pathway as causeway with hidden timber retaining edge



Space D - Lime Tree Avenue Junction Study  
Supporting Details - Drainage



Detail C. Soakaway and buried clay drainage pipe



Detail D. Swale cross section



## 4.0 Signage and Countryside Furniture





4.0 Signage and Countryside Furniture- overall recommendations

4.1 The recommendations cover:

- Existing signage / wayfinding elements for shared use pathways
- Current conflicts
- Proposed outline strategy for shared use pathways

Existing Signage/Wayfinding elements/Countryside Furniture

There are a number of different signs along the paths, which can confuse users and does not provide a coherent identity to the path. Other countryside furniture, benches, water fountains and bins for example, are equally varied and not always placed in the most appropriate position relative to the path. Feedback from consultation echoed these points. Some of the issues are illustrated.

Proposed Strategy

4.2 The signage will provide reminders at key points that users are on a particular path, and of the pedestrian priority, similar to those used for the Tamsin Trail in Richmond Park. The shared use pathways should be demarked by a blue or green band on the posts along its route contrasting similar signage on routes marked with a yellow band to indicate routes not to be used by cyclists.

4.3 The purpose of the signage is to inform users of the nature of the path, and the reasons for its design structure and location. In addition it will provide a map of the path and of points of interest along it as well as guidance on its use, speed limits for example and the fact that the paths are for pedestrians and cyclists, but that the pedestrians have priority. Details of the design have not been worked up but in concept, it will provide clear information, be in keeping with the Heath’ signage policy and positioned at the start and end of the path as well as at any major junctions.

4.4 Following feedback natural materials are preferred to man made materials and must be in-keeping in character to the surroundings.



In principle all signs will follow a common style in terms of background colour/text size and font, and construction. The example below shows the current style for information boards on the Heath. These would be positioned at the entrances to paths and at key junctions.

Timber bollards with symbols based on those in the signs will be used to outline the route of the paths.



A coordinated series of information boards and signage bollards that relate to each other using the same palette of material while retaining the rural/ countryside aesthetic.

These signs are proposed to be displayed on cut logs around the Heath in keeping with the informal style of the area.

-  Suggested colour band integrated onto wooden post for shared use pathways
-  Suggested colour band integrated onto wooden post for prohibited routes for cyclists

Current Conflicts



Entrances and key orientation points have too many signs that could confuse users



Existing signage, concrete pads in the path, protrude causing a hazard and are neither consistent nor clear.



Elements along the path are varied and are not always positioned appropriately.





# Appendix





## Meeting 28/11/17 - notes / feedback

A meeting was held on 28/11/17 between LUC, the Corporation, Sustrans and a number of user groups. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the outline pathway proposals & signage strategy as outlined within this report and to gain feedback. A summary of the points taken in the meeting can be found below:

### **Preferred path surfacing materials for resurfacing work to take place on the shared use paths from Highgate Ponds to Hampstead Ponds. Options contained within LUC report – circulated with agenda.**

- Agree with the popular path surface, Breedon gravel. However, we ask that the colour of the new surface is in keeping with the natural environment that surrounds it.
- I think all path surfaces should be brown rather than grey. I believe you favour “Hoggin”. I am very aware of the drainage problems with this particularly on the East side of the model boating pond. In the end it is a technical decision best made by those who maintain the paths.
- With regard to choices of materials as suggested at the meeting on 28/11/17, I have no specific preference, and felt that the consultants presenting were of ample expertise to be entrusted with the decision.
- Issues of drainage, stability (re withstanding of effects of torrential rainfall) and durability re occasional vehicles and of course cycles, were all dealt with carefully, and I would only recommend that budgetary requirements be made to allow for the best material that will last over time, whilst being aware that there is a great need to extend the shared usage remit of other paths, to provide access for leisure and transportation cycling.

### **Preferences or alternative ideas for way marking signs. Proposals contained within LUC Report – circulated with agenda.**

- Agree with the desire for a minimum amount of signage, though directions to amenities, cafes, ponds etc would be covered by this, using natural materials ideally (wood), and reasonably unobtrusive. (Comment from Bob - Waymarking needs to relate solely to the shared-use paths)
- Suggest contrasting colour markings for the designated cycle paths, perhaps green or blue reserving yellow for prohibited paths.
- The section on signs is short and I think a workshop on existing and proposed signs would be useful. As you know I have advocated signs set into the paths but these would need to be constructed in a way that does not result in safety hazards.



