East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy Heathfield 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

Contents

Introduction Propensity to Cycle Map Trip Generators and Transport Network Description of the Town Heathfield Proposed Network 200: A265 Snatchells Farm – Broad Oak 201: Sheepsetting Lane - Sandy Cross Lane 202: Leeves Common 203: Cuckoo Drive - Green Lane 210: Battle Road West 211: Battle Road East 212: Halley Road 300: NCN Route 21 301: Cuckoo Trail extension 302: Thorny Close link 303: A265 – Sandy Cross Lane Table of recommendations East Sussex Delivery Methodology Glossary of Terms

Revision	Description	Author	Check	Date
-	Version 1	SP	ST	06/09/17
A	Version 2	SP	ST	09/03/18
В	Version 3	SP	ST	26/06/18

East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy Heathfield LCWIP June 2018



- ii
- v vi
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 4 5
- 5
- 6
- 6
- 7
- 7 8
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 12



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







Description of the Town

Heathfield and Waldron lie on the crest and southern slopes of one of the main ridges of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. To the south there is the coast and South Downs. Population of the parish is around 11,500, while the main urban area of Heathfield was 7,732 at the 2011 Census.

The topology of the area was formed some 65 million years ago when the region rose above the sea, creating the Downs and the Weald. Later erosion of the High Weald cut through the chalk to expose the underlying sandstones and clays and create the ridges and steep-sided ghylls, dense forests, woods, flora, wildlife and springs and streams. For many centuries its peripheral position was emphasised by difficult access, especially in winter.

The original settlement at Heathfield grew up along the ridge which runs east-west some 150-170 metres above sea level. Waldron, also lies a little way off the ridgeway, where ancient routes meet at Cross-in-Hand. Modern Heathfield has grown up in the bowllike valley of Waldron Ghyll.

Transport

The A265 is the main west-east road through the town, with links to the A267 between Tunbridge Wells and Hailsham. The B2096 links to Battle and Hastings to the southeast. The railway operated between 1880 and 1968 and the line south to Polegate has been converted to a traffic-free path. The nearest station is Uckfield (for Tunbridge Wells and London) and Polegate is on the coastal line between Brighton and Ashford.

Policy

The overall vision for Heathfield is to enable the retention of existing services and improved services and facilities, along with improving accessibility to jobs and other key services, through improved and integrated travel options. The promotion of the town as a tourist destination, alongside the Cuckoo Trail will be required to support the local economy.

Housing will be provided in appropriate locations to meet the needs of the town, but the AONB will be protected, and the following growth is proposed:

- Land allocated for up to153 dwellings
- The provision of 290 square metres of retail floorspace, subject to further retail studies.

Local Trip Generators

The town provides a number of key local services to support both work and play, which generate a number of localised trips, alongside attracting visitors. These are concentrated on the High Street and Station Road in the northern part of town. The Cuckoo Trial is a significant attraction, linking Heathfield with Hailsham, Polegate and Eastbourne.

There is a small industrial area on Ghyll Road. Heathfield Community College serves a wide geographical area with around 1200 students. There are two primary schools in Heathfield at opposite ends of the town – Cross in Hand and Parkside.

Cycling and Walking in Heathfield

The underlying geography of the area is undulating, with the majority of key trip generators along the main ridge around the High Street. Residential areas occupy the more undulating parts of town, though these are not generally excessively steep. 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.

The only existing dedicated walking and cycling route is the Cuckoo Trail between Heathfield and Polegate, which forms part of the Avenue Verte London-Paris via the Newhaven-Dieppe ferry.

There is some effective traffic calming and a 20mph zone outside Cross in Hand Primary School.

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

- Traffic congestion in the town centre and fast moving traffic on Mutton Hall Road.
- Provide alternatives to cycling on carriageway for the busiest routes, this can be on-road, or off carriageway as a shared or segregated path, as feasible in each situation.
- A key objective is to provide a continuous, ideally traffic-free, walking and cycling route to the community college.
- Cycle parking at key trip generators is currently below standard in both quantity and security level, enhancing this will encourage more cyclists.
- Improved crossings and flush dropped kerbs for pedestrians and disabled people





2

200: A265 Snatchells Farm – Broad Oak

Route description

This is the main west-east route through the town, linking residential areas with the main commercial centre in the High Street.

Background

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

200.1 Snatchells Farm – Fire Station

Existing conditions

This section of the A265 is lined with residential properties with a continuous footway on the north side.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The A265 is a busy road, with more than 10,000 vehicles per day (vpd) and a 40mph speed limit, which makes it intimidating for on-road cycling and for pedestrians. The footway is not wide enough for shared use.

Recommendations

200.1.1 Widen footway to 3m for shared use (min 2.5m at pinch points). Reduce speed limit to 30mph.

200.2 Fire Station – Tower Street

Existing conditions

High Street is the main commercial centre, with shops on both sides of the road. Mutton Hall Hill rises gradually to the east and is constrained by private properties.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The volume of traffic is the main barrier and footways are narrow on Mutton Hall Hill. Parked cars are an obstacle for on-road cyclists, with the additional hazard of opening doors. There are several pedestrian crossing in the town centre and footways are generally in good condition.

Recommendations

- 200.2.1 Reduce speed limit in commercial area to 20 mph and remove on-street parking.
- 200.2.2 Consider gateway treatments and raised tables at either end of commercial area to slow traffic.
- 200.2.3 There are no obvious solutions on Mutton Hall Hill as there is limited space for on-road cycle lanes or to widen footways. Even if traffic speed can be reduced, volumes will be a major deterrent to cycling. Consider traffic calming.

200.3 Tower Street – Broad Oak

Existing conditions

From Tower Street to Street End lane, the A265 has open fields and woodland to the south and dispersed properties to the north, with a small industrial site at the Battle Road junction.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The A265 continues as a busy road, although volumes are slightly reduce east of Battle Road to 5,000-10,000 vpd. Narrow footways can be intimidating for pedestrians and are not wide enough to allow cycling.

Recommendations

- 200.3.1 Widen southern footway to 3m by moving boundaries or new construction on fields behind the hedge.
- 200.3.2 Improve uncontrolled crossing of Battle Road with clear road markings and reduced corner radii.
- 200.3.3 Widen southern footway to 3m by moving boundaries or new construction on fields behind the hedge.
- 200.3.4 Speed limit through Broad Oak is 30mph, but traffic volumes mean that cyclists cannot be accommodated safely on-road. Verges are generally too narrow to widen footways for shared use. Consider traffic calming.
- 200.3.5 Install Zebra crossing at the small commercial centre in Broad Oak.

















201: Sheepsetting Lane - Sandy **Cross Lane**

Route description

This route follows secondary distributor roads through the town, linking the Cross in Hand and Parkside Primary Schools. It also passes a small industrial estate on Ghyll Road.

Sheepsetting Lane – Ghyll Road 201.1

Existing conditions

There is extensive horizontal and vertical traffic calming and a 20 mph zone outside Cross in Hand Primary School, but no facilities elsewhere on the route. We do not have traffic data, but assume volumes are less than 5,000 vpd.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Speed and volume of traffic is the main barrier to cycling. Horizontal traffic calming at the school has no cycle bypass. There is a continuous footway but it is narrow in places.

Recommendations

- 201.1.1 Extend 20mph zone throughout this residential area, with physical traffic calming measures throughout. Cycle bypasses at give way islands.
- Footway widening 201.1.2 and surface improvements where possible.
- 201.1.3 Widen footway and provide smooth transition for cyclists between Leeves Way and Pook Reed Lane.

Sandy Cross Lane 201.2

Existing conditions

Old Ghyll Road is a quiet cul-de-sac with filtered permeability at the eastern end. Sandy Cross Lane is narrow in places and is a minor distributor road to surrounding villages.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Sandy Cross Lane is bounded by hedges and has no footways, with limited connections to residential areas to the north. Speed limit changes to derestricted half way along lane. Steps and an uneven ramp at Old Ghyll Road. No access to the school from Sandy Cross Lane.

Recommendations

- 201.2.1 Surface ramp and provide crossing of Hailsham Road.
- Reduce speed limit to 20 mph along 201.2.2 length of lane, with traffic calming at key pedestrian access points.
- 201.2.3 Create new access to Parkside Primary School, on land likely to be owned by the school.











202: Leeves Common

Route description

A useful local route on quite roads, linking residential areas with the town centre.

202.1 Newnham Way -Leeves Way

Existing conditions

Quiet residential roads with no through traffic due to the green space called Leeves Common.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Path across the common is a little narrow for shared use.

Recommendations

202.1.1 Widen footpath across Leeves Common.



East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Heathfield June 2018

203: Cuckoo Drive – Green Lane

Route description

A useful west-east route across the southern part of town, linking residential areas with the Cuckoo Trail.

Leeves Common - Hailsham 203.1 Road

Existing conditions

Quiet residential roads and footpaths, one with numerous steps.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The footpath between Leeves Common and the Cuckoo Trail is narrow with steps and unsuitable for cyclists and for people with limited mobility.

An alleyway connects Harley Lane with Cuckoo Drive. Difficult staggered crossing of Hailsham Road.

Recommendations

- 203.1.1 Designate alleyway for shared use and remove barriers.
- 203.1.2 Provide crossing of Hailsham Road, with linking shared footways between Holly Drive and Prospect Road.

203.2 Hailsham Road – Park Road

Existing conditions

Prospect Road is a steep hill, with one-way traffic eastbound uphill. Green Lane is a quiet residential road leading to footpaths through an attractive green space.

Barriers to walking and cycling

One-way traffic on Prospect Road. Footpaths not designated for shared use.

Recommendations

- 203.2.1 Allow contraflow cycling downhill on Prospect Road.
- 203.2.2 Widen footpath for shared use and replace barriers with bollards.







210: Battle Road West

Route description

This is an important route to the Community College and Leisure Centre alongside the B2096 beside Heathfield Park.

Background

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

A265 – Community College 210.1

Existing conditions

The road is busy with over 5,000 vpd. There is a narrow footway on the southwest side of the B2096, constrained by the park boundary in places.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Narrow footway beside the busy road, unsuitable for shared use and limited space for widening.

Recommendations

210.1.1	Widen footway to 3m by moving boundary
	fence.

- 210.1.2 On narrowest section construct path behind boundary wall, private land will be required.
- 210.1.3 Parking restrictions at school times to allow safe use of road outside Leisure Centre.















211: Battle Road East

Route description

This route provides a useful link for several villages to the Community College and Heathfield alongside the B2096.

Background

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

College - Punnett's Town 211.1

Existing conditions

Signal crossing of Battle Road just to the east of Portland Square. There is a continuous footway to Punnett's Town, which changes sides of the road.

Barriers to walking and cycling

One-way street outside the college. Narrow footway is unsuitable for shared use and crosses the road in two places.

Recommendations

- 211.1.1 Allow contraflow cycling southbound on Portland Square.
- 211.1.2 Widen footway to 2.5m minimum for shared use.
- 211.1.3 Provide safe road crossings where footway changes sides.

212: Halley Road

Route description

A useful link between Broad Oak and the Community College.

212.1 Broad Oak - College

Existing conditions

Existing footway in a wide grass verge from the edge of Broad Oak village to Battle Road.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Narrow lane is hazardous for shared use and has no footways. Footway on Halley Road is not wide enough for shared use.

Recommendations

- 212.1.1 Point closure of narrow lane with no footway to prevent through traffic and create a good quality link between residential areas and Halley Road
- 212.1.2 Widen footway to 2.5m minimum for shared use.













300: NCN Route 21

Route description

This route provides a primary cycling and walking link between Mayfield, Heathfield and Hailsham. It also forms part of the long distance Avenue Verte London-Paris route

Background

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

300.1 Marklye Lane

Existing conditions

The bridleway between Newick Lane and Marklye Lane has been improved in recent years, but still has a rough surface and is prone to erosion on the steeper slopes. There are traffic signals at the A265 junction.

Barriers to walking and cycling

This section is a delightful traffic-free route through woodland and open countryside, but has a poor surface. Road cyclists are recommended to use Newick Lane.

Recommendations

300.1.1 Improve the bridleway surface so that it can be used by road bikes in all weathers.

300.2 A265 – Cuckoo Trail

Existing conditions

Mainly quiet residential roads with short sections on busier roads at each end – Tower Street and Station Road.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Two busy roads with no crossing facilities.

Recommendations

- 300.2.1 Provide shared footway on east side of Tower Street in wide verge, with raised junction table at Downsview.
- 300.2.2 Provide shared footway on west side of Station Road in grass verge, with raised junction table at Gibraltar Rise.

300.3 Cuckoo Trail

Existing conditions

Traffic-free surfaced path between Heathfield and Polegate on the old railway line.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Steep slopes at some road crossings.

Recommendations

- 300.3.1 Ease gradients at both sides of Old Ghyll Road crossing.
- 300.3.2 Ease gradient and approach to Toucan crossing of Ghyll Road.













301: Cuckoo Trail extension

Route description

This alignment has been investigated in the past, to continue the traffic-free path northwards to Mayfield.

Background

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

301.1 Mayfield - Heathfield

Existing conditions

Most of the dismantled railway formation is intact as far as Mayfield, where the alignment has been used to construct the Mayfield Bypass. There have been some landslips along this section.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The old railway is in private ownership and not available to the public, apart from a short section at the Heathfield end. Heathfield Tunnel is owned by the Parish Council but is currently closed.

Recommendations

301.1.1 Negotiate access and construct a new path along the old railway line.



302: Thorny Close link

Route description

This is the best available route between the Cuckoo Trail and the town centre.

Background

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

302.1 Town Centre-Cuckoo Trail

Existing conditions

The route follows footpaths, shared footways and quiet roads, with one narrow section between a high wall and hedge.

Barriers to walking and cycling

There is a short 25 metre length of twitten between private properties that is too narrow for shared use.

Recommendations

- 302.1.1 Widen footpath where possible for comfortable shared use.
- 302.1.2 Improve crossing of Newnham Way with raised table and replacement of barriers with bollards.

303: A265 – Sandy Cross Lane

Route description

A useful route on the east side of town, linking residential areas with the primary route to Broad oak and the Community College.

Background

There are very few through routes in the southeast quadrant of the town, which makes for quiet roads but very limited permeability for walking and cycling.

303.1 A265-Park Road

Existing conditions

Tower Street is a moderately busy road, with more than 5,000 vpd. It falls fairly steeply to the south, with likely increases in traffic speed on this section.

Barriers to walking and cycling

The road is too busy for on-road cycling, with no footway on the east side beside Heathfield Park.

Recommendations

- 303.1.1 Widen footway to 3m on east side of Tower Street (see also 300.2).
- 303.1.2 Construct new shared path on east side of road. Given the nature of the road, it would be preferable to negotiate access to land within Heathfield Park.

303.2 Park Road - Sandy Cross Lane

Existing conditions

Quiet residential roads and an unsurfaced footpath.

Barriers to walking and cycling

Footpath between Lime Way and Sandy Cross Lane is unsurfaced. Park Road is one-way southbound.

Recommendations

- 303.2.1 Contraflow cycling on Park Road.
- 303.2.2 Surface improvements to public footpath.











East Sussex Cycling and Walking Strategy

Heathfield June 2018

Table of recommendations

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

Priority

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

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

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

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost
200 A265	Snatchells Farm – Broad Oak 3,930m	•	•
200.1.1	Widen footway	Medium	High
200.2.1	Reduce speed limit	High	Low
200.2.2	Gateway features	Medium	Medium
200.2.3	Traffic calming	High	Medium
200.3.1	Widen footway	High	High
200.3.2	Improve crossing	High	Medium
200.3.3	Widen footway	High	High
200.3.4	Traffic calming	Medium	Medium
200.3.5	Zebra crossing	Medium	Medium
201 Sheep	osetting Lane – Sandy Cross Lane 2,240m		
201.1.1	Extend traffic calming	High	High
201.1.2	Improve footways	Medium	High
201.1.3	Widen footway	Medium	Medium
201.2.1	Provide road crossing	Medium	High
201.2.2	Reduce speed limit	Medium	Low
201.2.3	New school access	Low	Low
202 Leeve	es Common 500m		
202.1.1	Widen footpath	Low	Medium

Cost

High = more than £100,000

Medium = £20,000 to £100,000

Low = less than £20,000

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

Item	Brief Description	Priority	Cost
203 Cucko	oo Drive – Green Lane 1,130m		
203.1.1	Designate shared use	Low	Low
203.1.2	Provide crossing	Medium	High
203.2.1	Contraflow cycling	Medium	Low
203.2.3	Widen footpath	Low	Medium
210 Battle	Road West 1,020m		
210.1.1	Widen footway	High	High
210.1.2	Widen footway	High	High
210.1.3	Traffic restrictions	Medium	Low
211 Battle	Road East 1,330m		<u>^</u>
211.1.1	Contraflow cycling	Medium	Low
211.1.2	Widen footway	Medium	High
211.1.3	Road crossing	Medium	Medium
212 Halley	Road 930m		•
212.1.1	Point closure	Low	Low
212.1.2	Widen footway	Medium	High
300 NCN F	Route 21 6,300m	·	·
300.1.1	Improve surface	High	Medium
300.2.1	Road crossing	Medium	Medium
300.2.2	Road crossing	Medium	Medium
300.3.1	Ease gradients	Medium	Medium
300.3.2	Ease gradients	Medium	Medium
301 Cucko	oo Trail extension 2,780m		·
301.1.1	Negotiate access	Low	Low
302 Thorny	/ Close link 380m	· · · ·	•
302.1.1	Widen footpath	Medium	Medium
302.1.2	Improve crossing	Medium	Medium
303 A265 -	- Sandy Cross Lane 1,700m		°
303.1.1	Widen footway	Medium	Medium
303.1.2	New shared path	Medium	High
303.2.1	Contraflow cycling	Low	Low
303.2.2	Surface improvements	Medium	High





East Sussex Delivery Methodology

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

Stage	Purpose	Inputs	Outputs	Tools/ Guidance	Stakeholders Engaged
1. Network Criteria	 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 cegeneration, 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 Ard be by **Pi** Lo a rel to the **Pi** Min cy **Pi** A in cy **Pi** Ea:

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.

