

Kingston Parish Council – East Sussex 2006 – 2011 Transport Plan Comments

Page	Para	Comment
4	2.2.2	Should include improved ROW network. Justification: Economic regeneration: Tourism, rural diversification, equestrian industry (second largest land base industry after agriculture). Quality of life: benefits for improved health of the community. Part of the non-vehicular transport network.
6	2.2.7	Excellent aim but difficult to implement – re out-of-town shopping Developments and ‘centres of excellence’ for hospitals and schools. Good to include for future developments.
7	2.2.12	Good to include all users here, although but this is not emphasised in later strategies, where vulnerable users seem downplayed. The ROW network is part of the transport network for walkers and cyclists. Improvements to the network would allow those walking, cycling and riding for exercise to do so safely, away from traffic.
7	2.2.15	Agreed but need adequate and affordable school transport for all as well as safe routes for cycling and walking and crossing points. Particular problem of severance (e.g. Rodmell).
8	2.2.23	Keep up the good work. I wonder how long it will be before the rail company decides about Lewes Rail Bridge.
15	Box 1	Need to introduce better and cheaper public transport
15	Box 2	Flexi hours make it difficult for regular car sharing
15	Box 2	Need to include improved Rights of Way network.
16	Box 3	Need better and cheaper public transport for all children
23	3.4.7	The East Sussex Rural Transport Partnership should be included when transport priorities are discussed.
23	3.4.10	Accessibility Strategy – see 3.4.7 above
24	ESSP	Strongly support moves to improve public transport. Strongly support speed management, but why exclude speed cameras (fixed or speed checks), which have been shown to be effective in reducing accidents if appropriately sited?
24	ESSP	Should include improved Rights of Way and improvements in safety for vulnerable road users (footways, verges, multi-user tracks for walkers, cyclists and riders.)

Kingston Parish Council – East Sussex 2006 – 2011 Transport Plan Comments

25		Improved services have certainly increased passenger numbers in my village.
25		Strongly support “Improved Safety through Villages”.
29	3.5.13	Strongly object to inclusion of “energy recovery from waste – i.e. incinerator. It will be contrary to air quality objectives, and increase heavy traffic in the vulnerable and already congested area between the A27 and the A259, and increase pressure on rural roads such as the C7
29	3.5.13	Strongly support recommendations.
33	3.6.12	Essential to improve public transport services to achieve objective
34	Rural Dimension	Strongly support “demand responsive transport” - essential for rural regeneration and inclusion. (East Sussex Rural Transport Partnership input essential).
35	Airports	Local transport to pick-up points for airport coaches/trains is essential.
36	Inter-modal	Strongly support improvements between bus and rail services. Also, car/cycle- rural users need to access the bus and rail network. Strategic, affordable parking spaces at bus depots/railway stations allow a short journey and switch to public transport. Cycle users need to be able to take the bike on the train, or lock it up.
37		A27 – an earlier start would be appropriate and welcomed
42	3.7.5	Recognises the problems for the C7, and C342 through Kingston, along with improvements to trunk roads, how will ESCC counter the adverse effects on the rural roads and the rural communities along these routes from the greater pressures anticipated? Failure to take action will have negative effects on many other key objectives.
45	3.8.8	More car parking space is needed in Lewes – this is essential for small shops and people living in rural surrounds. Improved bus links Telscombe/Peacehaven/Lewes, Newhaven, especially with links to rail, and strategic parking to allow users to switch to public transport would create a more integrated system, encouraging greater use of public transport. Evening and weekend services are important. People have to be able to access public transport, and get home again. A route is only as good as its weakest link.
48		Revitalising Railways - Strongly support Lewes/Uckfield line. Need bus links to stations and improved parking, and cycle provision (on trains and lock ups at stations)
51	3.10.3	Supports theory that provision of good, affordable public transport reduces need for a car!

Kingston Parish Council – East Sussex 2006 – 2011 Transport Plan Comments

52	3.10.10	Could be reflection of lack of provision for vulnerable road users, and need to improve rights of way network.
56	3.10.24	Emphasised the need for improved public transport, as road network improvements are limited in the foreseeable future. Improvements in ROW network and provision for vulnerable road users, and rural traffic management are essential for rural regeneration, and quality of life.
56	3.10.28	Social exclusion in villages often comes from severance by busy roads, no pavements/verges/safe crossing points. Many people need access to a car to leave the house or visit a close neighbour!
57	3.10.31	Concessionary fare scheme for buses welcomed but this should be funded NATIONALLY . This encourages greater use of public transport and if coupled with a stick of high parking charges, would help to encourage car users onto public transport, provided an integrated accessible network was available. Rural users must be able to access the main network however, or they are penalised still further.
59	3.10.41	In view of high infrastructure costs, the best way to maximize efficiency would probably be to have NIL GROWTH – bearing in mind that population growth in East Sussex is “entirely due to net in-migration”!!.
61	3.10.56	Quiet road surface: SMA has caused problems, and its use has been restricted or stopped in some other countries. Please review before committing the county to use it!
63	3.11.1	Re-opening of the Lewes – Uckfield railway line must remain the PRIORITY .
64	3.11.2	Affordable and adequate public transport to hospitals, education and employment should have TOP PRIORITY (these are essentials). Increasing use of public transport to school would greatly reduce peak congestion; we all note the reduction in traffic when school is out!
66	4.24	Inclusion of Parish and Town Councils is VERY important.
70	4.3.18	Omission of the A259 is very serious. It will cause serious and predictable pressures on the trunk road system, spilling over to the minor rural routes, having a serious detrimental effect on local communities. The situation is worsening daily and should be given priority especially if extra funding becomes available.

Kingston Parish Council – East Sussex 2006 – 2011 Transport Plan Comments

71	4.3.24	Strongly support. Could contribute to substantial increase in use of public transport from the coast, and reduce traffic congestion through Lewes. Train, e.g. Newhaven to Uckfield, could achieve better journey times.
81	4.5.17	Improve rights of way network for vulnerable users. For them it is a part of the whole network, and enables them to keep off the roads where it provides links. Safer for all.
84	4.5.29	Does this include the condition of verges, pavements, cycle tracks and multi user routes for vulnerable road users? Too often repairs to the roads seem to narrow verges (tarmac creep), or bring road levels up to the level of the footways, which become part of the road, and less safe for pedestrians. Thus road repairs are damaging the safe routes for vulnerable users, who are then forced into their cars, see for example the C7 Kingston to Lewes. Signs block verges, so walkers and riders are forced onto the road.
86	4.5.38	Provision of multi user tracks and maintain verges for vulnerable road users.
94	4.6.6	Four key sectors are mentioned – “the elderly” should be added?
94	4.6.9	Up-to-date Web site information would be useful
97	4.6.22	Strategic, affordable parking points to link to other forms of transport essential in rural county, as many people have to access public transport by car. (Cyclist provision is important as well)
106	4.6.57	It is important to note that the cost of taxis in the Lewes Area have soared since taxi meters were introduced. Additionally, fares can vary very much for the same distances – can be as much as £2+ on a £4 - £6 journey and these anomalies mean that hiring a taxi is a very risky business. However, in recognition of the need for this type of transport, a fixed fare might be more helpful to passengers.
113	4.7.21	Greater emphasis re accessibility to all forms of transport – especially public transport and into rural areas - is welcomed.
120	5.2.4	Membership of the Local Transport Forums should include Town and Parish Councillor representatives.
122	5.2.12	Parish and Town Councils will be able to provide first-hand information re specific rural transport issues.

Kingston Parish Council – East Sussex 2006 – 2011 Transport Plan Comments

122	5.2.13	Should be multi user provision. The provision of cycle tracks along rural roads places riders between cyclists and cars. This is extremely dangerous for the riders and the cars. Equestrianism may not be transport, but it is an important industry contributing many millions of pounds to the County's economy. Riders use roads, and policies, which increase danger for riders are not acceptable. Horse accidents on the road (8 a day) are always serious, and as many drivers as riders are killed.
123	5.2.13	Schemes funded by the (ex) Countryside Agency could be a valuable source of information and provide information re specific rural transport issues (E.Sx Rural Transport Partnership have information about many of these local schemes).
123	5.2.18	The road through Kingston (C 324) has been widened considerably over the last few years (consequence of maintenance dealing with damage to verges, etc.) – it is now unacceptable for a country lane and speeding traffic.
124	5.2.20	Welcome. Improve local rights of way network could be added. For vulnerable road users this is a part of the transport network, and is safer, as it keeps them away from roads. Also very cost effective.
124	5.2.22/23	A rights of way improvement plan is all well and good, but it needs more commitment for funding. It is extremely cost effective, brings excellent returns and is very important for the economy of the County. The effects of the closure of footpaths/bridleways during the foot and mouth outbreak should have demonstrated clearly the economic significance of the network. Important also for improved health/ increased exercise objectives.
125	5.2.25	Bus waiting facilities have worsened to such an extent that they are practically non-existent at certain times. Lewes has no toilet (apart from restaurant up steep stairs and only for customers) and the waiting room closes when not manned – the Information Officer has recently been made redundant. Newhaven and most other places have none. Emphasis should be made on the fact that good facilities are ESSENTIAL to promote increased use of public transport.
126	5.2.31	The list should include the A259 Seaford to Brighton? The section linking to the A26 from both sides is relevant, and the Newhaven bridge.
127	5.3.4	A 6 th category – “The Elderly” should be included.
128		Safe crossings at key points –hospitals, schools, essential to this. Supervised crossings at primary schools, so that parents can be confident about children using public transport unescorted.

Kingston Parish Council – East Sussex 2006 – 2011 Transport Plan Comments

130	5.3.19	Welcome, but consideration should be given to the effects on riders when putting in cycle tracks, particularly on rural roads.
130	5.3.20	Strongly support. Would the project for a multi user route linking Newhaven to Lewes, with links to the villages along the way, the “Ouse Valley Greenway” come under this strategy?
132	5.3.28	Town and Parish Councillor representatives could make a valuable contribution to this Accessibility Strategy.
135	5.3.46	Sufficient car parks in towns are essential. Lack of car parking results in drivers going to out-of-town super markets thus making the situation worse. After all, historically, shops have always been situated in towns and if shoppers are forced to travel further, this creates more traffic on roads. From a rural point of view, it can cause serious problems if you cannot park near to a Chemist shop or a doctor’s surgery, etc. How on earth can local shops and businesses be revitalised without adequate car parking?
140	5.3.73	... in consultation with BHS and bridleway groups. They will offer help and advice on this, and collect information from a large network of members across the county.
146		Vulnerable road users- riders should be included. They use the roads, and their safety is important, also it affects the safety of other road users- you do not come off too well if you drive into a horse. Changes to improve the network for other users, e.g. cycle tracks by the road, or behind a hedge, can seriously impair safety of riders on the road.
147	5.3.109	(pelican, toucan, puffin and Pegasus)
151	5.3.131	Current road resurfacing techniques are raising road surfaces to level of kerbing on footways, so they become part of the road. This is damaging footways. Tarmac creep is eroding verges. It is important that improvements in one area do not damage another.
162	Table 26	Where does the allocation to the rights of way network come here? It is a part of the transport system, as is rightly recognised. Yet the allocation in the spend is so small it disappears off the page! Riders also use roads. Measures which benefit riders also benefit other vulnerable users, so are best value. This needs some recognition in the budget.

184		<p><u>East Sussex Road Network – Revised Classification</u></p> <p>It is noted that the C324 has been included in the “Intra Rural Roads” category. However, on page 77 the definition of that category is “local roads connecting main villages with towns and major transport routes.” (Predominantly ‘B’ roads/some important C and Unclassified class roads”). It therefore needs to be pointed out that this lane (Wellgreen Lane) cannot be regarded as “connecting with major transport routes” because it is not a through road for heavy goods and large lorries. Kingston Parish Council consider that this position should be reviewed urgently and strongly suggest that the “Village Road” is a more suitable category because this is clearly a “local road serving small villages and hamlets or with only a local connection within villages”.</p> <p>Kingston Parish Council will welcome your support in this respect and be pleased to hear that the entry has been transferred to the “Village Roads” section.</p> <p>There was a similar error in the 2000 draft Local Transport Plan. When Kingston Parish Council commented on that draft plan, it was pointed out that under Draft Chapter 2 “Problems and Opportunities” Kingston Parish was classified as a “Large Urban Area”.</p> <p>It is hoped that this time the road classification for the C324 will be amended BEFORE the final LTP is printed.</p>
-----	--	--

The situation for the C7 and C324 is very serious. It is recognised that because of problems on the A259 and A26/A27 these rural village roads are being used for totally unsuitable purposes. And yet:

- no policy of review for the relevant section of the A259 has been recommended
- no policy of traffic management has been recommended
- no traffic calming through the villages has been recommended.

This is not satisfactory. These issues should be included in the management plan, as they are vital for the economic, environmental and community health of the residents of the affected villages, and of Lewes.

Finally, thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on your draft LTP.