East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy Lewes LCWIP

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
1	Version 1	SP	ST	16/01/18
2	Version 2	SP	ST	06/03/18
3	Version 3	SP	ST	26/06/18

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy Lewes LCWIP June 2018

Contents

Introduction
Propensity to Cycle Map
Trip Generators and Transport Network
Lewes and Surrounding Area Proposed Network
Lewes Town Proposed Network
Description of the Town
210: A27 and Lewes town centre
310: Ringmer-Southease
201: South Downs Way - Lewes
202: Lewes Priory
203: Montacute Road - Town Centre
204: South Downs – Spital Road
205: South Downs - Station
206: Ditchling – Cooksbridge
301: A27 - Swanborough
302: Lewes - Southease
303: Cockshut Road - Iford
305: Nevill - Southover
306: Offham – Town centre
307: Cooksbridge – Lewes Riverside
308: Malling - Southover
311, 312, 313: Town Centre walking routes
Table of recommendations
Current traffic circulation
Proposed traffic circulation
East Sussex Delivery Methodology
Glossary of Terms



- ii
- v
- vi
- vii
- viii
- 1 3
- 9
- 13
- 13
- 15
- 17
- 19
- 23
- 25 27
- 27
- 29
- 31
- 33
- 35
- 37
- 38 41
- 42
- 43
- 45



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.

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	Average Annual	Minimum			
Limit	Daily	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.



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:

Approximate number of cyclists (per day)

- ____ 5 20
- _____ 20 40
- 40+
 - Census Origin/
 - **Destination Points**

ASHTON CREEN



	KEY
	Primary Route
	Secondary Route
	Walking Only Route
	EMPLOYMENT
	2011 Census Workzones
2192 310	Density of Employment (Jobs per Hectare)
	50 - 100
IN NATURE RESERVE	 Key Locations (Secondary Education, Further Education, Large Health
	Administrative Boundary
	SUS trans
	2 College Green, Cathedral Square, Bristol, BS1 5DD
	PROJECT
	East Sussex Cycling & Walking Strategy
	PROPOSED NETWORK
	Drawn Charled Data Could the
Sto.	DL SP 5/3/2018 1:12,000
	ISSUED
1 km	DRAWING NUMBER REVISION 20204.L-SD-MAP-00-04 A

Description of the Town

Lewes is the historic market town of East Sussex situated within the South Downs National Park. approx. 7 miles north-east of Brighton. Once an active port with thriving iron, brewing and shipbuilding industries, the town now has a range of contemporary businesses and strong economic links with Brighton and London. The tourism industry plays a large part in the local economy, due to the town's many cultural assets.

Lewes was settled along a defensible chalk spur overlooking a bridge point over the River Ouse where it cuts through the downs on its way to the sea at Newhaven. The town was a fortified settlement in King Alfred's time and the Normans built their castle on the spur where it commanded views up and down the Ouse and controlled the river crossing.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the population of Lewes was 11,000. Unusually, due to the town's natural constraints of the downs and the River Ouse flood plain, it has since then only grown to a population of around 17,000. Thus a large proportion of the residents have long family histories in the town.

According to the Council for British Archaeology, it is one of 51 historic towns in the whole country that are "so splendid and precious that ultimate responsibility for them should be a national concern".

Transport

The A27 trunk road is the main west-east road through the area, which bypasses the town to the south. The A26 links Tunbridge Wells, Uckfield, Lewes and the port of Newhaven. It skirts the eastern side of the town, through the Cuilfail Tunnel. The only A roads within the town are the A277 Brighton Road from the west and the A275 from the north, which splits on the edge of the town as Offham Road and Nevill Road.

Lewes is well connected by rail, with direct services to London via Haywards Heath and regular services to Brighton, Eastbourne and Seaford. The railway station is within the town centre area but it is 600 metres from the bus station.

The central area of the old town is an Air Quality Management Area, with motor traffic undoubtedly a major contributor to the poor air quality.

The Local Transport Plan Implementation Plan states that: "We need to help reduce congestion in Lewes town by improving traffic flow, and address the air quality issues around Station Street and Fisher Street. Protecting the character of the town, tackling safety issues, and providing more sustainable travel options for visitors and residents alike, are fundamental to the future for Lewes."

Local Trip Generators

The town centre is a major destination for employment and shopping, but it extends for 800 metres from Westgate Street to South Street, according to the South Downs Pre-submission Local Plan. As the County town, Lewes has two major employers in the County Council and Sussex Police. Other employment sites include Lewes prison. Harvevs brewerv. Malling Industrial Estate and North Street. There is a significant educational quarter in the southeast of the town with Sussex Downs College and Priory Schools.

Cycling and Walking in Lewes

The underlying geography of the area is the river valley, and some steep slopes on both sides. Westeast movements through the town are easier than north-south, which are constrained by steep slopes and the pattern of settlement. The majority of trips made in the town are within 3 km, a distance that can be easily cycled. This means the town is ideally suited to having a high number of active travel users, but the road network and the lack of dedicated cycling facilities makes this an undesirable option for many people.

Walking is a popular option, with 18% of people walking to work in Lewes District at the 2011 Census. This is one of the highest proportions in the South East, despite the narrow footways and lack of road crossings in some areas.

Regional Cycle Route 90 passes through the town, but the route within Lewes is not fully agreed. It links Brighton, Falmer, Lewes and Firle. The Egrets Way is under development as a riverside route between Lewes and Newhaven, with some sections completed.

Much of the town centre and some residential areas are covered by 20mph zones although the only significant traffic calming is on Southover High Street and Mountfield Road.

From a review of the existing conditions, there are a number of general factors which need to be considered:

- Traffic conditions in the town centre and on Offham Road and Nevill Road.
- Consider traffic restrictions on town centre roads to improve conditions for walking and cycling.
- Continue to develop the Egrets Way route.
- · Provide new routes to outlying villages to the same standard as the Ringmer shared path alongside the B2192.
- Cycle parking at key trip generators is currently below standard in both quantity and security level, enhancing this will encourage more cvclists.
- Advanced Stop Lines to be provided at all traffic liahts

Developments and Opportunities

The North Street Quarter is identified as one of only two strategic sites in the South Downs Local Plan. It is planned for 415 residential units and at least 5,000 square metres of commercial space. Proposals should "incorporate a riverside shared foot / cycle route along the western bank of the River Ouse to extend the town's riverside focus and contribute to its character and quality". A further ambition is a new footbridge connecting the south and north banks of the river.

Land at Old Malling Farm is identified for up to 240 residential dwellings and "suitably designed access for pedestrians and cyclists should be provided from the site to the disused railway line adjacent to the site".

The other significant site in the town is Malling Brooks, where 7.040 square metres is identified for commercial use. This offers an opportunity to improve walking and cycling access to the existing industrial area and new links between Malling and the town centre.

Links to the villages and countryside north of Lewes are very limited and restricted by the busy A275 and A26 roads. A new footbridge over the River Ouse

between Malling and Hamsey on the old railway formation would make a huge difference and should be taken to the feasibility stage. This part of the old railway is apparently not required if the Lewes-Uckfield line were to be re-opened.

210: A27 and Lewes town centre

Route description

This is the main west-east route through the area, linking Lewes with Falmer to the west and Firle in the east. It is designated as Regional Cycle Route 90, with the exception of a missing section through central Lewes.

Background

This is largely an existing route adjacent to the A27, which is managed by Highways England. There have been several proposals over the years to fill the gap through Lewes, most notably an alignment covered by Route 203.

210.1 Falmer – Ashcombe Roundabout

Existing conditions

Shared footway beside the A27 trunk road, with short sections of access road.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The A27 is a very busy road, with more than 10,000 vehicles per day (vpd) and an unrestricted speed limit, which means that it is unpleasant for walking and cycling. The shared footway does not meet current Highways England standards as set out in IAN195/16.

Recommendations

- 210.1.1 The footpath linking Middle Street with the A27 is narrow and bounded by a stone wall on the north side. It should be widened to a minimum of 3.5 metres.
- 210.1.2 The existing footway is separated from the carriageway by a grass verge. It should be widened to 3.0 metres, including cutting back of overhanging vegetation.
- 210.3 The grass verge disappears and a crash barrier separates vehicles from path users for a short distance. This section is narrow and sits on an embankment, so widening would require significant engineering work. It would be preferable to construct a new 3m wide path in the adjacent field.
- 210.1.4 The footpath linking the Housedean Farm access road with the A27 is narrow and bounded by a stone wall on the north side.

It should be widened to a minimum of 3.5 metres.

- 210.1.5 From Housedean Farm to Ashcombe Farm, the existing footway is narrow with no grass verge in places. We recommend a new path in the adjacent field, around the back of the service station.
- 210.1.6 From Ashcombe Farm to the roundabout, the footway is separated by a grass verge and should be widened to a minimum of 3.0 metres.

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Lewes June 2018

210.2 Brighton Road

Existing conditions

Brighton Road is the main road linking the A27 from the west with all parts of Lewes. It is mainly residential, with the prison at the eastern end.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The volume of traffic is the main barrier and footways are narrow. The existing footway up to Houndean Rise is designated for shared use but it does not meet current standards.

Recommendations

- 210.2.1 Widen shared footway on rural section to 3.0 metres and retain verge.
- 210.2.2 Widen shared footway between Houndean Farm access and Houndean Rise to 3.0 metres, which could include removing the verge.
- 210.2.3 The existing footway between Houndean Rise and the prison is narrow and elevated, with embankments on both sides. Significant engineering work is needed to accommodate shared use on this section. It may be possible to reduce the carriageway width and move it slightly to the south.
- 210.2.4 Widen elevated footway outside the prison to 3.5 metres beside brick wall. Space is limited and it may be possible to utilise the prison service road instead.

210.3 Western Road - High Street

Existing conditions

This is the main west-east road through the town and it is the historic high street, with numerous listed buildings along the way. Traffic speeds are low, but the streets are congested and there is on-street parking in many places. East Sussex County Council offices are a major trip generator with large car parks. An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) includes the central part of the High Street.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The volume of traffic is the main barrier, together with narrow footways on historic narrow streets. We believe that it is necessary to restrict through traffic to improve conditions for walking and cycling. The eastern end of High Street is one-way, presenting a major barrier for cycling.

- 210.3.1 All-green pedestrian phase on traffic signals at the junction of Western Road and Nevill Road to allow diagonal crossing.
- 210.3.2 Enforce the speed limit of 20mph and review the need for traffic calming.
- 210.3.3 The street outside St Anne's Church is narrow, with no footway on the south side. Potential location for a "bus gate" or other traffic restriction point.
- 210.3.4 High Street is particularly narrow near the junction with Westgate Street and there is shuttle working controlled by traffic lights. This would be a good location for a traffic restriction point.
- 210.3.5 The junction of High Street and Station Street is at the centre of the AQMA and restricting through traffic is the best solution.
- 210.3.6 The eastern end of High Street is currently one-way and could be opened for twoway cycling. As the heart of the old town it should be open to delivery vehicles only, perhaps at restricted hours.
- 210.3.7 The junction of High Street and Eastgate Street has traffic signals, with pedestrians and cyclists forced to share narrow footways. We recommend a "shared space" approach to this central junction, with pedestrians able to cross anywhere.

210.4 Cliffe - Southerham

Existing conditions

Quiet streets in Cliffe, shared footway beside A26 and estate roads.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Uncontrolled crossing of the A26 and HGV traffic on industrial estate roads. Illegal parking and poor enforcement of restrictions reduce the quality of Cliffe High Street as a pedestrian and cycle priority street.

Recommendations

- 210.4.1 Smooth surface on traffic restricted section of Cliffe High Street and improved signage.
- 210.4.2 Widen shared footway between A26 and River Ouse to 3.0 metres.
- 210.4.3 Toucan crossing of A26 at Cliffe Industrial Estate and improvements to transition from shared footway to estate road.
- 210.4.4 Consider traffic calming to improve safety through industrial estate.

210.5 Southerham - Firle

Existing conditions

Shared footway beside the A27 trunk road.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The A27 is a very busy road, with more than 10,000 vehicles per day (vpd) and an unrestricted speed limit, which means that it is unpleasant for walking and cycling. The footway does not meet current Highways England standards.

- 210.5.1 The existing footway is 1.4m wide with a narrow grass verge. The path should be widened to a minimum of 2.5 metres and preferably 3.0.
- 210.5.2 The newer section of footway is wider at 2.0 metres but should ideally be widened to 3.0.
- 210.5.3 East of Beddingham, the footway is separated by a wider verge from the carriageway and has a good width. This could serve as a model for other sections.
- 210.5.4 East of the Glynde turn at Lacys Hill, the footway is again very close to the carriageway. Widening to a minimum width of 2.5 metres and separation with a verge is needed. The shared footway continues as far as Burgh Lane.

310.2.1

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Lewes June 2018

Shared path beside Lewes Road

310: Ringmer-Southease

Route description

This is the main north-south route through the area, linking Ringmer, Lewes, Southease and Newhaven. It follows the existing shared path from Ringmer to Lewes and the proposed Egrets Way alongside the River Ouse.

Background

The route is mostly traffic-free on existing paths and is supported by all stakeholders. The Ouse Valley Cycle Network is leading development of the Egrets Way.

310.1 Ringmer

Existing conditions

The route follows the busy B2192 Lewes Road and quieter lanes through Ringmer. There is a narrow footway for pedestrians beside the B2192.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The existing footway beside the B2192 is too narrow for shared use. There is no protected crossing of the road outside the Community College.

Recommendations

- 310.1.1 Widen existing northern footway between Yeomans and the B2192/B2124 roundabout into grass verge to 3.0 metres for shared use.
- 310.1.2 The north side footway to the Community College should be widened for shared use, although available space is limited in places. There is more room on the south side, but this would need a crossing of Lewes Road.
- 310.1.3 Zebra crossing of Lewes Road for College students.
- 310.1.4 Widen southern footway into grass verge up to Harrisons Lane.
- 310.1.5 Harrisons Lane is relatively quiet, but would benefit from a 20mph speed limit and traffic calming.
- 310.1.6 Gote Lane is also relatively quiet but the 30mph speed limit is too high for safe cycling and should be reduced to 20mph.

310.2 Ringmer - Lewes

Existing conditions

There is an existing good quality shared path running parallel to the B2192 Lewes Road, linking to residential streets and shared paths into Lewes town centre.

Barriers to walking and cycling

This is a good quality route with very few barriers. A few improvements would make the route even more attractive.

- 310.2.1 This is a good quality path than can serve as a model for similar facilities in a rural area.
- 310.2.2 Mill Road is a narrow residential street with on-street parking that reduces available width for a cyclist to pass a vehicle. Improved signing is needed.
- 310.2.3 Church Lane is moderately busy but is an important route for cycling and walking in South Malling. Traffic calming and reduction of speed limit to 20mph.
- 310.2.4 Blakes Walk is a good shared use path, but the access at the northern end needs improvement. Remove railings and install raised table crossing.
- 310.2.5 Two sections of shared path are separated by an awkward roundabout crossing. A formal crossing of Mayhew Way and a linking shared path would fill this gap.
- 310.2.6 The riverside path is popular and should be widened to 3.5 metres for comfortable shared use.
- 310.2.7 Sight lines are very poor on this short section beside the brewery and the path should be widened to 3.5 metres and vegetation cut back to improve visibility.
- 310.2.8 North Court is easily wide enough for shared use and cycling should be permitted. Pedestrian priority should be maintained at the Cliffe High Street exit.

3

310.3 Lewes - Southease

Existing conditions

There is an existing public footpath on top of the flood defence embankment and in some places a new path has been provided on the landward side. This route is planned to form part of the Egrets Way between Lewes and Newhaven, which is partly completed between Rodmell and Piddinghoe.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The existing footpath is unsurfaced and not suitable for cycling.

- 310.3.1 Railway Lane is one-way south to north where it meets Cliffe High Street, but this is not obvious on the north side. Surface improvements to the cobbled road are recommended.
- 310.3.2 The existing path through the Nature Reserve should be widened to a minimum of 2.5 metres for shared use.
- 310.3.3 The railway subway is muddy and needs surface and drainage improvements.
- 310.3.4 The permissive path is muddy and needs an improved surface.
- 310.3.5 A new path is needed alongside the flood defences from just south of the A27 bridge to the Rodmell Pumping Station.
- 310.3.6 Between the pumping station and Southease Bridge is a public bridleway running parallel with the public footpath. The northern half of the bridleway is unsurfaced and a new surface is needed to match that on the southern half.
- 310.3.7 The Egrets Way shared path between Southease Bridge and Deans Farm was opened in May 2016, but needs minor repairs where there is standing water on the path.

201.2.3 Station Road at Priory Street

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Lewes June 2018

201: South Downs Way - Lewes

Route description

An attractive bridleway in open countryside, which becomes an important west-east link through the town. Southover High Street is moderately busy with some traffic calming.

Background

The route is supported by the National Park Authority and other stakeholders.

201.1 South Downs – Juggs Road

Existing conditions

Public bridleway with small numbers of vehicles on access roads. Probably the most direct link between Lewes and the South Downs Way.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The surface is very poor in places, but satisfactory for leisure use on foot and with mountain bikes.

Recommendations

- 201.1.1 Improve surface of rough track between the top of the Downs and Kingston Ridge.
- 201.1.2 Safety improvements at the junction of Kingston Ridge and Ashcombe Hollow, which could be combined with a village entry treatment.
- 201.1.3 Grassy bridleway needs surface improvements for utility use, but is adequate for leisure trips.
- 201.1.4 Improve surface of rough track and cut back overhanging vegetation.
- 201.1.5 Speed limit on Juggs Road is currently 60mph and this should be reduced to 20mph.

201.2 Southover High Street – Ham Lane

Existing conditions

Narrow historic streets with cobbled traffic calming and 20mph speed limit. The B2193 Southover High Street is an important distributor road but speeds are low.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Narrow footways and on-street parking limit the space for walking and cycling.

Recommendations

- 201.2.1 Extend traffic calming to edge of built-up area. Consider shuttle working to allow for wider footways on narrowest section.
- 201.2.2 Provide smooth bypasses of all cobbled traffic calming features.
- 201.2.3 Roundabout junction of Priory Street and Station Road is unfriendly for walking and cycling and should be re-modelled to favour vulnerable users.
- 201.2.4 Mountfield Road is traffic calmed with speed humps and has a 20mph speed limit, so has reasonable conditions for cycling. On-street parking reduces the space for comfortable cycling and should be reviewed.

202: Lewes Priory

Route description

An attractive footpath through the remains of the Priory of St Pancras and across the Convent Field, linking Route 302 with the station, schools and South Downs College.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders.

202.1 Lewes Priory

Existing conditions

Narrow footpath for walking only through the Priory ruins and avoiding Southover High Street.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The path is too narrow for shared use.

- 202.1.1 Widen existing path to 3.0 metres for shared use.
- 202.1.2 Widen existing path beside stone wall to 3.5 metres for shared use, including earthworks.

203: Montacute Road – Town Centre

Route description

A useful west-east route across the southern part of town, linking residential areas with the station and town centre.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation. It is the current preferred alignment for Regional Cycle Route 90.

203.1 Montacute Road – Grange Road

Existing conditions

Quiet residential roads and green space, avoiding the busiest roads.

Barriers to walking and cycling

It is not the most direct route with several changes of direction. Narrow footpaths at Bell Lane Recreation Ground.

Recommendations

- 203.1.1 Residential roads need clear signing at junctions.
- 203.1.2 Delaware Road is steep and would benefit from traffic calming to ensure speed limit of 20mph is enforced.
- 203.1.3 Existing Pelican crossing of Bell Lane should be upgraded to a Toucan, with wider footways on both sides of the road for shared use.
- 203.1.4 Widen existing path through Recreation Ground to 3.0 metres, including the entrance at St Pancras Gardens.

203.2 Grange Road – Railway Lane

Existing conditions

Generally quiet town centre roads with traffic calming on Grange Road.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Five-way junction at the bottom of Station Street.

- 203.2.1 Review on-street parking on Grange Road.
- 203.2.2 Redesign junction of Southover Road and Station Street using shared space principles.
- 203.2.3 Pinwell Road is an interesting example of shared space in practice.
- 203.2.4 There is an important short link between Pinwell Road and Court Road, which should be widened to 3.0 metres for shared use.

204: South Downs – Spital Road

Route description

Attractive paths in open countryside, then a useful link from Mount Harry Road towards the town centre.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation.

204.1 South Downs – Firle Crescent

Existing conditions

Bridleway comprising a compacted stone track on the chalk downland of the South Downs and an unsurfaced permissive footpath. The bridleway south towards the prison is deeply rutted in places and not recommended as an access route in current conditions.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The bridleway and footpath are unsurfaced and only suitable for leisure use on foot and with mountain bikes.

Recommendations

- 204.1.1 Bridleway and footpath need an improved surface, but can be used by mountain bikes.
- 204.1.2 Steps at Firle Crescent entrance should be replaced with a ramp for disabled people to access the Downs.

204.2 Firle Crescent – Spital Road

Existing conditions

Mainly residential roads, with a link across green space.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Unsurfaced path between Hawkenbury Way and Spital Road. Difficult crossing of Nevill Road.

- 204.2.1 Residential roads need clear signing at junctions.
- 204.2.2 Informal path across green space needs surface improvements with a minimum width of 2.5 metres. Need to move boundary fence of reservoir.
- 204.2.3 Surface improvements for Spital Road.
- 204.2.4 Safe crossing of Nevill Road needed. Options include shared space approach and traffic signals.
- 204.2.5 Reduce speed limit to 20mph, review of on-street parking and consider potential for traffic calming.

205: South Downs - Station

Route description

An attractive bridleway in open countryside, then an important link from Nevill Road into the town centre and station.

Background

The route is supported by the National Park Authority and other stakeholders.

205.1 South Downs - Nevill Road

Existing conditions

Bridleway on rough tracks along the chalk ridge of the South Downs.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The bridleway is unsurfaced but suitable for leisure use on foot and with mountain bikes.

- 205.1.1 Surface improvements to the bridleway as required.
- 205.1.2 From the old Racecourse buildings down to Nevill Road there are three routes – a public footpath and bridleway and a private tarmac road. We recommend use of the road if this can be negotiated.
- 205.1.3 An improved crossing of Nevill Road is needed, preferably a signal crossing.

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Lewes June 2018

205.2 Nevill Road – Fisher Street

Existing conditions

Offham Road is one of the major routes into Lewes town centre and carries more than 5,000 vehicles per day.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Speed and volume of traffic on Offham Road and White Hill. Lack of safe crossings at junctions and narrow footways.

Recommendations

- 205.2.1 Existing path between Nevill Road and Hill Road should be widened to 3.0 metres for shared use.
- 205.2.2 Hill Road is a quiet residential cul-desac but the speed limit is 30mph and this should be reduced to 20mph.
- 205.2.3 A new crossing of Offham Road is needed for walkers and cyclists to link King Henry's Road with Kingsley Road.
- 205.2.4 The A2029 Offham Road is too busy for safe cycling and there is insufficient highway width to widen footways for shared use. The only practical solution is to reduce speed with traffic calming. This section can be avoided by using King Henry's Road.
- 205.2.5 A new crossing of Offham Road is planned to link Prince Edward's Road and Landport Road.
- 205.2.6 Offham Road between Prince Edward's Road and The Avenue cannot be avoided and traffic calming is needed as a high priority, to enforce a speed limit of 20mph. The only footway on the north side should be widened by reducing the carriageway to 6.0 metres.
- 205.2.7 The roundabout junction of Offham Road and The Avenue needs improved provision for pedestrians.
- 205.2.8 White Hill also needs traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds.

205.3 Fisher Street - Station

Existing conditions

Busy town centre roads on narrow historic streets.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Very narrow footways, one-way streets and traffic queuing make for unpleasant conditions in the heart of the old town.

- 205.3.1 Fisher Street is one-way south to north and should be closed to through traffic as part of town centre management to improve access and air quality.
- 205.3.2 Station Street is also one-way south to north and is a steep hill down to the station. The street should be closed to through traffic.
- 205.3.3 Station Road has two-way traffic and a 30mph speed limit, which should be reduced to 20mph.
- 205.3.4 The station forecourt is dominated by vehicles and should be redesigned to give wider footways and improved crossings for pedestrians, to reinforce a reduced speed limit.

Lower ulleyswells Farm

206:3:2

0

SHI

Race

FB.

1

Ashurst

Green

Cross

-

The Old

Mill House

Upper Mill

Reed Pond

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Lewes June 2018

206: Ditchling – Cooksbridge

Route description

This route provides a cross-country link between Ditchling, Streat, Chiltington and Cooksbridge and onwards to Lewes that avoids the busy B2116.

Background

The route was not discussed during the stakeholder consultation but was requested by the client.

206.1 **Ditchling – Streat**

Existing conditions

Public footpaths and bridleways with variable surfaces.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Poor surfaces on some sections.

Recommendations

- 206.1.1 East End Lane is a guiet residential street, but with potential for rat-running at peak times.
- 206.1.2 Surface public footpath across public open space to 2.5 metres.
- 206.1.3 The final section of footpath is narrow through woodland with limited space for widening. A new path in the adjacent field is recommended.
- The bridleway between Spatham Lane and 206.1.4 Hayleigh Farm has a good tarmac surface and only minor repairs are needed.
- 206.1.5 The western section of bridleway is on a gentle slope and is little used by vehicles. It will need significant improvements as a utility route.
- 206.1.6 The eastern section of bridleway is used regularly by vehicles and is adequate, although a number of potholes need to be filled.

206.2 Streat – East Chiltington

Existing conditions

Bridleways with variable surfaces, generally in better conditions where they are used by vehicles to access properties.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Poor surfaces on some sections.

Recommendations

- 206.2.1 The western section of bridleway is in reasonable condition and needs minor improvements.
- 206.2.2 The central section of bridleway is in very poor condition with numerous potholes. Significant surface and improvements are needed.
- 206.2.3 The eastern section of bridleway is in regular use by vehicles and needs minor improvements.
- 206.2.4 The bridleway between Plumpton Lane and Chapel Lane has a poor surface and significant improvements are needed.
- 206.3 East Chiltington - Cooksbridge

Existing conditions

Quiet lanes for the most part, then open fields at Cooksbridge.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The A275 at Cooksbridge is a major barrier and the proposed path would link up the quiet lanes.

- 206.3.1 Quiet lanes between East Chiltington and Cooksbridge only need signing.
- 206.3.2 The existing public footpath at Lower Tulleyswells Farm is muddy and needs a new surface and drainage, especially under the railway.
- 206.3.3 A new path on the field edge is needed to link directly to Hamsey Lane, thereby avoiding the A275. This could incorporate the Chatfields development site.

301: A27 - Swanborough

Route description

This is a useful link between Swanborough and Kingston villages and the A27 cycle track.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation.

301.1 A27 - Kingston

Existing conditions

A Toucan crossing of the A27 leads to an attractive narrow footpath above Ashcombe Hollow. There is traffic calming in the village centre with a 20mph speed limit.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The Ashcombe Hollow footpath is too narrow for shared use. Ashcombe Lane is moderately busy with one narrow footway between Kingston Ridge and The Avenue.

Recommendations

- 301.1.1 Improve waiting areas for Toucan crossing.
- 301.1.2 Widen footway beside A27 as it does not
- meet current standards. 301.1.3 The footway under the railway bridge is very narrow and should be widened for shared use. The only practical way to do this is shuttle working with traffic signals through the bridge.
- 301.1.4 The existing footpath needs to be widened to 2.5 metres and resurfaced throughout for shared use.
- 301.1.5 The first section of Ashcombe Lane is physically constrained by an embankment and stone wall. We recommend extending the village traffic calming to include this section.
- 301.1.6 The village centre is traffic calmed with a 20mph speed limit, but it needs better facilities for pedestrians. We recommend a Zebra crossing at The Street.

301.2 Kingston - Swanborough

Existing conditions

An unsurfaced public footpath crosses farmland between the two villages, offering a safe and attractive link.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The footpath is too narrow for shared use and is unsurfaced.

- 301.2.1 Widen public footpath to 2.5 metres for shared use and provide an all-weather surface.
- 301.2.2 Clear signing for all users through Swanborough Farm yards.

302: Lewes - Southease

Route description

This route largely follows the C7 road and the existing cycle route between Southover and Kingston.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation. There is a Community Strategy for the C7, although there is no mention of walking and cycling in the document. Holiday lodges are planned at Swanborough Lakes, which will provide links to the wider network.

302.1 Lewes - Kingston

Existing conditions

This section of the route was completed in 2013 and uses existing tracks and purpose built shared paths and is part of the Egrets Way.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Poor surfaces on existing tracks.

Recommendations

- 302.1.1 Surface and drainage improvements to the existing track.
- 302.1.2 Surface improvements to the existing track.

302.2 Kingston - Southease

Existing conditions

The C7 is a busy road with limited footway provision outside the villages. It is a vital artery linking several villages together with Lewes and Newhaven.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Speed and volume of traffic is the main barrier, along with restricted verge widths in places. There are some nearby public footpaths across open fields but these are unsurfaced and not considered a practical alternative.

Recommendations

302.2.1 There is insufficient verge width for a new footway and a path in adjacent fields is recommended between Wellgreen Lane and Swanborough.

302.2.2 The verge is a little wider between Swanborough and Iford, but the only practical option is a new path in adjacent fields.

302.2.3 The verge is sufficiently wide in places between Iford and Northease for a shared footway, but again the best option is a new path in adjacent fields.

- 302.2.4 The verge is not wide enough for a shared footway between Northease and Rodmell and a new path in the adjacent field is recommended.
- 302.2.5 The existing footway through Rodmell village should be widened to 2.5 metres for shared use.
- 302.2.6 There is an existing permissive path in adjacent fields between Rodmell and Southease which needs a good surface for shared use.

303: Cockshut Road - Iford

Route description

A permissive path on farm tracks across open countryside. A little known route but used by some local residents, with potential for cycling and adding links to the Egrets Way.

303.1 Cockshut Road - Iford

Existing conditions

Mainly surfaced farm tracks with some sections across open fields.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Permissive path for walking only shared with farm traffic.

Recommendations

303.1.1 Surface missing section south of Rise Farm.

305: Nevill - Southover

Route description

This route follows busy roads on the western sides of Lewes and narrow footpaths that are unsuitable for shared use.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation.

305.1 Nevill Road

Existing conditions

There are footways on both sides of Nevill Road but no facilities for cyclists on this busy road with more than 5,000 vehicles per day.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Volume of traffic and footway width is the main barrier to cycling. Lack of road crossings is the main barrier to walking.

Recommendations

- 305.1.1 Widen footway on west side for shared use.
- 305.1.2 Toucan crossing of Neville Road between Neville Crescent and Prince Edward's Road.
- 305.1.3 Widen footway on east side for shared use.
- 305.1.4 Nevill Road between Neville Terrace and Western Road has narrow footways with limited space for widening. It may be possible to acquire land from the Prison.

305.2 Prison - Southover

Existing conditions

Winterbourne Hollow and Bell Lane are busy roads with more than 5,000 vehicles per day.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Volume of traffic is the main barrier, along with restricted footway widths.

- 305.2.1 Detailed survey to determine suitability for shared use of footpath above Winterbourne Hollow.
- 305.2.2 Investigate potential for wheeling ramps on this footpath with numerous steps.

306: Offham – Town centre

Route description

This route avoids busy roads by using existing tracks and footpaths in the Ouse Valley. It links Offham, Landport with the town centre.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders including Hamsey Parish Council and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation.

306.1 Offham - Landport

Existing conditions

Public byway, steep and muddy in places with some exposed tree roots.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The poor surface and lack of lighting will deter some potential users.

Recommendations

- 306.1.1 Surface improvements and cutting back of overhanging vegetation.
- 306.1.2 Surface improvements alongside the allotment site.
- 306.1.3 Widen footpath to 3.0 metres between school grounds and recreation ground.

306.2 Landport - Town Centre

Existing conditions

Very narrow footpath and town centre roads.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Narrow footpath and footbridge over railway. Traffic conditions in town centre.

- 306.2.1 Detailed survey to investigate possible shared use of footpath.
- 306.2.2 Footbridge should be replaced with a wider structure to enable shared use.
- 306.2.3 The North Street area is a major development site and the plans must include good quality provision for walking and cycling.
- 306.2.4 Green Wall is an important link to the town centre avoiding busy roads and considerate shared use should be permitted.
- 306.2.5 Eastgate Street is busy with one-way traffic north to south. We recommend a substantial redesign that includes two-way cycling and improved pedestrian access to the bus station.
- 306.2.6 Friars Walk is also a busy road but with two-way traffic up to Court Road. We recommend that this section is included in a comprehensive redesign for the town centre.

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Lewes June 2018

307: Cooksbridge – Lewes Riverside

Route description

This route provides an alternative to the busy roads between Cooksbridge, Hamsey and Lewes. The main feature is a proposed bridge over the River Ouse on the line of the old railway.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders including Hamsey Parish Council and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation. It would require significant investment in a new bridge.

307.1 Cooksbridge – Lewes

Existing conditions

Quiet lanes and the former Lewes-Uckfield railway line.

Barriers to walking and cycling

There is no bridge over the River Ouse and the old railway formation is unsurfaced.

- 307.1.1 Designate Hamsey Lane and Whitfield Lane as Quiet Lanes.
- 307.1.2 Surface improvements to the former railway embankment providing a shared path 3.0 metres wide.
- 307.1.3 New pedestrian and cycle bridge over the River Ouse, approx. length 70 metres.
- 307.1.4 Surface improvements to the former railway embankment and cutting providing a shared path 3.0 metres wide.
- 307.1.5 Widen and resurface existing riverside path to a minimum of 3.0 metres. Provide new link between existing path and the old railway formation.

308: Malling - Southover

Route description

This route provides a good quality link on existing paths and quiet roads between Malling and the town centre and railway station.

Background

The route is supported by local stakeholders and was discussed during the stakeholder consultation.

308.1 Malling - Southover

Existing conditions

Well used footpaths and a narrow footbridge over the River Ouse, then quiet town centre roads.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Narrow footpaths and footbridge over the river. Poor access to New Road. Cobbled surface on Keere Street.

- 308.1.1 Widen existing paths across the Recreation Ground to a minimum of 3.0 metres for shared use.
- 308.1.2 Replace existing Willeys Bridge with a wider structure for shared use.
- 308.1.3 Widen existing footpath to a minimum of 3.0 metres for shared use.
- 308.1.4 St John's Terrace is currently one-way south to north but could accommodate two-way cycling.
- 308.1.5 New Road is closed to traffic at White Hill, but access for cyclists is poor. Improvements to this junction are needed to facilitate north-south movement.
- 308.1.6 The junction of Westgate Street and High Street is controlled by traffic signals, but there is no pedestrian phase to access Keere Street and this should be added.
- 308.1.7 Keere Street is steep with a cobbled surface and is unsuitable for cycling, even though there is no through traffic. An improved surface is needed, although this will need to be sensitive to the historic context.

311, 312, 313: Town Centre walking routes

Route description

These routes provide useful alternatives to the busy town centre roads. We have not attempted to describe all walking routes in the town centre, just a few of the strategic ones.

Background

The routes are supported by local stakeholders and were discussed during the stakeholder consultation.

White Hill - Southover Road 311

Existing conditions

Quiet lanes with limited vehicle access.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Uneven cobbled surface on Castle Gate.

Recommendations

- 311.1.1 Castle Banks is blocked by bollards and kerbs with no easy access for wheelchairs and improvements are needed.
- 311.1.2 Castle Gate has been attractively surfaced but is difficult for wheelchairs. Sensitive surface improvements should be considered.
- 311.1.3 St Martin's Lane is narrow with very narrow footways. We recommend a shared surface approach with no designated footways given that traffic levels are very low.

312 High Street - Friars Walk

Existing conditions

This is one of a number of "twittens" or narrow alleys that link the two streets

Barriers to walking and cycling

Cycling is not permitted because Broomans Lane is narrow and bounded by high walls in places.

Recommendations

- 312.1.1 Consider allowing cycle access to Broomans Lane, since it less steep and narrow than other twittens in the area.
- 312.1.2 Improvements needed to the informal crossing of Friars Walk, where a raised table is recommended.

313 Court Road - Mountfield Road

Existing conditions

Quiet residential road, railway footbridge and College grounds.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The footbridge is a significant barrier for cyclists and people with limited mobility.

- 313.1.1 A subway would be a considerable improvement and is a high priority for all users.
- 313.1.2 A pedestrian route through the Sussex Downs College site should be clearly marked.

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

Cost

High = more than $\pounds100,000$

Medium = £20,000 to £100,000

Low = less than $\pounds20,000$

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	
Route 210: A27 and Lewes town centre 14,270m				
210.1.1	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium	
210.1.2	Widen footway	Medium	High	
210.1.3	New path in field	Medium	High	
210.1.4	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium	
210.1.5	New path in field	Medium	High	
210.1.6	Widen footway	Medium	High	
210.2.1	Widen footway	Medium	High	
210.2.2	Widen footway	Medium	High	
210.2.3	Widen footway	High	High	
210.2.4	Widen footway	High	High	
210.3.1	All green phase	Medium	Medium	
210.3.2	Traffic calming	High	Medium	
210.3.3	Traffic restriction	High	Low	
210.3.4	Traffic restriction	High	Low	
210.3.5	Traffic restriction	High	Low	
210.3.6	Traffic calming	High	Medium	
210.3.7	All green phase	Medium	Medium	
210.4.1	Smoother surface	Medium	Medium	
210.4.2	Widen footway	Low	High	
210.4.3	Toucan crossing	High	Medium	
210.4.4	Traffic calming	Low	Medium	

210.5.1Widen footwayLowHigh210.5.2Widen footwayLowHigh210.5.3Existing shared pathn/an/a210.5.4Widen footwayLowHighRoute 310: Ringmer-Southease 14,900m310.1.1Widen footwayMedium310.1.1Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.2Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumLow310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowHigh310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.8Surface improvementsLowHigh310.3.1 <td< th=""><th>Item</th><th>Brief Description</th><th>Priority</th><th>Cost</th></td<>	Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost
210.5.2Widen footwayLowHigh210.5.3Existing shared pathn/an/a210.5.4Widen footwayLowHigh210.5.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.1Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.2Widen footwayHighHigh310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowWodium310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowHigh310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvements <t< td=""><td>210.5.1</td><td>Widen footway</td><td>Low</td><td>High</td></t<>	210.5.1	Widen footway	Low	High
210.5.3Existing shared pathn/an/a210.5.4Widen footwayLowHighRoute 310: Ringmer-Southease 14,900mMediumHigh310.1.1Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.2Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumLow310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowHigh310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowHigh310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvements	210.5.2	Widen footway	Low	High
210.5.4Widen footwayLowHighRoute 310: Ringmer-Southease 14,900m310.1.1Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.2Widen footwayHighHigh310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathLowHigh310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Miore path repairsMediumLow310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.	210.5.3	Existing shared path	n/a	n/a
Route 310: Ringmer-Southease 14,900m310.1.1Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.2Widen footwayHighHigh310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumLow310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.9Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.1Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.5New pathHighLow310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium	210.5.4	Widen footway	Low	High
310.1.1Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.2Widen footwayHighHigh310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.1Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.5Reduce speed	Route 310: R	ingmer-Southease 14,900m		
310.1.2Widen footwayHighHighHigh310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumLow310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.	310.1.1	Widen footway	Medium	High
310.1.3Zebra crossingHighMedium310.1.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.7Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.1Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.1Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.4<	310.1.2	Widen footway	High	High
310.1.4Widen footwayMediumHigh310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.1Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.1Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.1 <td>310.1.3</td> <td>Zebra crossing</td> <td>High</td> <td>Medium</td>	310.1.3	Zebra crossing	High	Medium
310.1.5Reduce speedMediumLow310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighLow310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.9Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsLowMedium310.3.8Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.9Surface improvementsLowMedium31	310.1.4	Widen footway	Medium	High
310.1.6Reduce speedMediumLow310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathLowHigh310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.6Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium<	310.1.5	Reduce speed	Medium	Low
310.2.1Existing shared pathn/an/a310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingMediumMedium<	310.1.6	Reduce speed	Medium	Low
310.2.2Improve signingLowLow310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathLowMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingMediumMedium <td>310.2.1</td> <td>Existing shared path</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td>	310.2.1	Existing shared path	n/a	n/a
310.2.3Traffic calmingMediumMedium310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumMedium310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumMedium	310.2.2	Improve signing	Low	Low
310.2.4Raised tableMediumMedium310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumLow310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890mLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitLowMedium201.2Bypasses of traffic calmingHighLow201.2.4Review car parkingMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumMedium	310.2.3	Traffic calming	Medium	Medium
310.2.5New cossing & pathMediumMedium310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumLow310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingHighLow201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumMedium	310.2.4	Raised table	Medium	Medium
310.2.6Widen pathLowHigh310.2.7Widen pathMediumMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumLow310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.2.5	New cossing & path	Medium	Medium
310.2.7Widen pathMediumMedium310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumLow310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.2.6	Widen path	Low	High
310.2.8Permit cyclingMediumLow310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighMedium310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumMedium310.3.7Surface improvementsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890mLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.2.7	Widen path	Medium	Medium
310.3.1Smoother surfaceMediumMedium310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighHigh310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890mUowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.2.8	Permit cycling	Medium	Low
310.3.2Widen pathMediumMedium310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighHigh310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890mLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.1	Smoother surface	Medium	Medium
310.3.3Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighHigh310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m201.1.1Surface improvementsLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.2	Widen path	Medium	Medium
310.3.4Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.5New pathHighHigh310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m201.1.1Surface improvementsLow201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.3	Surface improvements	High	Medium
310.3.5New pathHighHigh310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMedium201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.4	Surface improvements	High	Medium
310.3.6Surface improvementsHighMedium310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsHighLow201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.5	New path	High	High
310.3.7Minor path repairsMediumLowRoute 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsLowMighLow201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHighMedium201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.6	Surface improvements	High	Medium
Route 201: South Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsHighLow201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitLowMedium201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	310.3.7	Minor path repairs	Medium	Low
201.1.1Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.2Safety improvementsHighLow201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	Route 201: S	outh Downs Way - Lewes 4,890m		
201.1.2Safety improvementsHighLow201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.1.1	Surface improvements	Low	Medium
201.1.3Surface improvementsLowHigh201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.1.2	Safety improvements	High	Low
201.1.4Surface improvementsLowMedium201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.1.3	Surface improvements	Low	High
201.1.5Reduce speed limitHighLow201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.1.4	Surface improvements	Low	Medium
201.2.1Traffic calmingHighMedium201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.1.5	Reduce speed limit	High	Low
201.2.2Bypasses of traffic calmingMediumMedium201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.2.1	Traffic calming	High	Medium
201.2.3Roundabout re-designMediumMedium201.2.4Review car parkingMediumLow	201.2.2	Bypasses of traffic calming	Medium	Medium
201.2.4 Review car parking Medium Low	201.2.3	Roundabout re-design	Medium	Medium
	201.2.4	Review car parking	Medium	Low

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost		
Route 202: Lewes Priory 580m					
202.1.1	Widen path	Low	High		
202.1.2 Widen path Low					
Route 203: N	<i>I</i> ontacute Road – Town Centre 2,500m				
203.1.1	Route signing	High	Low		
203.1.2	Traffic calming	Medium	Medium		
203.1.3	Upgrade crossing	Medium	Medium		
203.1.4	Widen path	High	Medium		
203.2.1	Review car parking	Medium	Low		
203.2.2	Junction redesign	High	Medium		
203.2.3	Existing shared space	n/a	n/a		
203.2.4	Widen path	Medium	Low		
Route 204: 8	South Downs – Spital Road 2,060m				
204.1.1	Surface improvements	Low	Medium		
204.1.2	Replace steps with ramp	High	Medium		
204.2.1	Route signing	High	Low		
204.2.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium		
204.2.3	Surface improvements	Medium	Low		
204.2.4	Junction improvements	High	Medium		
204.2.5	20mph speed limit	High	Low		
Route 205: 8	South Downs - Station 9,630m				
205.1.1	Surface improvements	Low	Medium		
205.1.2	Negotiate use of road	Medium	Low		
205.1.3	New crossing	High	Medium		
205.2.1	Widen path	Medium	Low		
205.2.2	20mph speed limit	High	Low		
205.2.3	New crossing	High	Medium		
205.2.4	Traffic calming	High	Medium		
205.2.5	New crossing	High	Medium		
205.2.6	Traffic calming	High	Medium		
205.2.7	Junction improvements	High	Medium		
205.2.8	Traffic calming	High	Medium		
205.3.1	Road closure	High	Low		
205.3.2	Road closure	High	Low		
205.3.3	20mph speed limit	High	Low		
205.3.4	Forecourt redesign	Medium	Medium		

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost	
Route 206: Ditchling – Cooksbridge 10,400m				
206.1.1	Quiet lane	n/a	n/a	
206.1.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium	
206.1.3	New path in field	Medium	Medium	
206.1.4	Minor improvements	Medium	Low	
206.1.5	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium	
206.1.6	Minor improvements	Medium	Low	
206.2.1	Minor improvements	Medium	Low	
206.2.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium	
206.2.3	Minor improvements	Medium	Low	
206.2.4	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium	
206.3.1	Quiet lanes	n/a	n/a	
206.3.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium	
206.3.3	New path in field	Medium	High	
Route 301: A	27 - Swanborough 2,600m			
301.1.1	Improve Toucan crossing	Low	Low	
301.1.2	Widen footway	Medium	High	
301.1.3	Widen footway	Medium	Medium	
301.1.4	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium	
301.1.5	Traffic calming	Medium	Medium	
301.1.6	Zebra crossing	Medium	Low	
301.2.1	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium	
301.2.2	Clear signing	High	Low	
Route 302: L	ewes - Southease 6,660m			
302.1.1	Surface improvements	Medium	Low	
302.1.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Low	
302.2.1	New path in field	Medium	High	
302.2.2	New path in field	Medium	High	
302.2.3	New path in field	Medium	High	
302.2.4	New path in field	Medium	High	
302.2.5	Widen footway	Medium	High	
302.2.6	New path surface	Medium	High	
Route 303: C	ockshut Road - Iford 3,380m			
303.1.1	Surface improvements	Low	Medium	

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost		
Route 305: Nevill - Southover 1,460m					
305.1.1	Widen footway	Medium	High		
305.1.2	Toucan crossing	High	Medium		
305.1.3	Widen footway	Medium	High		
305.1.4	Widen footway	Medium	Medium		
305.2.1	Widen footpath	Medium	High		
305.2.2	Wheeling ramps	Medium	Low		
Route 306: 0	Offham – Town centre 3,140m				
306.1.1	Surface improvements	Medium	High		
306.1.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium		
306.1.3	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium		
306.2.1	Widen footpath	Medium	High		
306.2.2	Replacement footbride	Medium	High		
306.2.3	Include in development plans	Medium	Medium		
306.2.4	Permit shared use	High	Low		
306.2.5	Redesign of street	High	Medium		
306.2.6	Redesign of street	High	Medium		
Route 307: 0	Cooksbridge – Lewes Riverside 3,930m		•		
307.1.1	Quiet lanes	n/a	n/a		
307.1.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium		
307.1.3	New bridge	High	High		
307.1.4	Surface improvements	Medium	High		
307.1.5	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium		
Route 308: N	/alling - Southover 1,540m				
308.1.1	Widen footpath	High	Medium		
308.1.2	Replacement bridge	High	High		
308.1.3	Widen footpaths	High	Medium		
308.1.4	Contraflow cycling	High	Low		
308.1.5	Junction improvements	High	Low		
308.1.6	Add pedestrian phase	High	Medium		
308.1.7	Improve surface	Medium	Medium		
Routes 311,	312, 313: Town Centre walking routes				
311.1.1	Access improvements	Medium	Low		
311.1.2	Surface improvements	Medium	Medium		
311.1.3	Shared surface	Medium	Medium		
312.1.1	Consider cycle access	Medium	Low		
312.1.2	Crossing improvements	Medium	Medium		
313.1.1	Subway to replace bridge	High	High		
313.1.2	Improve wavfinding	Hiah	Low		

Town Centre traffic circulation

Narrow medieval streets in the town centre were not built to accommodate modern traffic flows, which create a hostile environment for walking and cycling. Pedestrians are confined to narrow footways, which are very difficult to use with prams, pushchairs and mobility vehicles. Cyclists have to compete for road space with motor vehicles as there is insufficient space for dedicated cycling facilities.

The town centre is designated as an Air Quality Management Area and it is likely that the biggest single contributor to this major problem is the exhaust gases from motor vehicles. Poor air quality affects pedestrians, cyclists and occupants of motor vehicles in equal measure.

Inspired by the James Edwards town plan of 1799, we recommend that traffic is restricted in the historic heart of the old town. Access to properties for residents and deliveries would be maintained, but through traffic would be prevented. This would be enforced with a number of "bus gates" which permit buses and cycles but exclude motor vehicles. This could be complemented by improved bus services and/or "Park+Ride" as suggested by others.

Current situation

The map to the left shows the current major two-way distributor routes for through traffic in Lewes:

- Nevill Road
- Offham Road & White Hill
- Western Road & High Street
- Winterbourne Hollow, Southover High Street, Priory Street & Station Road

The following town centre streets are one-way for motor traffic and could be opened to two-way cycling immediately:

- Fisher Street & Station Street
- West Street & Market Street
- East Street & Little East Street
- Eastgate Street
- Friars Walk & Lansdown Place

In addition, Lancaster Street and Abinger Place are designated one-way streets and are used by some through traffic. This does lead to conflicts and congestion for traffic turning right from Abinger Place into White Hill.

Proposed circulation

The map to the right shows one option for a revised traffic circulation pattern that restricts traffic through the historic west-east spine comprising Western Road and High Street. The following streets would be closed to through traffic:

- High Street
- Fisher Street
- Station Street
- Market Street

Detailed access arrangements for residential and commercial properties will need to be determined and delivery times could be limited as is the case in many town centres.

Perhaps the most significant change is for a number of one-way streets to be changed to two-way traffic flow:

- Little East Street
- Eastgate Street
- Friars Walk
- Lansdown Place

West Street would ideally be restricted too, but we recognise the importance of this street for traffic on the north side of the town. Reversing the one-way flow on Abinger Place and Lancaster Street should enable a smoother flow of traffic in this area. Development of the North Street Quarter should take into account these existing and proposed traffic movements in the area.

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

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

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

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.

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.