# **East Sussex County Council**

## **Peacehaven Newhaven Seaford**

June 2018







#### **About Sustrans**

Sustrans is the charity making it easier for people to walk and cycle.

We are engineers and educators, experts and advocates. We connect people and places, create liveable neighbourhoods, transform the school run and deliver a happier, healthier commute.

Sustrans works in partnership, bringing people together to find the right solutions. We make the case for walking and cycling by using robust evidence and showing what can be done.

We are grounded in communities and believe that grassroots support combined with political leadership drives real change, fast.

Join us on our journey. www.sustrans.org.uk

Head Office Sustrans 2 Cathedral Square College Green Bristol BS1 5DD

© Sustrans June 2018 Registered Charity No. 326550 (England and Wales) SC039263 (Scotland)

VAT Registration No. 416740656

Revision	Description	Author	Check	Date
0.1	Version 1	DL	SP	30/08/2017
0.2	Version 2	DL	SP	28/06/2018

## Contents

Introduction	i - v
Description of the Town	1
200: South Coast Road (A259) Peacehaven	6
300: Peacehaven Loop	8
Peacehaven Secondary Routes	10
210: Newhaven East/West Corridor	12
310: Egrets Way	15
Newhaven Secondary Routes	16
220: Seaford East West Corridor	18
230: The Station – A259 via Sutton Avenue	22
320: Seaford Northern Loop	24
Seaford Secondary Routes	26
High Level Costs	30
East Sussex Delivery Methodology	33
Glossary of Terms	35





## Introduction

Sustrans was commissioned by East Sussex County Council (ESCC) in March 2017 to support the development of a countywide Cycling and Walking Strategy. Our role is to lead on identifying new and improved walking and cycling routes and infrastructure that align with key County Council policies and programmes that support local economic growth, improvements to health and well-being and the environment, together with the engagement of key local stakeholders, who have a vested interest in the development of the strategy.

The scope of the work was limited to utility trips to work, education and shopping of up to 5km. It does not include consideration of leisure trips outside the urban areas.

Our approach was to review all existing identified schemes and proposals in each of the towns and to plot these on our Earthlight GIS platform. We then identified gaps in the network with support from local stakeholders and surveyed potential routes on foot and bicycle. The methodology we adopted is outlined in the table in the Appendix, which was informed by the Design Guidance published as part of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013 and the London Cycling Design Standards guidance on developing a coherent cycle network.

#### Network Maps

For each town, we produced a series of maps to inform our work and to share with stakeholders. The information was also made available on our online mapping system with a unique password protected login.

#### **Trip Generators**

This map identifies origin and destination points for major destinations across each town that are likely to generate significant numbers of trips.

#### **Transport Network**

This map identifies major roads, railways, proposed cycling and walking routes and contours. ESCC traffic flow data indicates the busiest roads in each town that present the main challenges to cycling and walking, both along the road and at crossing points.

#### **Mesh Density Analysis**

This map identifies whether the grid of cycle routes is tighter (with more route choice) or looser (less extensive). London guidance suggests that in a properly joined-up cycle network, cyclists should not have to travel more than 400 metres to get to a parallel route of similar guality. Analysis of mesh density is undertaken with GIS software by dividing the area into cells and measuring the length of cycle network in each cell. For the East Sussex towns, we have adopted an average distance of 500 metres between routes as a starting point to develop the network. This means that each 500 x 500 metre cell should contain 1 km of cycle routes.

#### **Proposed Network**

This map integrates the existing network, current proposals and our own recommendations from our surveys, the origin and destination points, cycle flows and core walking zones and routes, to convert these into a network of primary and secondary routes and proposed measures. The primary routes are judged to be the most popular and strategic routes, linking residential areas with the key trip generators. Secondary routes can be locally important but are less strategic as they fill the gaps in the primary network.

The primary network has been tested against the Propensity to Cycle website, which takes the Travel to Work data from the 2011 Census to test various scenarios for increasing cycling. It is a useful tool but it only models a fraction of all journeys and does not include school, shopping or leisure trips.

## Designing for busy roads

Recently published guidance from Highways England (Interim Advice Note 195/16) is a useful starting point when considering whether the busier roads are likely to be suitable for cycling and walking.

This guidance suggests that the key threshold at all traffic speeds is an average annual daily traffic flow of 5,000 vehicles per day (vpd). At higher traffic flows, physical separation from motor vehicles is recommended.

Reducing traffic speed from 30mph to 20mph is clearly desirable, but if traffic flows cannot be reduced below 5,000 vpd, then physical separation

will still be required. In these situations it is tempting to accommodate cyclists on existing footways, but this is not acceptable if it means a reduced level of service for pedestrians.

Speed Limit	Average Annual Daily	Minimum Provision	
	Traffic (AADT)		
40+	All flows	Cycle Tracks	
30	0-5,000	Cycle Lanes	
	>5,000	Cycle Tracks	
	<2,500	Quiet Streets	
20	2,500-5,000	Cycle Lanes	
	>5,000	Cycle Tracks	

From Interim Advice Note 195/16

Sustrans recommends a minimum shared path width of 3.0 metres in an urban setting, with reduced widths acceptable in certain circumstances. The table below is taken from the Sustrans Design Manual, a handbook for cycle-friendly design.

On some roads it may not be possible to accommodate cycle lanes, cycle tracks or a shared path and the designer must consider other alternatives, such as closing the road to through traffic or finding a different route alignment.

Type of route	Minimum path width
Urban traffic free	3.0m on all main cycle routes, secondary cycle routes, major access paths and school links; wider on curves and steep gradients.
	2.5m possible on access routes and links with low use
Urban fringe traffic free	3.0m on all main cycle routes, major access paths and school links
	2.5m possible on lesser secondary cycle routes and access links
Rural traffic	2.5m on all main routes, major access paths and school links
free	2.0m possible on lesser routes and links

From Sustrans Design Manual

## Traffic restrictions

Experience from towns and cities across the UK and in Europe suggests that in addition to providing good quality infrastructure for walking and cycling, it is necessary to restrict motor vehicles so that active travel is the natural and obvious choice for short trips. This does not mean any lack of accessibility for motor vehicles, just that they may need to make longer trips than the equivalent journey on foot or by bike.

There are various ways that traffic can be restricted and the designer will need to consider the appropriate solution for each location. A number of suggested measures are listed below:

- Vehicle Restricted Areas (pedestrian zones)
- Traffic calming and 20mph zones to reduce vehicle speeds
- · Reduced availability of on-street and off-street parking
- Workplace Parking Levy
- Congestion charging
- Clean Air Zones

#### Filtered permeability

Filtered permeability gives pedestrians and cyclist accessibility and journey time advantages compared to other vehicles by exempting them from access restrictions that apply to motor traffic and by the creation of new connections that are available only to cyclists and pedestrians. Measures can include:

- cycle contraflows on one-way streets
- exemptions from road closures, point closures and banned turns
- permitting cycling in parks and open spaces
- traffic free paths such as links between cul-de sacs and public or permissive routes through private areas
- traffic cells, restricting through traffic in defined areas
- cycle parking situated closer to destinations than car parking

#### Recommended measures

A number of technical solutions are included in the brief text descriptions for each location and some of these are summarised in this section.

#### **Traffic calming**

Physical measures to reduce traffic speed can be useful in locations where the limit is regularly exceeded or there is a record of crashes. There may be objections from local residents, emergency services and bus operators. Extensive traffic calming is unlikely to be supported on major roads, other than for short lengths. Common vertical and horizontal features are illustrated below.

**Road humps** 



#### **Priority system - pinch point**



#### Informal road crossings

Where a footway alongside a main road crosses a side road, clear priority should be given to pedestrians. The most effective approach is to provide a clear, wide contrasting surface that is raised above carriageway level.

If this is not possible for reasons of available space or cost, flush dropped kerbs should be provided as a minimum, according to ESCC Dropped Kerb Policy, included within their Cycling and Walking Strategy.

#### Zebra crossings

Unsignalled 'priority' crossings for both pedestrians and cyclists are a standard part of the toolkit in many parts of continental Europe but are not authorised for use in the UK. Some local authorities have experimented with "parallel Zebras" where extra space is provided for cyclists. These are becoming increasingly common in London and an example from Canterbury is illustrated below.



Chaucer Road, Canterbury

#### 20mph speed limits

It is widely accepted that 20mph is much safer for all road users in urban areas and many towns across the UK have introduced 20mph as the default speed limit, particularly in residential areas. If collisions do occur, the risk of a fatality or serious injury is significantly reduce at 20mph compared with 30mph.

There are 60 local authorities in the current list of places implementing a community-wide 20mph default speed limit published by 20's Plenty for Us. In the South these include Brighton & Hove, Chichester and Portsmouth. Some towns in East Sussex already have 20mph zones, notably Lewes.

Studies show that a 20mph limit can improve traffic flows and road capacity in some situations, by reducing stop-start traffic and promoting a more even flow through urban streets.

Whilst East Sussex County Council does support schemes to reduce the speed to 20mph, these are delivered within specified areas and 20mph zones will need to be supported by traffic calming measures. These can be difficult to implement due to formal objections from the public and bus operators. They should not be introduced in isolation due to potential for rat-running on parallel routes.

#### Road closures

Point closures are a simple, cheap, effective and reversible way to remove traffic from streets. They can also reduce the need for more extensive traffic calming and are best implemented across a wider area to avoid traffic displacement onto parallel routes.

Very few of these schemes are implemented in East Sussex due to the legal processes around road closure and concerns of emergency services. There are some examples in the County, such as New Road in Lewes. They have been used extensively in London to create "traffic cells" so that through traffic is eliminated from residential neighbourhoods.



### Land Use Planning

The consideration of land use planning was an integral element of the audit work, as many towns and settlements will be accommodating further growth in housing and commercial development, in order to meet the Government targets for development in the South. We have not shown any development sites on our mapping, because these are subject to change and it is difficult to obtain an accurate picture for all towns. We have taken account of potential development sites in our network planning where this has been agreed and published in Local Plans.

There are some references to specific sites in the detailed route descriptions for each town. As a general principle, developers should make walking and cycling easy within their sites. They should also provide good quality connections to the existing walking and cycling network and proposed routes within this report. This is included as a policy within the ESCC Cycling and Walking Strategy.



#### Propensity to Cycle Tool

The aim of the PCT is to inform planning and investment decisions for cycling infrastructure by showing the existing and potential distribution of commuter cycle trips and therefore inform which investment locations could represent best value for money. PCT uses two key inputs:

- Census 2011 Origin and Destination commuting data (O-D data)
- Cycle Streets routing

The model estimates cycling potential adjusted for journey distance and hilliness as well as predicting the likely distribution of those trips using the Cycle Streets routing application.

The model can be applied to consider different scenarios such as: Gender Equality, where women cycle as frequently as men; Go Dutch, if cycling levels were the same as in the Netherlands; and, Government Target, where cycling levels meet the target for current government's aim for cycling (based on the Cycling Delivery Plan).

There are a number of limitations to this model which should be considered especially when making decisions based on the patterns shown. These limitations include the data only showing travel to work trips, therefore only covering a small proportion of all journeys. Travel to school, shopping and for leisure is not included. The data also misses out the minor stages of multi-stage commuter trips so cycle journeys to train stations and bus stops are not represented. Lastly the distribution of journeys is a prediction of the likely route taken based on the Cycle Streets routing algorithm and not the actual routes being used.

It is worth noting that whilst the model builds an assessment of cycling propensity, it does not segment potential users, or provide any insight into pedestrians. Although this model does provide planners with an overview to identify areas for appropriate investment for cycling trips to work, it does not provide further information on those potential cyclists and their personal attributes and behaviours to help design the most effective interventions.



In East Sussex we have used the "Go Dutch - Fast Routes" scenario to produce PCT maps for each town. The map above shows current levels of cycling to work, which are very low with the exception of some parts of Lewes and Eastbourne. The map includes Brighton and Hove, where the proportion of trips made by bike is significantly higher.

PCT is an open source transport planning system, part funded by the Department for Transport. It was designed to assist transport planners and policy makers to prioritise investments and interventions to promote cycling. More information is available from the PCT website:

https://www.pct.bike/m/?r=east-sussex







	KEY
ALCIST	EMPLOYMENT
	2011 Census Workzones Density of Employment (Jobs per Hectare)
	20 - 50
	50 +
	POPULATION
	2011 Population Data
	50 - 100
	100 - 200
	200 +
	TRIP GENERATORS
	Leisure
	Leisure or Sports Centre Services
	Hospital
	Police/Ambulence/GP
	Schools
	Secondary School
	Size is based on Pupil Numbers
	Administrative Boundary
STBOURNE RD A259	
	SUS <b>trans</b>
	PROJECT East Sussex Cycling & Walking Strategy
	TITLE NEWHAVEN PEACEHAVEN & SEAFORD TRIP GENERATORS AND LOCAL ATTRACTORS
	Drawn Checked Date Scale at A3 DL JF 17/4/2018 1:35,000
	ISSUED
1 2 km	DRAWING NUMBER REVISION 20204.PNS-SD-MAP-00-01 C

## **Description of the Town**

Peacehaven, Newhaven and Seaford are three coastal settlements situated between Brighton in the west and Eastbourne in the east. This is one of the County Council's key growth areas. Seaford is the largest in size with a population of 26,955 (2011) followed by Newhaven with 12,232 (2011) and Peacehaven with 14,067 (2011). Spatially Peacehaven and Seaford have typically seaside layouts spreading along the coastline with Newhaven divided by the River Ouse and characterised by a central industrial area with residential areas in the north east and south west. Peacehaven is completely residential with a handful of local amenities, whereas Seaford has a vibrant centre, more local facilities, access to rail and some industry. Seaford also attracts some tourism from its long promenade and beach front location. In comparison Newhaven is heavily centred on the port and related industries.

#### Transport

All three settlements are connected to the strategic road network by the A259 running east to west through all three with Newhaven connecting north to Lewes via the A26 and the Lewes Road. There are three rail stations , two Newhaven and one in Seaford with regular services to London and Brighton. The number 12 bus connects to Brighton and Eastbourne stopping regularly across each town and providing a 10/15 minute frequency service as well as a fast commuter service (12x) at peak times. There is also the number 14 bus services, providing access between Brighton and Peacehaven.

## **Planned Development**

Newhaven is marked for significant development with plans for the expansion and upgrade of the port and surrounding industrial estates, including a new port entrance road east of the existing B2109. 700 new homes are planned at harbour heights and the Marina over the coming years with money available to improve the town centre. This is currently blighted by a gyratory system that exhibits many of the issues commonly associated with this type of road layout.

An Enterprise Zone has been designated within Newhaven, which is a collaboration between the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership and Lewes District Council. The project aims to facilitate the economic regeneration of Newhaven and shift the town to a higher value economy over the next 25 years.

Newhaven Enterprise Zone officially commenced in April 2017. It covers approximately 79 hectares and is forecast to have the following benefits:

- Create 55,000m<sup>2</sup> of new commercial and employment floorspace
- Refurbish a further 15,000m<sup>2</sup> of commercial and employment floorspace
- Create / safeguard up to 2,000 jobs.

Encompassing eight key sites situated throughout the town, the Enterprise Zone will focus on higherend manufacturing encompassing the 'Clean, Green & Marine' sectors, building off Newhaven's historic strengths as a port town and gateway to the continent.

#### **Trip Generators**

Travel in Peacehaven is dominated by journeys to the surrounding settlements with Brighton making up a large proportion of commuter trips. The Meridian Centre, schools, coastal path, park and various small clusters of shops on the A259 make up the local destinations.

Newhaven's' major pole of attraction is centred around the bridge, the station and the retail area just east of the bridge with the port and industrial estates generating a large influx of external traffic.

In Seaford the town centre, seafront promenade and the cluster of schools along Sutton Avenue are the key local destinations with a few other trip generators scattered across the settlement.

Due to the small size of Peacehaven, Newhaven and Seaford journeys to the surrounding areas will feature heavily in peoples travel patterns.

## Air Quality Management Area Newhaven

The designated area incorporates Newhaven Town Centre, Southway, Northway and sections of the A259 Brighton Road, Lewes Road and the swing bridge.

An Air Quality Action Plan has been prepared to address the high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) which people are exposed to alongside the busy roads in the centre of Newhaven. Road transport is the main source of emissions relating to NO2, and diesel vehicles in stop - start traffic make the biggest contribution to this area of high emissions.

#### Action

Enable the use of sustainable travel choices through the delivery of transport infrastructure and initiatives. This is included in the plan and will be supported by the County Wide Cycling & Walking Strategy.



## Cycling and Walking in the area

All three settlements have good potential for large numbers of active travel users as distances between the centre and the outskirts are all less than 2.5km. Chain journeys using a combination of active travel and public transport also have a significant potential for growth across the settlements.

Despite this potential a number of town-wide barriers are present that will require significant political support and investment to overcome. These include:

- A lack of dedicated, continuous and joined up cycling and walking routes to key destinations including schools, employment centres and local amenities.
- Severance caused by the A259 in all three settlements due to a lack of both dedicated crossing facilities and provision to move along this key corridor.
- High levels of traffic, travelling at 30mph, within residential areas. This is most problematic in Seaford and Peacehaven.
- Low levels of service for pedestrians especially in Seaford and Newhaven town centres.
- A lack of high quality cycle parking at key destinations and especially around transport hubs such as the train station.



	0 - 2,500
_	2,500 - 5,000
	5,000 - 10,000
—	10,000 +
<b>e</b>	Railway Station
	Administrative Bound





## **Mesh Density Analysis**

The existing network comprises National Cycle Route 2 along the seafront which connects to Brighton moving West and Eastbourne moving East.

Our recommended network combines the existing routes and current proposals, along with recommended routes we have surveyed in all areas of the Borough. The more green cells shown on each map, the denser the cycle network in those areas. There remain some areas with limited coverage, but most are on the periphery.

The North section of Seaford will be covered by an area wide traffic management scheme which will improve conditons and should make this area appealing for both cycling and walking.







## 200: South Coast Road (A259) Peacehaven

#### **Route description**

Representing the spine route for Peacehaven and the main access corridor for the settlement, the majority of both short and longer journeys will involve this link. It also provides the main interface with public transport including buses to Brighton and the rail station in Newhaven.

The A259 South Coast Road is a busy and congested corridor and the major source of severance for mobility in Peacehaven. Providing a high quality link that allows safe movement both along and across this road will significantly improve Peacehaven for active travel.

The route is 5.5km and links to routes 300 and 301 for access to Centenary Park, Meridian centre and residential areas in the north of the settlement as well as the National Cycle Route (NCN) 2 for access to Saltdean, Brighton and Newhaven.

#### Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders with a consensus favouring this over the existing Arundel Road alignment of the NCN.

# 200.1 South Coast Road through Peacehaven

#### **Existing conditions**

A shared use footway coming in from Brighton in the west extends as far as Ambleside Avenue. The NCN moves inland at this point via a two stage Toucan crossing with no further provision along the rest of the South Coast Road through Peacehaven.

The existing road is a wide single carriageway high street with one traffic lane in each direction which runs through the town of Peacehaven. The road is fronted by a mix of residential, commercial and retail properties.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

On road conditions for cyclists are difficult with high volumes of traffic at 10,000+ vehicles per day (vpd) and a high proportion of large vehicles.

The layout of the junctions with Telscombe Cliffs Way and Sutton Avenue create collision risk and represent the main barrier along this link. Fluctuating road widths, parking, bus stops and refuge crossings create conflict forcing cyclists to move between primary and secondary positions.

The existing shared provision lacks width and creates conflict between users. The transition on and off-carriageway is substandard.

Footway widths and extent are good although a lack of priority for pedestrians at side roads, short green times at crossings and a generally poor streetscape make for a poor walking environment.

#### Recommendations

- 200.1.1 Widen shared use provision to meet current DfT standards of 4m preferred, 3m minimum. Improve transition from onroad to off-road and ensure it safely and intuitively ties in with new east/west route.
- 200.1.2 Cycle proof key junction. At the signal junction tighten geometry, provide an early release for cyclists and remove the left slip lane. Change the roundabout to a compact layout with single lane entries.
- 200.1.3 Install an east/west cycle facility along length of the road. Provision might include a stepped track on either side created from the existing footway space, road narrowing and a rationalising of parking.
- 200.1.4 Review and upgrade crossings to wide single stage toucans or parallel zebras. Remove or upgrade refuge islands. Allow cycle access through dead end side roads linking to crossings in key locations.
- 200.1.5 Provide public realm improvements were there are clusters of shop frontages. and combine with visual and physical traffic calming. Install blended footways that give cyclists and pedestrians priority over side roads.

There is an existing scheme planned for the South Coast Road aimed at improving this corridor for sustainable transport. Sustrans would strongly argue that any planned improvements should aim to provide a good level of service for both pedestrians and cyclists that meets current standards such as the DMRB IAN/195. Such provision will make this link walkable and cyclable by a range of users of different ages and abilities and will go some way to help mitigate the negative issues caused by high traffic volumes along this road.

21



East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

June 2019







## 200.2 Peacehaven to Newhaven

#### **Existing conditions**

A shared use footway on the north side moves east linking to a toucan crossing at the edge of Newhaven.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

The off-carriageway provision is below DfT standards and lacks priority at side roads creating a risk of collision from turning vehicles.

On road conditions are particularly difficult in this location with vehicle speeds and driver behaviour being flagged as a major issue by stakeholders.

200.2.1	Upgrade crossing and remove refuge island to improve links to secondary
	routes.
200.2.2	Install blended footways giving cyclists
	and pedestrians priority over side roads

- 200.2.3 Widen shared use through road narrowing and reduce speeds by removing centre line.
- 200.2.4 Further investigate location for cycle and walking improvements.







## **300: Peacehaven Loop**

#### **Route description**

Provides the primary North - South circuit for Peacehaven linking route 200 to all the major trip generators and residential areas in the settlement. The route is 4.2km long and links up routes 201,202 ,203 ,204 and 301 and will facilitate trips throughout Peacehavens residential areas. It is also intended to provide two safe priority crossings of the South Coast Road (A259).

#### Background

Local stakeholders identified the need for a North - South link within Peacehaven but with various alignments.

#### The A259 to Glynn Road 300.1 **Existing conditions**

Telscombe Cliffs Way has moderate levels of local traffic and Ambleside Avenue has four bus services. There is currently no cycle provision although there are wide verges along significant sections.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

The junction of the A259 and Telscombe Cliff Way is the major barrier.

- 300.1.1 Improve signal junction. Simplify layout, tighten radii, install single stage pedestrian crossings and separate cycle movements. Extend the stepped track cycle provision adopted along the A259 up to the junction with St Peters Avenue and along Ambleside Avenue.
- 300.1.2 St Peters Avenue, Ambleside Avenue and Heathy Brow require further investigation to assess appropriate provision. This might involve either a combination of junction treatments and traffic calming or cycle provision that utilises the space in the verge.
- 300.1.3 Convert dead end to filtered permeability including urban realm improvements.







## 300.2 Glynn Road to The A259

#### **Existing conditions**

A traffic-free section between Glynn and Firle Road links together a number of quiet residential streets with limited through traffic.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

The main barrier on this section is where it intersects busier roads including Greenwich Way and Newton Road which see high levels of local traffic and the A259 with 10,000+ vpd.

- 300.2.1 Improve interchange between on and off-road sections. Replace railings with bollards and improve public realm.
- 300.2.2 Make Newton Road one way retaining access but freeing up space for a segregated cycle track linking to a parallel zebra crossing of Greenwich Way and Arundel Road.
- 300.2.3 Engage school and church to design slow streets measures on Edith Avenue. Install filtered permeability access on Edith Avenue either side of the A259. Install a Parallel Zebra crossing by relocating parking and narrowing the carriageway.













## **Peacehaven Secondary Routes**

#### 201: Coastal Path **Brief Overview**

Identified by stakeholders as a leisure route it links up residential streets and provides a quiet alternative to the South Coast Road. The route is 3km long with the majority existing only as an unsealed dirt track. Any investment would be at significant risk of damage by cliff subsidence in the long term.

#### Recommendations

201.1.1

201.1.1	Install 3-4m shared use sealed path
	across unmade sections.
201.1.2	Improve unmade road sections.
201.1.3	Add small scale public realm
	improvements that increase the leisure
	quality of route.
201.1.4	Install filtered permeability and interface
	with east- west primary route



Install shared-use path (Go

## 202: Arundel Road (NCN 2)

#### **Brief Overview**

This existing NCN route uses a quiet alternative to the South Coast Road although in practice this is narrow and used as a rat run creating conflict as highlighted by stakeholders.

The route is 2.5km long consisting of 30mph residential streets with horizontal traffic calming that is ineffective and creates pinch points.

#### **Recommendations**

- Adopt area based approach installing traffic management at strategic points to reduce traffic volumes and speed. This will create quiet local access only streets and will push traffic to the A259. Tighten corner radii of side roads.
- 202.1.1 Remove horizontal traffic calming and create 20mph zone.
- 202.1.2 Investigate junction for cycling and walking improvements.





## 203: Firle Road

#### **Brief Overview**

A short 500m link that joins up to route 300 at either end servicing residential streets and providing safe connections at the junctions for onward travel.

A quiet residential street with 30mph limit and no traffic calming.

#### Recommendations

- 203.1.1 Table junction and change priority.
- 203.1.2 Create 20mph zone and add physical traffic calming if necessary.
- 203.1.3 Install filtered permeability and Parallel Zebra crossing of Ambleside Avenue to link to route 300.





![](_page_18_Picture_12.jpeg)

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

June 2019

![](_page_18_Picture_15.jpeg)

## 204: Saltdean – Peacehaven – Southease **Brief Overview**

An external link in the north linking Peacehaven to Saltdean in the west and to Southease via the Egrets Way. The majority of this route does not yet exist consisting of either dirt track or small unmade roads.

An existing feasibility study has been carried out on the eastern link which identified land issues as a barrier to delivery. Stakeholders highlighted this route as nice to have rather than an essential part of the network although upgrades to the sections within Peacehaven will improve access and could be upgraded separately.

- 204.1.1 Undertake feasibility study for west section.
- 204.1.2 Progress feasibility study aimed at resolving outstanding issues.

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 205: Peacehaven - Newhaven via The Highway

#### **Brief Overview**

A 1.2km stretch of the existing NCN route 2 that provides a guiet alternative to the A259 linking to Newhaven. Gradient, poor surface quality, no street lights, no speed restrictions and the cycle dismount connection to Gibbon Road impact the utility of this route. Stakeholders relegated this to a secondary link based on these negative factors.

#### **Recommendations**

- 205.1.1 Provide safe connections to facilities on the A259.
- 205.1.2 Upgrade surface and introduce speed limit
- 205.1.3 Investigate feasibility of widening access to Gibbon Road to accommodate 3.5m - 4m shared use path and a transition to carriageway towards Newhaven.

## 301: Piddinghoe Avenue

## **Brief Overview**

A 1.5km link from the A259 to the main recreation facility in Peacehaven. This leisure facility is also considered a destination outside Peacehaven therefore it is important both as a leisure route and as a utility link to the residential areas in North Peacehaven. The link is supported by local stakeholders and connects to the proposed housing development at the east end of Firle Road

The route does not currently exist except for the section through the park.

## **Recommendations**

- 301.1.1 Install filtered permeability on Piddinghoe Avenue on both north and south sides of the A259. Install parallel zebra crossing and urban realm improvements. Move car park entrance to the A259.
- 301.1.2 Remove mini-roundabout, table junction and change priority.
- 301.1.3 Leverage developer money to create shared-use connection between park and one of the residential streets south of Firle Road.

![](_page_19_Picture_20.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_22.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_23.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

## 210: Newhaven East/West Corridor

#### **Route description**

A primary route for journeys both within Newhaven and as part of longer journeys to surrounding settlements it runs east/west for 2.5km and joins up all other routes in the town (310, 311, 312, 221).

From the west the route uses two quieter alternatives to the Brighton Road, runs in to the centre and over the Swing Bridge moving east on NCN2. Brighton Road would be the preferred option but width limitations and traffic volumes make this impractical and a feasibility study should be carried out to rule this option out.

The route takes in most major destinations including residential areas, Seahaven Academy, Newhaven Town station, the Island and the major retail and industrial estate on the east side of the river. Provision along the link is inconsistent and patchy for both cycling and walking.

#### Background

Identified by all stakeholders as the primary movement corridor with a consensus that current conditions are poor for all users especially at the gyratory and to the east of the bridge. The town centre is marked for redevelopment and current traffic flows highlighted as an air pollution issue requiring action.

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### 210.1 Brighton Road – Lewes Road via Valley Road

#### **Existing conditions**

From the Toucan crossing of Brighton Road an unsealed path links through to Valley Road. The length of Valley Road is quiet and residential with no through traffic.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

The unmade section means the link is unsuitable for all types of bike.

The mini roundabout and the section of Lewes Road are a barrier for cycling due to speed and volume of traffic. At peak times the uncontrolled crossing becomes difficult to use and narrow footways create low pedestrian comfort levels despite wide grass verges.

#### Recommendations

- 210.1.1 Upgrade to sealed shared use path of adequate width.
- 210.1.2 Create 20mph zone throughout residential area.
- Treat mini roundabout to slow speeds. 210.1.3 Remove refuge crossing and change traffic island south to a priority cycle and pedestrian crossing. Run a wide shared use path from Valley Road to Elphick Road.
- 210.1.4 Redesign side road junction by tightening geometry, limiting parking and providing a safe cycle transition from off to on road. Improve public realm with planting.

![](_page_21_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_14.jpeg)

## 210.2 Upper Valley Road – The Town centre via Church Hill

#### **Existing conditions**

From the toucan crossing of Brighton Road rising steeply to the Public Right of Way (PROW) path through Meeching Down and dropping down Church Hill to the gyratory via Harbour Primary School.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

The gradient is very challenging along the length of Church Hill.

- 210.2.1 Upgrade PROW to good quality cycle and walking link.
- 210.2.2 Improve pedestrian environment and street scape around the school. Investigate options for other alignments through the Down.

![](_page_21_Picture_26.jpeg)

# 210.3 North and South Way (Newhaven Gyratory)

#### **Existing conditions**

A two lane gyratory circling the town centre with five at grade crossings and two subways.

Short stretches of line segregated cycle provision access the two subways at South Road and Elphick Road.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

The gyratory is a major source of severance cited by stakeholders as a poor environment for all users. It represents the primary obstacle to active travel in the area.

Issues created by this layout are reflected in collision statistics with intimidating on road conditions for cyclists and a lack of safe easy access for pedestrians into and across the town centre.

Multi-stage crossings, railings, lack of priority and vehicle speed and volume create an intimidating street scape that prioritises motor traffic.

Cycle parking provision across the town centre and key local destinations such as the train station is limited and poor in quality.

#### Recommendations

- 210.3.1 Investigate gyratory removal options and a return to two way working on North Way.
- 210.3.2 Downgrade South Way to a local road coupled with street scape improvements that promote pedestrian access.
- 210.3.3 Upgrade all at grade crossings.
- 210.3.4 Improve cycle and pedestrian access across North Way to the Island.

![](_page_22_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_15.jpeg)

### 210.4 Newhaven Swing Bridge -Mount Pleasant Roundabout Existing conditions

Cyclists are required to dismount on the bridge and moving east shared and line segregated provision skirts the three junctions. Other than two signal crossings at either end all road crossings are informal.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

A high mix of heavy vehicle traffic to the port and industrial estate

Existing provision requiring sharing is substandard in terms of width.

Multiple heavily used side roads create risk from turning vehicles.

Road geometry including the large roundabouts, mini roundabout and side road entrances allow vehicles to move at speed. Informal crossings are difficult to negotiate for both cyclists and pedestrians representing a significant safety and comfort issue.

- 210.4.1 Investigate options for improved cycle and pedestrian access across bridge to provide route continuity. Provide safe access to the UTC Harbourside.
  210.4.2 Provide pedestrian and cycle priority at side road crossings along route.
- 210.4.3 Widen existing shared path on both sides of road and improve crossings.

![](_page_22_Picture_28.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_29.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_30.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

.

## 310: Egrets Way

#### Route description

Identified by all stakeholders as a key 6km link between Newhaven - Piddinghoe - Southease and Lewes with good potential for utility and leisure trips. The route joins up with 300, 204 and the South Downs Way. Existing provision runs to the outskirts of Lewes where a public footpath continues on the riverside flood defences as far as Rodmell with some existing sections south of this. The route is currently incomplete but under development.

#### Background

The Egrets Way is the name given to the proposed riverside path between Newhaven and Lewes. It has been developed in stages over the last few years and a local group, the Ouse Valley Cycle Network, is leading the development of the route.

#### Recommendations

- 310.1.1 Improve surface of riverside path for shared use.
- 21

![](_page_23_Picture_9.jpeg)

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2017 Ordnance Survey 0100031673

## **Newhaven Secondary Routes**

## 211: Gibbon Road & Court Farm Road to the Swing Bridge

#### **Brief Overview**

A 2.5km route that is part of NCN2 with offcarriageway provision from the Swing Bridge to the junction with Fort Road where the route joins the road. The route links residential areas, the Seahaven Academy and the new housing development at Harbour Heights to the town centre and Peacehaven in the west. Negative factors include the gradient, the mini-roundabout and the conflict arising from a mix of driver behaviour and the width on Gibbon Road. All stakeholders allocated this as a secondary route based on these negative factors.

#### **Recommendations**

211.1.1A/	3 Creat	e
	20mph zone through traffic calming ar	۱d
	enforcement on Gibbon Road and Cou	urt
	Farm Road. Limit parking on narrow	
	sections.	
211.1.2	Remove mini-roundabout, table junction	on
	and change priority.	
211 1 3	Investigate public realm improvements	2

211.1.3 Investigate public realm improvements to prioritise pedestrians along waterfront section.

![](_page_23_Picture_20.jpeg)

EasE8stsSussexCovcDyclogund WalkingStrategyeRetenhaven Seaford

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_4.jpeg)

Dentor

#### 311: A259 to Denton **Brief Overview**

A 2km route linking Denton, Paradise Park and Denton Primary school into the wider network. Stakeholders all identified the need for a secondary link in this area.

Both Avis Road and New Road serve the same vehicle movement so there may be scope for limiting through traffic on Avis Road pushing it to the A road instead.

#### **Recommendations**

- 311.1.1 Install two way cycle track on east side Avis Road and improve footway. Remove road centre line and narrow carriageway to calm traffic and provide more verge width.
- 311.1.2 Provide pedestrian and cycle priority at side road crossings along the route and tighten geometry (Denton Road, Avis Way and Iveagh Crescent).
- 311.1.3 Upgrade crossing to a parallel zebra and reduce speed limit north to 30mph. Provide transition to on-road at Avis Way or continue two way track if feasible.
- 311.1.4 Create 20mph zone through traffic calming and enforcement with cycle lane and parking restrictions on uphill section.

## 312: Railway Road **Brief Overview**

Railway Road is currently the main port access road although this will change with the opening of a new road link just to the east which should take the majority of port traffic.

## **Recommendations**

- 312.1.1 Once new port road is open downgrade this road and make it local access only.
- 312.1.2 Create 20mph zone through traffic calming and enforcement

Lank

![](_page_24_Picture_20.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_22.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 220: Seaford East West Corridor

#### **Route description**

The A259 through Seaford is the main access to the town carrying the bulk of the traffic and representing the main barrier to walking and cycling. Addressing this has huge potential to tap into suppressed demand for active travel and to promote walking and cycling as a stage of longer trips. There are currently few facilities along this corridor.

A 5.5km east - west link along this corridor provides the primary route from residential areas throughout the town connecting directly to the town centre, Seaford Station, the Downs Leisure Centre. It links up routes 320, 321, 322 and 221 for travel north as well as routes 230, 231,323, 324, 325 & 326 for connections south to the Seafront, Bishopstone Station and the cluster of schools on Sutton Avenue.

High volumes, high speeds and a high proportion of large vehicles means segregated provision is the appropriate intervention on carriageway according to recent DfT standards. For walking, improved crossing points as well as public realm improvements and the widening of footways are the main improvements

#### Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders.

As well as being the key utility route it also gives access via NCN2 to both the Ouse Estuary Nature Reserve in the west and Seven Sisters Country Park to the east.

## 220.1 A259 Ouse Estuary Nature Reserve – Belgrave Road

#### **Existing conditions**

Shared use provision from Newhaven runs to Marine Parade then ends turning off to the Seafront.

National speed limit ends before the junction with Beacon Road becoming 30pmh beyond this point.

There are three uncontrolled refuge crossings on this seciton.

The footway ends at Hill Rise becoming a single dirt track on the south side of the Buckle Bypass to Beacon Road.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

On road conditions are extremely challenging and unsafe with a high risk of serious injury due to volume and speed of traffic.

Pedestrian proximity to high speed, high volume traffic with no buffer feels unsafe.

Lack of priority at crossings creates huge severance making crossing difficult at peak times.

The shared facility is below DfT standards for such provision adjacent to a 60mph road.

Buckle Bypass track doesn't allow passing in both directions.

#### Recommendations

- 220.1.1 Create Greenway management plan with ecologists input for off-road section to improve path for users and nature.
- 220.1.2 Reduce speed limit to 40mph east of Tidemills car park. Install min 500mm buffer between path and road and increase shared path width. Add cycle parking next to bus stops and increase based on demand.

#### 220.1.3A/B

Upgrade

- to a single stage wide toucan crossing with induction loops. Tighten geometry of side roads (Bishopstone/Hill Rise/Marine Parade). Install shared-use path from Marine Drive and Hill Rise to crossings. Install parallel zebra crossing of Marine Road.
- 220.1.4 Install 3-4m wide shared use path in the verge on south side of Buckle Bypass and improve access to Hawth Hill.
- 220.1.5 Review crossings adding a Toucan on the key desire line. Tighten geometry of side roads (Beacon Road/Claremont Road) and extend shared-use provision on the south side of Buckle Bypass to Belgrave Road. Install shared-use path from Beacon Road to Belgrave Road. Give pedestrians and cyclist priority treatments across side roads. Investigate public realm improvements to local shopping parade.

![](_page_26_Picture_20.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_22.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_23.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_26.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_27.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_28.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### 220.2 A259 Belgrave Road – Avondale Road

#### **Existing conditions**

Claremont Road is wide with a street width of 16 m with small variations. There are limited restrictions on parking except around side roads and a small section of cut away parking. East of the station, full parking restrictions exist. Station Approach runs up to a four arm mini roundabout east of which is the main high street extending to Avondale Road. There are three signal crossings along this section.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

Footway provision is good although pedestrians lack priority at side roads

Pinch points are created by traffic islands combined with careless driver behaviour creates conflict. Side road geometies allow vehicles to negotiate junctions at speed.

The multi-lane mini roundabout (Station Approach/ Clinton Place) is a major barrier and was cited by stakeholders as a poor environment for all users and featured in most top barrier lists. The safety record heavily reflects the poor utility of this junction and section of road for walking and cycling.

#### **Recommendations**

- Install stepped cycle tracks on either side 220.2.1 of road between Belgrave Road and the station car park. Narrow carriageway, remove refuge islands and accommodate parking where feasible. Add side road treatments that prioritise pedestrians.
- 220.2.2 Install cycle hub at station with safe access. Reconfigure street space on Station Approach including the bus stop, taxi rank and station parking. Create a slow street environment where cyclists can use the road. Open access on southern side of station so cyclists can avoid issues on Station Approach.
- Redesign mini roundabout to allow safe 220.2.3 movement in all directions for pedestrians and cyclists by limiting vehicle speeds and simplifying user interactions.
- Investigate urban realm improvements 220.2.4 that significantly reduce speed and prioritise pedestrians crossing. Create 20mph zone and add blended side road crossings.

![](_page_27_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_16.jpeg)

## 220.3 A259 Avondale Road – Arundel Road

#### **Existing conditions**

There are two refuge crossings and one signal crossing along this length andparking restrictions from Avondale to Gildrege Road.

A wide 12 to13m street that only falls below this either side of the signal crossing east of Southdown Road.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

There are high traffic volumes with a high proportion of large vehicles. Conditions are difficult during both peak and non-peak periods.

There is a lack of priority crossing points for cyclists and pedestrians.

#### Recommendations

- 220.3.1 Install stepped cycle tracks on either side of road from Avondale Road east. Narrow carriageway, remove refuge islands and restrict parking along length of Sutton Road.
- 220.3.2 Install blended side road crossings that prioritise pedestrians.
- 220.3.3 Explore options for extending safe cycle provision through narrow section. Upgrade crossing to a Toucan.

![](_page_28_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_12.jpeg)

# 220.4 A259 Avondale Road – Exceat Bridge

#### **Existing conditions**

There is a three arm mini roundabout. One signal and one refuge crossing along this section.

Parking restrictions from Avondale to Gildrege Road.

It is a wide 16m with limited variation.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

There are high traffic volumes with a high proportion of large vehicles and long uninterrupted sections of road that allow vehicles to travel at speed.

There is a lack of priority crossing points for cyclists and pedestrians.

#### Recommendations

220.4.1	Provide cycle provision and improved
	pedestrian facilities at junction.
220.4.2	Install stepped cycle tracks on either side
	of road. Restrict parking along length of
	Eastbourne Road to the edge of Seaford.
220.4.3	Treat side roads, tighten geometry
	blended crossings of minor residential
	roads.

220.4.4 Investigate options for two way track within highway boundary from Seaford to Exceat Bridge.

![](_page_28_Picture_27.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_28.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_29.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 230: The Station – A259 via Sutton Avenue

#### Route description

The primary east – west link in the south of the town. It is 2km long and joins up the station and town centre to residential areas, four schools and the college. It links to routes 325 and 326 for access to the seafront and routes 323 and 324 for journeys north.

#### Background

The route was highlighted by all stakeholders as a primary link.

The route runs parallel to the NCN but serves more destinations making it a better utility route.

## 230.1 The Station – Southdown Road

#### **Existing conditions**

One way street with on street public parking limited by time and duration along Church Street and South Street. Moving east Steyne Road is wide with restricted parking and 20mph limits from Cricketfield Road onwards. Seaford Head School has two zebra crossings with good visibility.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

Sections lack footway on both sides and limited footway widths on Church Street and South Street users can't pass in both directions.

Driver behaviour, a lack of physical traffic calming and parking on Steyne Road create conflict between users..

Footway widths accessing zebra and in front of the school are substandard.

The junction with Southdown Road allows vehicles to negotiate at speed.

#### Recommendations

- 230.1.1 Allow contraflow cycling and rationalise parking to increase space for pedestrians as required. Install level shared surface along Church Street to the junction with the High Street to prioritise pedestrians. Include urban realm improvements in front of active frontages.
- 230.1.2 Prohibit vehicles turning right onto Steyne Road and install right turn refuge for cyclists moving west. Extend 20mph zone with more self-enforcing traffic calming measures along length of Steyne Road/ Pelham Road.
- 230.1.3 Add physical traffic calming measures, blended side road crossings, parking restrictions in front of the school and college and street scene improvements including footway widening to promote a slow speed environment allowing students to cross easily.
- 230.1.4 Table junction, simplify layout, remove refuge crossing and tighten geometry.

![](_page_30_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_15.jpeg)

# 230.2 Sutton Avenue Existing conditions

This is a residential street with moderate traffic levels, a 20mph speed limit and limited traffic calming with two build outs that do not limit twoway motor traffic.

There are parking restrictions around junctions and in front of schools, two zebra crossings and a number of refuge crossings.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

There are long uninterrupted sections of road that allows vehicles to travel at speed.

There is a lack of priority crossing points for cyclists and pedestrians.

Traffic islands create pinch points creating conflict for cyclists.

The mini-roundabouts are the major barrier and safety issue for cyclists. Lack of priority crossings is the main issue for pedestrians especially with the number of school age users.

#### Recommendations

230.2	Add physical traffic calming along length and review all crossings. Install blended crossings over side roads. Narrow road, restrict parking and widen footway where appropriate.
230.2.1	Remove roundabout, table junction and switch priority to North/South, providing informal crossings set back on each arm
230.2.2	Engage school in street redesign project to create safe slow street environment.
230.2.3	Investigate options for roundabout removal or upgrade to safer continental style with vertical traffic calming and pedestrian priority crossings.
230.2.4	Remove roundabout, tighten geometry,table junction and give priority

to minor road.

![](_page_30_Picture_29.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_30.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 320: Seaford Northern Loop

#### **Route description**

This primary link for travel through the residential areas of North Seaford. The route includes Belgrade Road and parts of Lexden Road, Vale Road and Alfriston Road connecting to the A259 at both ends. It is 3km long and joins up routes 321, 221 and 222. It provides access to four schools and the industrial estate.

#### Background

The route was supported by all local stakeholders, although opinions on alignment varied.

#### Area Based Approach

An area based approach is being suggested here as the appropriate strategy for creating a good environment for cycling and walking in the northern part of Seaford. This includes route 320 as well as the area shown on the map in green.

Through installing traffic management measures at strategic points such as filtered permeability closures, volume, speed and the type of motor traffic will be restricted to local access only. This will create a guiet residential area with good on road conditions for cycling and walking. Existing through traffic should be reassigned to the A259.

## 320.1 Belgrave Road – Alfriston Road Existing conditions

A collection of residential streets with moderate traffic levels, 30mph speed limits and no traffic calming.

There are no pedestrian crossing facilities along streets.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

Long uninterrupted sections of road allow vehicles to travel at speed on Belgrade Road and Vale Road. Local rat running traffic, probably avoiding the A259, creates conflict and uncomfortable road conditions as do pinch points created by parked vehicles. This is reflected in collision statistics for Belgrade Road.

The mini-roundabout at the junction with Firle Road is a significant barrier as is the road layout at the junction with Alfriston Road. There is a lack of footway along portions of the north side of Belgrade Road.

#### Recommendations

- 320.1.1 Remove mini-roundabout, table junction and switch priority to North/South, providing priority crossings set back on each arm.
- 320.1.2 Tighten corner radii, raise junction and narrow carriageway.
- 320.1.3 Investigate public realm improvements to local shopping parade.
- 320.1.4 Table junction and tighten radii.
- 320.1.5 Install physical traffic calming.
- 320.1.6 Rationalise and simplify junction layout. Tighten geometry and table junction. Upgrade zebra to a parallel crossing and run share-use path from Vale Road to the crossing.

June 2019

![](_page_32_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_14.jpeg)

## 320.2 Alfriston Road – A259 Existing conditions

This is a busy link with 5000+ vehicles per day, a 30mph speed limit and no traffic calming.

Limited off street public parking and street widths of 13m+.

#### Barriers to walking and cycling

Traffic volume and a lack of continuous footways are the major barrier to walking and cycling.

- 320.2.1 Install stepped cycle tracks on either side of road from the Vale Road crossing to the A259. Rationalise parking to make space and treat side roads to slow speed and prioritise pedestrians. Remove pinch-point at uncontrolled refuge crossing.
  320.2.2 Install Parallel Zebra crossing at
- shops and investigate public realm improvements to parade.

![](_page_32_Picture_25.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_26.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_27.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Seaford Secondary Routes**

### 221: Town Centre – Lexdon Road via Blatchington Road and Vale Road **Brief Overview**

A useful 1km route from the town centre and train station to residential areas in the north east and onward access to Cradle Hill Primary School and Cradle industrial estate. The route links to 220, 320 and 321. The junction with Avondale Road is the major barrier on this alignment.

#### **Recommendations**

- 221.1.1 Investigate adding contra-flow cycling on either Blatchington Road or Broad Street. At pinch points widen by rationalising parking.
- 221.1.2 Investigate options to allow safer access through junction for cycling and walking. 221.1.3 Table junction and tighten geometry.
- 221.1.4 Create 20mph zone through traffic
  - calming and enforcement on Sutton Drove and Vale Road. Limit parking on narrow sections.

![](_page_33_Picture_10.jpeg)

## 222: Alfriston Road - South Downs

#### **Brief Overview**

A 700m secondary link facilitating leisure trips into the South Downs as well as access to the primary network via route 320. Alfriston Road is a busy road with 5000+ vehicles per day, a 30mph speed limit that becomes national speed limit at the edge of Seaford and no traffic calming making on road conditions difficult.

- 222.1.1 Link into the new Parallel Zebra crossing of Alfriston Road west of the junction, provide priority for pedestrian and cyclists over Cradle Hill Road and investigate feasibility of installing a wide shared use provision on the north side of the road into the South Downs as far as Alfriston.
- Install a Parallel Zebra crossing for access 222.1.2 to Hillside Avenue and provide a shared facility on the south side for access to Alfriston Park.

![](_page_33_Picture_20.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

Brief Overview				
Seafront				
231: Marine – E	xceat	Bridge	via Sea	aford

The existing NCN route 2 alignment running the length of the seafront and graded here as secondary as it misses many of the key destinations in Seaford however it still provides a primary leisure route. It is 7km long and comprised of a mix of on and off-carriageway provision becoming an unsurfaced single track path east of Seaford. Linking to routes 220 in the east and west as well as routes 323, 324 & 325.

#### **Recommendations**

231.1.1	Widen shared use provision to meet
	current DfT standards of 3-4m, depending
	on likely usage. Link into new Parallel
	Zebra crossing of Marine Parade.
231.1.2	Make route along seafront continuous.
231.1.3	Redesign section of seafront to improve
	public realm for pedestrians. Install
	crossings on desire lines and improve
	access through sea wall to promenade.
231.1.4	In the short term realign route via
	Cricketfield Road because parts of Cliff
	Gardens are unsurfaced, in future improve
	provision along the Esplanade and Cliff
	Gardens.
231.1.5	Create 20mph zone through traffic
	calming between College Road and
	Chyngton Lane.
231.1.6	Install surfaced shared use path along one
	side of Chyngton Lane.
231.1.7	Improve surface of public footpath across
	chalk grassland for shared use.

![](_page_34_Picture_6.jpeg)

June 2019

![](_page_34_Picture_10.jpeg)

## 321: Town Centre - Belgrave Road via Avondale Road and Blatchington Hill

#### **Brief Overview**

A short 600m north – south link that most significantly provides a safe interchange for access to the improved cycle and waling provision along the A259 (route 220).

- 321.1.1 Investigate options to improve the road layout in this location. Measures might include closing the junction arm east of the war memorial, simplifying the road layout and tightening the geometry then running a cycle track through the closed arm up to a Parallel Zebra crossing of the A259.
- 321.2.2 Install physical traffic calming along Avondale Road and Blatchington Hill. Install blended crossings over side roads.
- Investigate options to allow safer access 321.2.3 through junction for cycling and walking.

![](_page_34_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 322: A259 – Alfriston Road via Walmer Road

#### **Brief Overview**

Links residential areas in the north east into routes 220 and 222 for onward travel as well as passing a recreation ground and Chyngton School.

A collection of residential streets with moderate traffic levels, 30mph speed limits and no traffic calming.

#### **Recommendations**

322.1 Adopt area based approach installing traffic management at strategic points to reduce traffic volumes and speed creating quiet local access only streets. Push traffic to the A259. Tighten corner radii of side roads.

323: Town Centre - Seafront via Dane Road and The Causeway

#### **Brief Overview**

The town centre shops and the links to the sea front from the station form the focal point of Seaford and improvements here would deliver significantly benefits. Currently traffic management is limited to a set of one way streets mostly lined with a significant amount of public parking. Pedestrianisation was highlighted by most stakeholders as a top improvement to conditions for cycling and walking in Seaford. The route links to routes 220, 230 and 231.

![](_page_35_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_12.jpeg)

#### **Recommendations**

- 323.1.1 Investigate feasibility of pedestrianising parts of Broad Street, Place Lane and the High Street. Local stakeholders should be heavily engaged as part of this process. Allow time dependent cycle, freight delivery and permit holder access.
- Allow contra flow cycling on small 323.1.2 section of the High Street. Remove mini roundabout, table junction and give priority to north – south movements. Improve pedestrian crossing at junction.
- Make the Causeway one way with contra 323.1.3 flow cycling linking into a Parallel Zebra crossing of the Esplanade.
- 323.1.4 Install physical traffic calming and treat junctions at either end. Add blended side crossings to give pedestrians priority.
- Install Zebra crossing on west side of 323.1.5 junction and remove section of wall to provide direct cycle access through junction to the Promenade.

![](_page_35_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_22.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 324: Southdown Road

#### **Brief Overview**

A short 700m north – south route joining up 220, 230, 231 and providing access from residential areas to the cluster of schools along Sutton Avenue and a signal crossing of Sutton Road.

#### Recommendations

- 324.1.1 Improve junction and signal crossing for cycling and walking.
- 324.1.2 Install physical traffic calming and 20mph speed limits.

## 325: Arundel Road

### **Brief Overview**

Another short 700m north – south route that links to Seaford Head School, The Downs Leisure Centre and joins up with routes 220, 230 and 231.

A residential street with low traffic levels, 20mph speed limits in front of the school and no traffic calming.

- 325.1.1 Adopt area based approach installing traffic management at a strategic point to reduce traffic volumes and speed creating quiet local access only streets. Push traffic to the A259. Tighten corner radii of side roads and extend 20mph across link.
- 325.1.2 Engage school to design slow streets measures and install dedicated crossing facility for pedestrians.

![](_page_36_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_19.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Table of recommendations

The tables below summarise all the recommended interventions which are itemised in the descriptions of each route. A brief description of each item is provided, along with a very broad assessment of priority and cost.

#### Priority

High = safety critical and essential to the overall quality of the route

Medium = not safety critical but important to the quality of the whole route and important in its own right

Low = not essential, but would improve the quality of the route

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost
200 South (	Coast Road (A259) Peacehaven 5560m	·	·
200.1.1	Improve transition and widen shared use	Low	Low
200.1.2	Cycle proof junction	High	Medium
200.1.3	Cycle proof junction	High	Medium
200.1.4	Stepped track on either side of road	High	High
200.1.5	Upgrade crossings and side roads	High	Medium
200.1.6	Improve public realm, install traffic calming and blended footways	Medium	Medium
200.2.1	Upgrade crossing	High	Low
200.2.2	Install blended footways	Medium	Low
200.2.3	Widen shared use by narrowing road	Medium	Medium
200.2.4	Investigate location for improvements	Medium	Low
201 Coasta	I Path 2940m		
201.1.1	Install shared-use path	Medium	Low
201.1.2	Improve unmade road	Low	Low
201.1.3	Placemaking improvements	Low	Low
201.1.4	Install filtered permeability	Medium	Low
202 Arunde	I Road (NCN 2) 2550m	•	
202.1.1	Improve traffic calming	High	Medium
202.1.2	Redesign junction	Medium	Medium

#### Cost

High = more than £100,000

Medium = £20,000 to £100,000

Low = less than £20,000

These are very broad values and not intended as a precise guide to final costs. More work is needed to provide detailed cost estimates, which is beyond the scope of this report.

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost	
203 Firle Road 680m				
203.1.1	Table junction and change priority	High	Medium	
203.1.2	Create 20mph zone	High	Low	
203.1.3	Install filtered permeability and Parallel Zebra	High	Medium	
204 Saltdean	- Peacehaven - Southease 5110m			
204.1.1	Investigate route feasibility	Low	Low	
204.1.2	Progress feasibility study	Low	Low	
205 Peaceha	ven – Newhaven via The Highway 1270m			
205.1.1	Provide safe connections to facilities on the A259	High	Medium	
205.1.2	Upgrade surface	Low	Low	
205.1.3	Investigate widening access	Medium	Low	
210 Newhave	n East/West Corridor 5720m			
210.1.1	Install shared path	Medium	Low	
210.1.2	20mph zone throughout residential area	Medium	Low	
210.1.3	Treat junction and install shared path	High	Medium	
210.1.4	Redesign side road junction	High	Medium	
210.2.1	Upgrade PROW	Medium	Low	
210.2.2	Improve pedestrian environment around school	Medium	Low	
210.3.1	Investigate gyratory removal	High	High	
210.3.2	Downgrade South Way and improve street scape and pedestrian access	High	Medium	
210.3.3	Upgrade all at grade crossings	High	Medium	
210.3.4	Improve cycle and pedestrian access to the Island	High	Medium	
210.4.1	Improve cycle and pedestrian access	High	Medium	
210.4.2	Add priority at side roads x 3	High	Medium	
210.4.3	Widen shared both sides and improve crossings	High	Medium	
211 Gibbon F	Road & Court Farm Road to the Swing Bridge 2910m			
211.1.1A	20mph zone and rationalise parking	Medium	Low	
211.1.1B	20mph zone and rationalise parking	Medium	Low	
211.1.2	Remove mini-roundabout	High	Medium	
211.1.3	Public realm improvements that prioritise pedestrians	Low	Medium	

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost	
220 Seaford East West Corridor 7070m				
220.1.1	Greenway management plan	Low	Low	
220.1.2	Widen shared use path	Medium	Medium	
220.1.3A	Upgrade crossing	High	Medium	
220.1.3B	Upgrade crossing	High	Medium	
220.1.4	Install shared use path	High	Medium	
220.1.5	Upgrade crossing	High	Medium	
220.2.1	Install stepped track	High	High	
220.2.2	Install cycle hub and slow street	High	High	
220.2.3	Redesign junction	High	Medium	
220.2.4	Urban realm improvements	High	High	
220.3.1	Install stepped tracks	High	High	
220.3.2	Install blended side road crossings x 5	High	Medium	
220.3.3	Upgrade crossing	Medium	Medium	
220.4.1	Redesign junction	Medium	High	
220.4.2	Install stepped tracks	High	High	
220.4.3	Treat side roads x 5	High	Medium	
220.4.4	Investigate options for a two way track within highway	Medium	Medium	
221 Town C	entre – Lexdon Road via Blatchington Road and Vale Road 1240m			
221.1.1	Allow contra-flow cycling and rationalise parking	Medium	Low	
221.1.2	Redesign junction	High	Medium	
221.1.3	Table junction and tighten geometry	High	Medium	
221.1.4	Install 20mph zone through traffic calming and enforcement	Medium	Medium	
222 Alfristor	n Road – South Downs 750m			
222.1.1	Install shared use and connect to crossing	High	Medium	
222.1.2	Redesign junction	High	Medium	
230 The Sta	tion – A259 via Sutton Avenue 2000m			
230.1.1	Allow contraflow cycling and shared surface	High	Medium	
230.1.2	Ban right turn, extend 20mph add a rigth turn refuge island	High	Medium	
230.1.3	Traffic calming and street scene improvements	Medium	Medium	
230.1.4	Redesign junction	High	Medium	
230.2.1	Redesign junction	High	Medium	
230.2.2	School street redesign project	Medium	Medium	
230.2.3	Investigate options for roundabout removal	High	Medium	
230.2.4	Remove roundabout, tighten geometry and table junction	High	Medium	

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost		
231 Marine -	231 Marine – Exceat Bridge via Seaford Seafront 7070m				
231.1.1	Widen shared use + link to Parallel Zebra	Medium	Low		
231.1.2	Make route continuous	Low	Low		
231.1.3	Improve public realm and promenade access	Medium	Medium		
231.1.4	Improve provision along the Esplanade and Cliff Gardens	Medium	Medium		
231.1.5	20mph zone through traffic calming	Medium	Medium		
231.1.6	Install surfaced shared use path along one side	Low	Medium		
231.1.7	Improve path surface	Low	Low		
300 Peaceha	ven Loop 4190m				
300.1.1	Install stepped track	High	Medium		
300.1.2	Investigate either on-road on in the verge provision	High	Medium		
300.1.3	Install filtered permeability	Medium	Low		
300.2.1	Improve transition	Medium	Low		
300.2.2	Link track to a Parallel Zebra crossing	High	Medium		
300.2.3	Filtered permeability to Parallel Zebra	High	Medium		
301 Piddingh	oe Avenue 1750m				
301.1.1	Filtered permeability to Parallel Zebra	High	Medium		
301.1.2	Redesign junction	Medium	Medium		
301.1.3	Filtered permeability to Parallel Zebra	Medium	Medium		
310 Egrets W	/ay 2980m				
310.1.1	Improve surface	Medium	Medium		
311 A259 to	Denton 1670m				
311.1.1	Install two-way cycle track	High	High		
311.1.2	Add priority at side road crossings and tighten geometry	High	Medium		
311.1.3	Install Parallel Zebra	High	Medium		
311.1.4	20mph zone, traffic calming and cycle lane on uphill section	Medium	Low		
312 Railway	312 Railway Road 1050m				
312.1.1	Downgrade road	High	Low		
312.1.2	20mph zone through traffic calming and enforcement	Medium	Medium		

![](_page_38_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost	
320 Seaford Northern Loop 3120m				
320.1.1	Redesign junction	High	Medium	
320.1.2	Tighten corner radii, table junction and narrow carriageway	High	Medium	
320.1.3	Public realm improvements along shopping parade	Medium	Medium	
320.1.4	Table junction and tighten radii	Medium	Medium	
320.1.5	Install physical traffic calming	Medium	Medium	
320.1.6	Upgrade crossing and redesign junction	High	Medium	
320.2.1	Install stepped tracks	High	High	
320.2.2	Public realm improvements	Medium	Low	
321 Town Ce	ntre – Belgrave Road via Avondale Road and Blatchington Hill 650m			
321.1.1	Rationalise road layout and install Parallel Zebra	High	Medium	
321.1.2	Install physical traffic calming and blended side road crossings	High	Medium	
322 A259 – A	lfriston Road via Walmer Road 1120m			
322	Area based approach reducing speed and volume of traffic	Medium	Medium	
323 Town Ce	ntre – Seafront via Dane Road and The Causeway 900m			
323.1.1	Investigate pedestrianisation	High	High	
323.1.2	Allow contraflow cycling and redesign junction	High	Medium	
323.1.3	Make one way with contra flow cycling linking to a Parallel Zebra	Medium	Medium	
323.1.4	Install traffic calming, treat junctions and add blended side crossings	Medium	Medium	
323.1.5	Install Zebra crossing and improve access to promenade	Medium	Medium	
324 Southdo	wn Road 700m			
324.1.1	Table junction and tighten geometry	Medium	Medium	
324.1.2	Install physical traffic calming and 20mph speed limits	Medium	Medium	
324.1.3	Table junction and tighten geometry	Medium	Medium	
325 Arundel Road 910m				
325.1.1	Adopt area based approach to reduce speed and volume of traffic	Medium	Low	
325.1.2	Slow street and install crossing	High	Medium	

## East Sussex Delivery Methodology

The following methodology draws upon the Active Travel Act (Wales) and LCDS to provide a sequential process for the ESCC Walking and Cycling Strategy (NB. This is for cycling only, a separate process will be used for walking based on Wales guidance)

Stage	Purpose	Inputs	Outputs	Tools/ Guidance	Stakeholders Engaged
1. Network Criteria	<ul> <li>To identify and agree network aims of client and local authority, in order to focus route scoping, planning and engagement. This should be in line with project brief and local policy and should include:</li> <li>Type of journeys the route should cater for</li> <li>Density of the network</li> <li>Specific network requirements</li> <li>Quality criteria</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Engagement and research to understand existing and future aspirations through:</li> <li>Review of existing plans and strategies (including transport strategy)</li> <li>Review of relevant quality criteria</li> <li>Review of project brief</li> <li>Engagement with client</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>One page document outlining agreed aims and requirements around:</li> <li>Priority journey types (e.g. utility/ leisure journeys)</li> <li>Aspirational network density (mesh widths and clustering of destinations)</li> <li>Network requirements (coherence, directness, safety, comfort, attractiveness)</li> <li>Levels of Service measurement to be applied</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LCDS – Section 2.1.2, Cycle Network Strategy</li> <li>Active Travel Wales Design Guide – Section 5.7, Network Planning For Cycling</li> <li>Active Travel Wales Design Guide – Section 5.8.4, Network Aims and Requirements</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>East Sussex County Council</li> <li>District/Borough Councils (Planning Policy, Environment &amp; Sustainability)</li> </ul>
2. Information Gathering	To gather the information required to plan and scope network routes that connect to key trip generators, make best use of existing and planned active travel infrastructure, and reflect future aspirations of local authorities and stakeholders. It will also highlight future opportunities for investment and delivery, by identifying future highways, regeneration, housing, and business developments.	<ol> <li>Desktop research to identify the following:         <ul> <li>Employment and residential areas</li> <li>Local amenities (shopping centres, schools, leisure centres, council offices)</li> <li>Transport interchanges</li> <li>Greenspace and leisure routes</li> <li>Existing cycle and walking routes (classified by type)</li> <li>Plans within wider strategies (e.g. town centre regeneration, traffic management plans, Local Development Plans, active travel plans)</li> <li>ONS data on travel patterns (Propensity to Cycle)</li> <li>Collision data</li> <li>Existing PRoW, walking paths</li> </ul> </li> <li>Stakeholder engagement to identify the following:         <ul> <li>Cycle and walking routes currently planned or in delivery</li> <li>Aspirational cycle and walking routes</li> <li>Future highways upgrades</li> <li>Future regeneration, housing, business development projects</li> <li>Traffic volumes and speeds</li> <li>Local land use constraints and opportunities</li> <li>Barriers to movement</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Comprehensive base map containing:</li> <li>All existing trip generators within study area</li> <li>Future developments and projects that will influence demand</li> <li>Overview of existing road network, classified by accessibility</li> <li>Existing and planned cycle and walking network</li> <li>Aspirational networks defined by stakeholder group</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Sustrans GIS Earthlight mapping</li> <li>Wales Active Travel Act: Design Guidance – Section 5.8.21, Information Gathering</li> <li>LCDS – Section 2.3.3, Mesh Density Analysis</li> <li>LCDS – Section 2.3.4, Accessibility classification</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>East Sussex County Council</li> <li>Local Cycle Groups</li> <li>Local Walking Groups/Ramblers</li> <li>District/Borough Councils (Planning Policy, Environment &amp; Sustainability)</li> <li>South Downs National Park Authority</li> <li>Local Access Forum</li> </ul>

![](_page_40_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

Stage Purpose	e	Inputs	Outputs	Tools/ Guidance	Stakeholders Engaged
3. Network Mapping Mapping Mapping Mapping	tify the geographic locations that in the strategic trip generators of the x, and the types of route required to t them. if/ where new cycle and walking tions are required to deliver a cycle t that meets the requirements of ms.	<ol> <li>Identification of trip generators across the study area, plotting links, and designating route type. This will involve:</li> <li>Plot departure and destination trip generators using base mapping</li> <li>Clustering trip generators to reduce complexity of connections (e.g. larger employment sites)</li> <li>Identify desire lines between trip generators</li> <li>Classification of route type (primary, secondary, local routes)</li> <li>Assess connectivity of existing and proposed network</li> <li>Overlay network desire lines with existing and proposed routes</li> <li>Assess suitability of existing and proposed routes against network requirements (coherence, directness etc.), and route type</li> <li>Identify gaps in network to be resolved in stage four.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Revised network map(s) to share with stakeholders showing:</li> <li>Clusters of departure and destination points/ trip attractors</li> <li>Existing, planned and aspirational routes classified by route type (primary, secondary, local)</li> <li>Gaps within the network shown as desire lines, and type of route requirements to meet network criteria</li> <li>Options to resolve gaps for site assessment</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Sustrans GIS Earthlight mapping</li> <li>Wales Active Travel Act: Design Guidance – Section 5.8.49 – Assessment of Routes</li> <li>LCDS – Figure 2.3, Cycling Levels of Service Assessment</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>East Sussex County Council</li> <li>District/Borough Councils (Planning Policy, Environment &amp; Sustainability)</li> </ul>
4. Route Assembly & Assessment To identify network p network of	be and identify deliverable routes astructure that will complete c connections to meet network ments. tify routes to be included within c plan based on ability to meet c criteria and deliverability.	<ol> <li>Desktop review of potential route connection to resolve gaps within network</li> <li>Audit of existing routes and planned routes</li> <li>Engagement with local stakeholders to seek local knowledge around connections (if insufficient information at Stage 2)</li> <li>Survey and assess potential routes against network requirements and level of service criteria.</li> <li>Classify type of connection</li> <li>Route ride with stakeholders</li> <li>Undertake levels of service assessment to review directness, coherence, safety, comfort, attractiveness</li> <li>Identify upgrades required to deliver routes, and major barriers to delivery</li> <li>Assess deliverability of route options</li> <li>Select routes to be included within Network Map</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Draft network map to be shared with project stakeholders for validation, including:</li> <li>Proposed network routes, classified by type (primary, secondary, local), and by stage of delivery (existing, planned, new)</li> <li>Key trip generator clusters (including existing and planned destinations)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Wales Active Travel Act: Design Guidance – Section 5.8.49 – Assessment of Routes</li> <li>LCDS – Figure 2.3, Cycling Levels of Service Assessment</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Local Cycle Groups</li> <li>Local Walking Groups/Ramblers</li> <li>District/Borough Councils (Planning Policy, Environment &amp; Sustainability)</li> <li>South Downs National Park Authority Local Access Forum</li> </ul>
<b>5. Validation</b> <b>5. Validation</b>	late the draft network map with nity and local authority olders to ensure aspirations and nts are captured correctly,	1. Engagement with stakeholders involved through the project as agreed with client to attain comments and approval of map. Engagement to be conducted through face to face meetings, or submission of draft map as required.	Agreed network map to be submitted to client for review.	<ul> <li>Wales Active Travel Act: Design Guidance – Chapter 5.8.58, Validation of Integrated Map</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>East Sussex County Council</li> <li>Local Cycle Groups</li> <li>Local Walking Groups/Ramblers</li> <li>District/Borough Councils (Planning Policy,</li> </ul>

## **Glossary of Terms**

(taken from London Cycling Design Standards)

#### Advisory cycle lane

A dashed white line marking an area of the carriageway designated for the use of cyclists. Motor vehicles may need to cross the markings but generally should not enter the lane unless it is unavoidable.

#### ASL – Advanced stop line

Stop line for cyclists at traffic signals ahead of the stop line for general traffic, with a waiting area marked with a large cycle symbol and extending across some or all of the traffic lanes.

#### **Bus lane**

Lane designated for bus use during the signed hours of operation. Signs also advertise whether other vehicles, such as cycles, are permitted in the lane during those times.

#### Bus stop bypass

A bus stop layout in which through-movement for cycles is away from the carriageway and from the bus stop cage. Can be achieved with shared use or partially separated footway around the bus stop but usually features a dedicated cycle track passing behind the bus shelter.

#### Carriageway

That part of a road or highway constructed for the use of vehicular traffic (including cycles).

#### Chicane

A horizontal deflection in the carriageway used as a speed-calming measure.

#### **Continuous footway**

Technique used at priority junctions and other vehicular accesses to assert visual priority for pedestrians over turning vehicles by continuing the footway material across the access or the mouth of the junction. A 'continuous cycleway' can be added in a similar way if a cycle lane or track is present.

#### Contraflow or Cycle contraflow

A facility allowing cyclists to travel in the opposite direction to one-way motor traffic. Requires a Traffic Order and can be implemented using lane markings, which may or may not have some other form of physical protection, or by using signing only.

#### **Courtesy crossing**

Location designed to invite pedestrians (or cyclists) to cross and to encourage vehicles on the carriageway to give way – although there is no legal obligation to do so. Often used as part of a design approach aimed at reducing vehicle speeds.

#### Cycle bypass

Form of physical separation for cycles enabling them to avoid a controlled feature for other road users – e.g. traffic signals or a pinch-point requiring 'give way' to oncoming traffic.

#### Cycle street

A street where the carriageway is dominated by cyclists and, by virtue of the width and design of the street, all motor traffic moves at the speed of the slowest cyclist.

#### Cycle track

A cycle facility physically separated by kerbs, verges and/or level changes from areas used by motorists and pedestrians. It may be next to the road or completely away from the carriageway and may either be at footway level, carriageway level or inbetween.

#### Decluttering

Rationalisation of street furniture, signs and signals aimed at minimising the amount of such objects in the street environment, thereby reducing visual and physical clutter.

#### **Dropped kerb**

Feature to facilitate access, usually between the footway and the carriageway. Must be flush when provided for pedestrians, wheelchair users or cyclists.

#### 'Dutch-style' roundabout

A type of roundabout where cyclists are physically separated from other road users with orbital cycle tracks. It is one of many types of roundabout seen in the Netherlands.

Entry treatment or Raised entry treatment

Raised carriageway surfacing at a side road junction, taking the form of a hump with ramps on either side and usually provided at footway level. The purpose is principally to slow vehicle movements at the junction.

#### **Filtered permeability**

An area-based network planning approach to improving conditions for cycling by removing through motorised traffic in zoned areas. Cyclists can pass freely through motorised traffic restrictions between zones and so are favoured in terms of journey time and convenience.

#### Footway build-out

Area of footway that extends out further than the previous kerb edge and narrows the carriageway.

#### Greenways

Various shared use route types largely or entirely off-highway – generally designed for people of all abilities to use on foot, cycle or horseback, for leisure, local connection or commuting.

#### Homezone

A group of streets and spaces designed primarily to meet the needs of non-motorised users and where the speed and dominance of motorised traffic is reduced. A 10mph limit normally applies.

#### Horizontal traffic calming

Forms of traffic calming that work by changing the width available for driving. Typically these take the form of static elements such as build- outs or traffic islands, but they may also utilise car parking or temporary features.

#### Junction table or Raised table

Raised carriageway surface (often to footway level) at a junction, used as a speed control measure and a way of supporting pedestrian movement and

![](_page_42_Picture_49.jpeg)

pedestrian priority.

#### Light segregation

The use of intermittently placed objects to separate and protect a cycle facility (usually a marked cycle lane) from motorised traffic.

#### Mandatory cycle lane

A section of the carriageway marked by a solid white line that is designated for the exclusive use of cyclists during the advertised hours of operation.

## Parallel priority crossings or 'parallel crossing'

A cycle crossing next to a zebra crossing where users of the main carriageway have to give way to both pedestrians and cyclists crossing that carriageway.

#### **Pedestrian crossings**

One of various crossing types for pedestrians that do not allow cycle access. Includes signal-controlled types (Pelican, Puffin and Ped-X crossings) and priority crossings (Zebra crossings).

#### Pedestrian Zone

Area closed to vehicles, including cycles – often marked with exceptions for loading. Cycles may also be specifically exempted, or they may be included by designating a 'Pedestrian and Cycle Zone'.

#### **Pinch point**

Locations where the carriageway narrows, often as a result of traffic calming measures or addition of refuge islands. Unless well designed, they can add to collision risk and discomfort for cyclists by forcing them into close proximity with motorised traffic.

#### Point closure

Method of closing a street to through-traffic, ideally in the form of a modal filter (i.e. allowing access for cyclists).

#### **Priority junction**

A junction where the priority is shown by 'give-way' road markings – i.e. the minor arm gives way to the major arm.

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Quietway

A branded cycle route type established by the London Mayor's Vision for Cycling (2013). Quietways are strategic routes using less heavily trafficked local streets and off-carriageway facilities.

#### **Raised delineator**

A raised strip, between 12 and 20mm high, that separates areas used by cycle and pedestrians when they are at the same level. It is defined in TSRGD (diagram 1049.1) and therefore has legal status as a road marking.

#### **Refuge islands**

Islands in the carriageway to support either pedestrian crossing or vehicle right turns (which may include cycle-only turning pockets). Their placement and design should avoid creating hazardous pinchpoints for cyclists.

#### Segregated cycle lane/track

Cycle facility separated by a continuous or nearcontinuous physical upstand along links (usually verges or kerbed segregating islands).

#### Shared use area, footway or path

A footway, footpath or part of any public space shared between pedestrians and cyclists but where motorised vehicles are not permitted. It is identified by the shared use sign – a blue circle with white pedestrian and cycle symbols. In these spaces, pedestrians have priority.

#### Shared space

A design approach that seeks to change the way streets operate by reducing the dominance of motor vehicles, primarily through lower speeds and encouraging drivers to behave more accommodatingly towards pedestrians and cyclists.

#### Shared surface (level surface)

A street or space either with no distinction between footway and carriageway or no kerb upstand between the two.

#### Speed cushions

Small speed humps installed across the road with gaps at distances that, ideally, allow certain users such as buses and large emergency service vehicles to pass easily, but force most other motorised vehicles to slow down to negotiate the humps.

#### Speed humps

Raised areas, typically placed horizontally across the carriageway, designed to reduce traffic speeds. The ramps either side of the hump should have a sinusoidal profile so as to minimise discomfort to cyclists.

#### Tactile paving

Textured paving that helps people with sight impairments to read the street environment around them by feeling the change in surface underfoot and/ or seeing the change in material.

#### Two-stage turn

A manoeuvre allowing cyclists to make an opposed turn at a junction in two stages, without having to move across lanes of moving traffic. Between two traffic signal stages, the cyclist waits in the junction, away from the traffic flow.

#### Uncontrolled crossing

A pedestrian and/or cycle crossing where vehicles do not legally have to give way but may do so out of courtesy. They are used where vehicle flows and speeds give safe opportunities for crossing the street without the need for a controlled facility.

#### Vertical traffic calming

Forms of traffic calming that rely on a change of level in the carriageway for slowing effect – typically speed humps or speed cushions.

#### Visibility splay

The physical space at an access or junction through which a road user exiting from the minor arm needs good, clear visibility in order to see potential conflicts or dangers in advance of the distance they need in order to brake and come to a stop.