



Access and movement

5G: Getting around

203 responses

Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	9
Question 15: What is your view on a new roundabout or any other solutions to access the site?	98
Question 16: Do you support shared surface or segregated routes for vehicular traffic and pedestrians/cyclists for parts of the redeveloped site?	96

Comments received

(R23/session 60863; Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment)
Created August 2nd 2022

3.1) There seems to be an opportunity for a bold, forward-thinking approach to site access, in line with the aspirations to create an exemplar. Such an approach could maximise space available in the lower part of the site (the 'Cement Works' and possibly 'Riverside') for built development and it would allow the most environmentally sensitive areas to be conserved. The Transport Study makes assumptions which have generated a conventional scheme with major highway interventions. How travel and access to the site are planned and managed will have a profound effect on the design of the development and therefore on the landscape. In the AAP para. 5.92 says that 'in terms of the access solutions there are landscape effects generated by the different options, for example, the provision of a roundabout would require the clearance of much of the Cement Works.' A more radical approach to travel planning could be developed to include in the preferred option version of the AAP. 3.2) The additional fourth scenario, outlined in 5.0 below, could usefully be covered by the Transport Assessment. 3.3) Limiting vehicle access would minimise the amount of space taken by highway infrastructure, on the site and outside it, as well as parking. This would have a number of benefits including: maximising potential area for built development; freeing up space for green areas around the buildings, reducing the impact on air quality and tranquillity the experiential landscape in general. 3.4) Development of pedestrian and cycle routes to service the site has been described within the AAP but no reference is made that we can see to improving the surrounding network of paths and lanes and open access areas. This is a topic that could be covered in the next iteration of the AAP. In particular the single track rural road to the east may offer an additional link for cyclists and walkers.

(R66/session 60910; West Sussex County Council (WSCC))
Created August 2nd 2022

Further work will be required to develop the transport evidence base supporting the AAP

prior to Submission. The NPPF paragraph 104 states that 'Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that: a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed; b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated; c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued' Section 3.6.3 on Movement (Pgs. 22 & 23) refers to sustainable transport being prioritised over private vehicle use, but overall the AAP does not currently provide detail on how this is to be achieved. We would expect most detail to be provided in a Transport Assessment rather than the over-arching policy document, nonetheless there is currently insufficient detail in the AAP as to how sustainable transport will be prioritised. The Transport Assessment does have some specific recommendations including on increasing the frequency of the Route 2 bus service, resurfacing the Downs Link and improving access to it, and improving the South Downs Way crossing of the A283, but there are currently no conceptual designs or references to feasibility. Further work is required in order to understand the effectiveness and viability of the AAP in strategic and sustainable transport terms. There is a lack of detail on how the site will connect into the adjacent Downs Link path for cyclists and pedestrians. A change in ground level is mentioned, which implies that a ramp would need to be provided, but the extent of works that would be needed is not specified. Further work will need to be carried out to establish the feasibility of this access showing the length, gradient, and orientation of the access ramp and how it ties into the internal site pedestrian and cycle path connections and to the Downs Link. It will need to be demonstrated that the proposed ramp will be suitable for users to access both Shoreham and Steyning. Further feasibility work will also be regarding improvements to the South Downs Way crossing of the A283. The Transport Assessment suggests an improvement to the at-grade crossing, but there is also a more lengthy route passing under the A283 bridge over the river Adur to avoid this crossing point. It should be established whether the approach to this route from the south could be shortened by improving and connecting from the riverside path. The adopted West Sussex Transport Plan (WSTP) provides the County Council's aspirations to enable and accelerate the shift to more sustainable patterns of travel behaviour (WSTP Section 1.9 Page 11) which should be considered in the development of new transport schemes. Section 3.13 of the WSTP (Page 20) encourages higher use of sustainable transport modes, and any mitigation of impacts as a result of development of the Cement Works site should be consistent with aspirations of the WSTP. The location of the site will be a significant factor influencing mode choice, but it is nonetheless essential that the AAP sets out a vision and proposals that will deliver a high sustainable transport mode share whilst ensuring the viability of the site. In addition, a joined-up approach in respect of active travel connections between the South Downs and neighbouring areas is part of the priorities in the West Sussex Walking and Cycling Strategy. Scheme ID 109 of the Strategy is relevant to utility journeys to/from Shoreham Cement Works. The Transport Assessment already proposes a doubling in frequency of Bus 2 serving the site (Steyning to Rottingdean). Another service improvement could be discussed with bus operators whether its viable to increase services on Route 106 which forms useful links to Worthing/Lancing and to Henfield. Further accident analysis for the junctions listed in Section 4.3.3 of the Transport Assessment (Junction 1: Washington Roundabout, Junction 8: A283/A27 Slips Roundabout, Junction 11: A27/Old Shoreham Road/Coombes Road T-Junctions & Junction 12: Lancing Manor Roundabout) will no longer be needed. These staggered junctions are being removed and replaced, whilst the roundabouts are having their layout upgraded, so no further analysis is currently required. In respect of the Washington Roundabout accident analysis provided in Section 4.3.5 (Page 41), WSCC are taking forward an improvement design for this junction subject to funding, consultation, and all relevant statutory processes. Proportionate contributions will be expected from the Cement Works site. In respect of the Lancing Manor roundabout, the reliance of this improvement design on third party land constitutes a risk to delivery of this mitigation. Further investigation would be required to establish the availability of the land required to enable the improvement should this approach be taken forward. PRoW can promote safe, high quality and pleasurable environments for movement and access that promote easy connectivity and healthy, active travel between places, which in turn

promotes mental and physical well-being, reduces reliance on the car, improves air quality by reducing pollution and reduces contributing to climate change. SCW presents opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public. These opportunities, including the unique views SCW has, should be accessible by sustainable, non-motorised, active travel that (PRoW) provides for. Development here offers the chance to improve the local PRoW network to and throughout the site. Movement throughout the site and alternative access may then be gained with the creation of a new east-west bridleway linking the Downs Link in the west, through the site and slightly beyond to Byway 2761, shown to the right of the site's eastern boundary on the map above. Byway 2761 links Shoreham via Mill Hill or Restricted Byway 3141 to a network of bridleways that include the South Downs Way and Monarchs Way.

(R68/session 60912; West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF))
Created **August 2nd 2022**

We wish to make the following comments: 1. We support the commitments expressed in the Shoreham Cement Works Action Plan 3.6.3 (p22) section on 'Movement', especially those points regarding the need to cater for NMUs and to encourage active travel: b) Active travel infrastructure and facilities should be provided within the site, which should be well connected to and integrated in the wider network, and d) Non-motorised connections with the nearby public rights of way network should be maximised, including the Downs Link and the South Downs Way. The Downs Link, in particular, could make a valuable contribution to sustainable transport. 3. Any development at the site should respect the existing PRoW network and also take up any opportunities that may arise to enhance it, such as improving connectivity between routes. Clearly the South Downs Way and Downs Link, and the various branches at the southern end of the latter, form an important part of the local PRoW network, and we are pleased to see the importance of these existing resources acknowledged in your proposals.

(R28/session 60868; Horsham District Council)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

We welcome the recognition that any development of the site would generate traffic and would, therefore, put pressure on both the local and the strategic road networks. It acknowledges the Transport Assessment that has been undertaken to assess the effects and viability of each development scenario from a transport perspective. Due to the stand-alone nature of the site and the potential level of development, it is important that the transport impacts and access to the site are thoroughly considered and thought out. It is noted that the transport assessment identifies that highway improvement measures will be required at junctions to the north of the site. In addition, to help mitigate the transport effects of the development and to minimise the usage of the private car, the provision of sustainable transport options and connections are considered critical as part of any scheme. The references to funding towards sustainable transport measures with a view to reducing private car trips, such as increasing the frequency of bus services in the area and improved pedestrian, cycle and horse rider linkages to the Downs Link, are welcomed. It is also recognised that the development could contribute towards Active Travel fund Projects. Due to the above, it will be important as the work on the AAP progresses to continue to undertake the relevant highways evidence base work in conjunction with West Sussex County Council. In addition, there appears to be a lack of commentary within the transport study on the impacts the development will have on the air quality of Steyning / Bramber and Upper Beeding. Further consideration of this would be welcome.

(R37/session 60878; Mid Sussex District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

Sustainable Travel In line with the NPPF, transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of developing proposals so that opportunities for sustainable and active travel are prioritised and fully integrated into the scheme. The AAP should therefore ensure an appropriate balance of uses and quantum of residential development as this is crucial for being able to support viable sustainable travel interventions. In addition, and linked to the suggestion on placemaking, creating a clear community centre/central focal point to the development will not only help in design terms but will also offer opportunities to maximise sustainable travel options for the entire scheme by integrating a 'mobility hub' for the development. A mobility hub should be a highly visible, safe and accessible space where public, shared and active travel modes are co-located alongside a main public open space/ realm and close to any community facilities.

(R39/session 60880; National Highways)

Created August 2nd 2022

National Highways (formerly Highways England) has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). We are therefore concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe, reliable and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A27 in the vicinity of the A27/A283 Shoreham junction. We note that the 28 questions included in the document for consultees to answer relate to matters pertaining to the site itself (potential future land uses, layout and design) and its immediate environs. In accordance with our statutory functions and Operational Licence, we do not comment on the principle of developments. Rather, we assess the impact of them in transport terms on the SRN if they were to go ahead. Therefore we have no comments with regards most of the questions. Similarly, West Sussex County Highway Authority will make any comments they wish with regards the impacts on the A283 and the potential site accesses. In terms of the SRN, principally the A27/A283 junction and its vicinity, we would comment as follows: We have been working with the National Park on their proposals for some time. The work has culminated in the production of a Transport Assessment from ADL Traffic and Highways intended to support the AAP. The commentary in the AAP refers to site access matters and the local road network. While a 'worst-case' scenario is cited and said to require £2.5 million worth of works for the 'surrounding junctions/roundabouts' – it is not clear whether this is referring to the SRN as well as the local road network. Therefore, at this stage it is not yet established what the impact of the potential redevelopment of the site would be; and hence what, if any, SRN mitigation is required. However, at this Issues and Options stage this is not unusual. Consequently, we will continue to liaise with the National Park and their transport advisers to discern impacts and any required mitigation. ACTION: SDNPA to continue to engage with us with regards to the need and form of any mitigation required for the SRN as the technical analysis has not yet reached a satisfactory conclusion. ACTION: SDNPA to clarify whether the £2.5 million of highway works cited in the AAP includes works on the SRN. SDNPA's attention is also drawn to the fact that the need/form of mitigation on the SRN is not currently agreed. We are committed to continue working with you and your technical advisors. At such time these discussions reach a satisfactory conclusion, we will be able to provide further responses to this or subsequent consultations.

(R43/session 60885; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

The cement works could play host to a bigger and more dynamic transport hub into the future - if the space and concept be safeguarded, the Shoreham to Horsham Railway is a much lamented loss to the area, with significant ridership on home to school buses, which

are not available to the communities they pass through, a tram network similar to Croydon Tramlink would be a fabulous competitor to the reliance on car usage in this area. A tram depot would nestle into this site admirably - bearing in mind the old railway passes along side the site. The concept of a tram being of light rapid transit, enables a more cost effective solution to inter Village operation and road sharing. With priority given to a tram shooting up the Adur Valley, car users would finally be able to use a competitive alternative and workers, scholars and day trippers too able to share the transport and make it more sustainable.

(R65/session 60909; Washington Parish Council)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

The Council is in agreement that the proposals should not adversely impact the A283 and local road network which feed the already congested Washington A24 roundabout. The Council looks forward to the opportunity to comment on the more detailed proposals when the

(R72/session 60917; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

In addition the pressure of more cars on our roads is just unimaginable and further contributes to carbon admissions.

Question 15: What is your view on a new roundabout or any other solutions to access the site?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

The scheme that has least impact on environment and greatest traffic flow is favourable

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

A roundabout would slow traffic, which is no bad thing. But pedestrian access would need to be carefully factored in.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Anything to keep traffic flowing well

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Not important to me as long as the cycle and foot paths are separate and protected from the cars. Car travel should be discouraged.

(R203/session 53949; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

It's all about the road, the road is already completely overloaded It used to be connected by the railway You must put a rail line back, or not develop the site

(R153/session 53964; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

Improved traffic flow to service the new site is very important

(R90/session 54020; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

This is a busy road that will get busier. Sustainable and Public transport is key to serve major employment areas on the coast and north of the site.

(R112/session 54076; member of public)
Created June 11th 2022

If a roundabout facilitates people visiting a rewilded nature park here, why not.

(R94/session 54186; member of public)
Created **June 13th 2022**

A roundabout seems best

(R142/session 54348; member of public)
Created **June 14th 2022**

Roundabout sounds reasonable

(R166/session 54370; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

A new roundabout/s should be avoided at all cost. improve current acces points instead

(R216/session 54416; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

Keep existing access via under bridge. Northbound and existing access direct of southbound

(R78/session 54414; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

The prime focus for the redevelopment should be on building new houses, not leisure development. This would reduce the number of buses and coaches. Compared to other housing developments across East and West Sussex this site already has a very good road infrastructure.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)
Created **June 16th 2022**

Would support

(R119/session 54505; member of public)
Created **June 17th 2022**

Roundabout it a good idea, although it will make the traffic even worse! And probably a zebra crossing for pedestrians.

(R209/session 54553; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**

there should be minimal impact to both traffic passage or footprint

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created **June 19th 2022**

Why not enlarge the existing underpass to take 4 slip roads?

(R134/session 54643; member of public)
Created **June 21st 2022**

This is a good idea. The SDNP should not get too worried about re-using the existing underpass if I have interpreted this correctly. An underpass can be quite a forbidding area to a pedestrian. This has to be designed properly so that it is an interesting part of the design, landscape led, integrated into the design and safe and welcoming.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created **June 21st 2022**

Road extremely bust already. Will just slow the traffic but may prevent some high speed motorbike accidents.

(R129/session 54811; member of public)
Created **June 23rd 2022**

positive, will slow traffic on a fast bit of road

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created **June 24th 2022**

I would rather have a straight through road with turnoff and flyovers rather than a roundabout as this creates tailbacks

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created **June 25th 2022**

I assume it is the best option

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**

Four-arm roundabout sounds sensible.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created **June 29th 2022**

We are supportive of any design that reduces speed, accidents and promotes walkers and cyclists as the predominant road user

(R172/session 55230; member of public)
Created **July 2nd 2022**

Safe cycle access (for all ages and abilities) from Downs Link.

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

I don't think there should be a new round about.

(R74/session 55269; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Left in left out and restructuring the tunnel/underpass would make the site less subject to traffic burden.

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

The site already copes with industrial traffic. New road building will only damage the National Park. Several studies commissioned by the Dept of the Environment have shown that new roads "induce" more traffic. There should be no road "improvements".

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Roundabouts always create traffic jams when there is a fairly heavy traffic flow across them, and the A283 is a busy road. Therefore, I like the left in - left out, with a functional connecting tunnel, proposal. It would almost certainly impact less on the existing traffic flows and anyone visiting the site would still be able to leave in the direction from which they arrived.

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

I am extremely disappointed that there is no mention anywhere of the potential to reinstate the railway line that used to run north from Shoreham. Has this even been considered? I accept that this would be a significant cost, but the trackbed still exists, and a single line could easily work alongside the Downslink. Even if this was only a shuttle service from Shoreham it would take huge amounts of traffic off the roads. As for the roundabout, yes, sure this is ok until someone puts traffic lights on it and slows everything down. But the problem with the roundabout is that it doesn't address the issue with the road itself. It is single carriageway each way and already pretty busy. Add another x number of traffic movements and the road will be gridlocked at busy times.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

There should be MORE than one access point to such a large site. Giving better traffic flow to both entry/exit points.

(R146/session 55327; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Might slow the traffic down

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

No more roads

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Although the A283 at the moment is a clear run from the Bramber bypass to the Shoreham interchange, a roundabout seems necessary and definitely a better option than traffic lights to ensure the continued free flow of traffic.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Needs to be a low-speed design using a single carriageway

(R175/session 55405; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Roundabout seems the best option

(R133/session 55416; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Traffic lights would be less disruptive to the flow of traffic along the a283 and can be activated when required

(R104/session 55482; member of public)
Created July 9th 2022

The new roundabout would be reasonable. Although I think the emphasis should be on using public transport or cycle routes to get to the site.

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

Roundabouts don't work, an arm would be preferable

(R98/session 56023; member of public)
Created July 15th 2022

A new roundabout would be the best solution. Traffic does build up currently, with Dudman turning in/out of the entrance south of the site. If only the railway was still in place today. Could bus routes also be in place to access it also (ie. similar to Brighton Marina) depending on what the site is mainly used for of course.

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

There is a fantastic opportunity to improve this section of road but before just adding a roundabout, please consider my comments. The A283 is already susceptible to congestion. It comes to a standstill every Sunday with the Shoreham car boot sale and with regular cycle events that causes tailbacks. As part of any development, the A283 would benefit from being widened to include a dedicated cycling lane on. There is a great opportunity to both sides (please don't just use existing road with as this road is used extensively by HGV's).

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

No opinion.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

Roundabout with underpass is a brilliant suggestion.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

At peak times the A283 can be very busy as it is used by commuters avoiding delays on the A27 through Shoreham & Lancing. I have often encountered long slow moving queues of up to a mile heading north to the Upper Beeding roundabout, with traffic crawling past the cement works. Introducing another roundabout doesn't seem likely to improve the situation. However a left in / left out is likely to worsen the situation as all traffic would then be forced north. On balance a roundabout would seem to be the most practical option.

(R187/session 56735; member of public)
Created July 20th 2022

That road has no pedestrian access alongside, so a roundabout could add one . I like the idea of an underpass for cyclists and walkers.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

Of course there should be efficient and safe access.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

A roundabout is a very good idea to keep the flow of traffic.

(R148/session 56870; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

Consult the experts for the best option

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

One roundabout will not be sufficient. It is clear that it should encompass two - one for the riverside and one for the east side of the site. The traffic flow will be very different, and should be segregated.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

The present access points to both sides of the site would probably be inadequate for the more intensive traffic generation, so a roundabout is a realistic option.

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

it would be a huge shame to lose the fantastic edifice of the current cement works buildings in return for a roundabout. as tempting as it is to envisage hoards of tourists coming to a new tourist 'attraction' - do we really (?!!) want that? do we really want to turn this difficult to access area into a traffic hub? do we want hundreds more car journeys and hundreds more people crammed into the area? even the minimum level of housing suggested doesn't take into account where these people will go to school/shops/work? upper beeding is already 'full' increasing the traffic levels on the already overused A283 will only inconvenience everyone already living in the local area. i think the entrance to the site should be as minimally invasive as possible, maybe access roads with traffic lights?

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

whatever causes the least traffic queues

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

No opinion

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

It is an essential first element to the plans

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

A new roundabout would be appropriate.

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

An underpass rather than a roundabout would ensure that traffic on the Shoreham - Steyning road did not impact the proposed site or a cause of local congestion. It is appreciated that this will be expensive but would have major benefits and be a lasting feature (its a one-off cost)

(R184/session 57024; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Development = infrastructure "improvements", today a roundabout, tomorrow, or in a few years' time, a dual carriageway. The SDNP needs not just conservation and enhancement, but recovery and restoration from decades of damaging development. Shoreham cement works is a classic case - any quarrying allowed these days would have robust conditions

attached (inc. £ bonds etc) for full post-use restoration. This is an old, pre-SDNP site, necessitating a robust response from the guardians of this nationally protected landscape, the SDNPA (see response to Q1).

(R103/session 56917; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Access to the site should not present any great difficulty because that situation is faced by road engineers all of the time. If it is considered that a roundabout is the best solution then so be it or perhaps it could be traffic lights or some other solution. This seems to be a minor issue at this moment in time.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Roundsabout is OK

(R124/session 57177; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

The A283 is already crowded and with planned developments in Lancing and Toad Hall Valley is set to get busier. If the cement works site is to be developed then new transport options such as light rail must be includede. We cannot just add huge amounts of traffic to the A283 and A27 with a new roundabout and be surprised when pollution rises to unsafe levels and gridlock is reached. The old railway line past the site to Shoreham station must be an integral part of any plan.

(R156/session 57287; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Smart roundabout

(R84/session 57491; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

a bridge would be better to avoid congestions on busy hours

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

15. The proposed new roundabout would be invasive in the landscape but seems an unfortunate necessity to enable access to the site whilst accommodating the likely increased traffic flowing along the A283. A new slip road and utilisation of the existing tunnel are also options.

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Must have the provision of a dual carriageway to A27 for construction traffic and ongoing residents of 200+ new houses. Improvements to A24 link from site to Washington roundabout

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

I would support a new roundabout as the left in, left out option would be too cumbersome and result in a lengthy detour to access the north - especially- or south, wasting fuel and causing more congestion as more traffic is generated.

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Roundabout as site traffic would be less, I would not be in favour of a huge underpass.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Preferable no roundabout.....a left in, left out access would be my preferred access.

(R82/session 57785; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Roundabout(s) would I imagine cause major traffic delay at certain times. I would prefer left-in-left-out access and an upgraded underpass.

(R220/session 57858; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

A four armed roundabout.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

A roundabout would reduce the risk of queuing traffic wanting to turn right as the Steyning road is pretty busy. Keep the tunnel as it's already there and makes a good cycle/pedestrian crossing. Possibly a second tunnel?

(R96/session 57924; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

With a nature recovery and public enjoyment option, there would probably no need for a any road or access improvements (which indicate the need to deal with more traffic and more emissions). Access could be integrated from the existing Downslink

(R126/session 57939; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

creating an isolated housing estate within the Park, will generate more road traffic and the residents will have to drive all any services or facilities they wish to use.

(R87/session 57957; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Roundabout is the most sensible solution, but the traffic will be considerably more worse than it already is. Slip lane for people turning right from Shoreham?

(R100/session 57971; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Residents of Fittleworth parish to the west of the application site have remarked that users of the A283 leading eastwards to the A27 experience nightmare traffic in the rush hour in the wider locality of the site. They would like to be reassured that the SDNPA will look even more closely at any traffic studies and forecasts relating to the access to the site and roundabouts at the A27 and as far back as outside Steyning, and any traffic alleviation proposals.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes, it would need one.

(R163/session 57979; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

Roundabout in other positions on this road work so a roundabout here should also be suitable.

(R202/session 57977; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

This solution seems woefully insufficient to support any of the proposed options for the site. Any development would need to deal with the wider impact of additional traffic on the Steyning Road as a roundabout at the cement works does not address this issue, only the access to the site. I cant imagine how this could be done adequately without making the Steyning Road 2 lanes both ways from Shoreham bypass roundabout to the Upper Beeding Roundabout. Have the traffic consultants actually monitored the current peak times traffic on this road or just using an algorithm? The impact on traffic seems to be an afterthought on this consultation when it would be the biggest concern for any local stakeholder

(R158/session 57982; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

As a local resident this is my major concern - the road is busy, fast, and there are often accidents. A roundabout might serve to slow the traffic past Dacre Gardens but the increase in traffic is a major concern. - Access in/out of Dacre Gardens is already difficult. Mr Dudman has informed us he is going to reopen the road behind Dacre Gardens, which we very much opposed to. (Dacre Gardens would become a traffic island.) Non-car methods of accessing the site should be encouraged, including better public transport, perhaps 'innovative' methods - electric bike rental etc could be showcased.

(R143/session 57986; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

A new roundabout is the obvious solution, with speed reduction measures put in place along the A287 as this is a notoriously fast stretch of single carriage road. On / off ramps down to an underpass will take up too much space.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)
Created **August 1st 2022**

A roundabout is necessary to manage traffic efficiently as this will be a very busy

intersection. Direct North/South traffic could pass underneath the roundabout to speed transit and ease congestion.

(R162/session 57996; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

Not needed

(R23/session 60863; Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment)
Created August 2nd 2022

2.2.4) Following on from the point above making decisions about a location for a roundabout or other new infrastructure will depend on that important high level decision about the future of the buildings. 3.5) The four arm roundabout option outlined in the section on evidence would be hugely intrusive in visual terms as well as taking up a significant part of the site (Question 15: What is your view on a new roundabout or any other solutions to access the site?) Section 5.99 in the AAP refers to two further options which were 'considered but dismissed by the consultants due to unacceptable impacts on traffic flows.' The first was the retention of the two all- movements junctions on both sides of the road plus the existing underpass. The second was the provision of two three-armed roundabouts plus the existing underpass. We would support further investigation on both these options would be significantly less harmful in landscape terms than the four arm roundabout option.

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)
Created August 2nd 2022

Objection to a new roundabout. There are other options such as upgrade of the existing underpass, traffic light system + underpass, and development scenarios that lead to lower traffic and therefore other access infrastructure more compatible with the special qualities of the site and the National Park. First, the development should deliver a substantial strategy for active travel and public transport.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

We think that your transport options have not been well thought through. • Traffic Counts and assessments do not always identify true peaks of traffic and local conditions. • A further review of Transport Requirements will be required once it has been agreed what quantity of housing/recreation/businesses are planned. • Several aspects should be considered. • Although the roundabout option is the most cost effective no consideration has been given to peak time volumes where it would be very difficult to join the A283 from the Cement Works even via a roundabout. • The effect on convenience and safety for residents of Dacre Gardens must be considered. • The South Downs Way crossing to the North of the Cement Works site will be made even more hazardous and a radical solution needs to be considered, such as the bridge crossing of the A26 at Itford Farm. • Public transport could be increased between the site and Shoreham. • Other transport options could be developed within the site and to other transport hubs to relieve traffic density. • We need to provide the necessary transport and infrastructure improvements, including the provision of integral sustainable transport opportunities, with safe road access, from the outset, not as a cheap add-on.

(R66/session 60910; West Sussex County Council (WSCC))
Created August 2nd 2022

Regarding a new roundabout, FP3139_2 runs adjacent to the River Adur and the part of the

SCW labelled Riverside, as highlighted in yellow on the map below. This footpath is part of the Downs Link which connects Guildford to Shoreham as a largely off-road route for walkers, cyclists and equestrians and is very popular. It also connects with the nearby long-distance trail, South Downs Way. It's desirable to - partly divert and straighten the path through any Riverside development to remove the sharp corner indicated by the red circle below, (SEE MAP SUBMITTED) - widen the entire length of FP3139_2 to 3m where possible, and - legally upgrade the path to bridleway status throughout the site and northwards until it joins BW3139_1. The preference is then for a new four arm roundabout that segregates vehicular traffic from any pedestrians / cyclists and equestrians accessing the site from the Downs Link who could safely use the existing / improved underpass.

(R20/session 60856; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

The A283 is currently very hazardous. It's a very busy road with vehicles tailgating and overtaking at and beyond the national speed limit. In the last couple of months there have been fatalities on separate occasions. I could see a roundabout benefiting if it provides a drop in the speed limit between the cement works and the next roundabout. This could provide relief for those living at Dacre Gardens. However roundabouts are also difficult for cyclists. So improvements would need to be made to the Downslink/and or a dedicated cycle way installed alongside the A283.

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)
Created August 2nd 2022

Considering any particular changes to road infrastructure is inappropriate without some appreciation of road modelling, active travel and multimodal solutions using data sets and transport ambitions. A roundabout is not a solution to the need to consider how the A283 connecting the A27 and A24 needs to respond to a variety of demands for improvement and the need help diminish personal car journeys. West Sussex CC will need to review this road between the A27 and Beeding roundabout in the short term. Transport consultants have previously developed options for ingress and egress at the SCW, including over/under solutions, when former projects there emerged.

(R18/session 60853; Friends of the South Downs)
Created August 2nd 2022

No matter how many dwelling/ industrial and commercial premises are finally decided upon, it appears that traffic in and out of the site will increase drastically both at the Riverside and the Eastern parts [the biggest part] will increase greatly over the present levels. Currently traffic entering and leaving the site can only turn left which necessitates an additional distance, currently being obliged to proceed towards Upper Beeding or Shoreham, depending on origin and destination. We suggest that the left in/ left out arrangements, which works fine at present, will create such additional mileage that local air pollution will be adversely affected. That said we are aware that we are discussing a plan which may not come to fruition for many years and that air quality issues may well be diminished by that time.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created August 2nd 2022

We are supportive of any design that reduces speed, accidents and promotes walkers and cyclists as the predominant road user without impacting the riverbank or adjacent habitat.

(R27/session 60867; Historic England)
Created August 2nd 2022

The former Steyning Railway served the cement works and brought raw materials (e.g. gypsum from Robertsbridge and coal from Dover) to the site, and transported processed cement from the site to Shoreham port by freight train. The route of the railway is now incorporated into the Downs Link footpath and bridleway that crosses the Riverside part of the Cement Works site. This historic transport link should be acknowledged and built upon in the AAP, possibly as a means of bringing visitors sustainably to any future cultural and leisure uses of the site.

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Council notes the reference in paragraph 5.86 that 'transport tensions on the surrounding network can be mitigated', and that paragraph 5.88 states that all development scenarios require significant highway improvement measures together with reductions in private car usage. The Council is keen to ensure there are no adverse impacts in the road network within Adur District or the vicinity, including the A27 and would welcome further liaison with the National Park and Highway Authority on this matter. We note that the accompanying transport study considers improvements on nearby junctions, including the A27/ Lancing roundabout. It will be important for the Council to understand how any mitigations will be implemented, phased and funded; this is particularly important given that Adur District Council will shortly be commissioning a transport study to support the forthcoming update of the Adur Local Plan, and would welcome continued liaison with the SDNPA on this matter. Similarly, the Council would welcome an understanding of whether funding of sustainable transport measures elsewhere in Adur is likely to arise from the proposed development. Given the reference to necessary mitigation works on surrounding junctions/ roundabouts in the AAP - perhaps these improvements could be detailed (or at least cross-referenced) in this document for clarity? Active Travel Given the need to reduce private car usage, active travel measures will be particularly important. The Shoreham Cement Works Local Landscape Character and Sensitivity Study (May 2022) identifies the following design principles which the Council strongly supports: ● Active travel facilities incorporated into any new mixed-use development within the site and links to the wider active travel network should be provided. This is particularly important given the location of the site away from any existing services and facilities. The Council supports this approach and notes the reference in paragraph 5.87 regarding improvements to sustainable access to the South Downs Way and Downs Link. Adur & Worthing Councils have published a Joint Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which seeks to increase the uptake of cycling and walking by identifying preferred routes and core zones for further development; and a prioritised programme of infrastructure improvements. The LCWIP includes Primary Cycle Route 330 Downs Link (Steyning-Shoreham). Paragraph 5.88 refers to the need to reduce private car usage; the location of a car club facility at the site should be considered. Paragraph 5.94 states that the roundabout would involve 'regrading of terrain'. It is not clear what the impacts of this would be, given the visually exposed nature of this character area. The landscape impacts of this should be fully clarified and assessed. See response to Question 8.

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I am open minded - something will be needed - depends on traffic flow forecast for whole area - assumes A27 is an on track solution

(R10/session 60845; Cycling UK Brighton and Hove)
Created August 2nd 2022

There should be concentration on better utilising existing road capacity, with traffic reduction, active travel, sustainable transport, public transport and car free development, not building new roads. New road schemes lead to more vehicle journeys (“induced traffic”) and the benefit/cost ratio is often poor. Emissions generated in the construction of new roads are unlikely to ever be “offset”. Current strategies to put the transport sector on the pathway to hit net zero targets and ensure the timely implementation action plans are insufficient. Action needs to be radically improved. Expert Professor Kevin Anderson of the University of Manchester is calling for “No more new roads.” Greg Marsden, Professor of Transport Governance at the Institute for Transport Studies at the University of Leeds says there must be at least a 20% reduction in overall car traffic levels to meet carbon reduction targets, which means planning for fewer cars, more shared cars and maintenance of roads, not “new build” roads. As well as inducing more traffic, continuous increases in road capacity and unsustainable development have resulted in escalating biodiversity loss, the degradation of natural landscapes, community severance, and the major barrier to active travel. Most people cite motor vehicle danger as the reason they do not cycle. Speed limits for motor vehicles in any place where people are present should be a maximum of 20mph. We support the “Twenty’s Plenty” campaign for any road where people are cycling/walking/wheeling, and slow speeds on access roads i.e. much less than the excessive National Speed Limit of 60mph.

(R211/session 57853; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

We think that your transport options have not been well thought through. Traffic Counts and assessments do not always identify true peaks of traffic and local conditions. A further review of Transport Requirements will be required once it has been agreed what quantity of housing/recreation/businesses are planned. Several considerations should be considered. Although the roundabout option is the most cost effective no consideration has been given to peak time volumes where it would be very difficult to join the A283 from the Cement Works even via a roundabout. The A283 was originally designed as a 3-lane carriageway, if investigated and re-planned the road could have dual carriageway accessibility in one direction at peak traffic times. Public transport could be increased between the site and Shoreham. Other transport options could be developed within the site and to other transport hubs to relieve traffic density. We need to provide the necessary transport and infrastructure improvements, including the provision of sustainable transport opportunities from the outset and safe road access.

(R199/session 58013; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

The fact a roundabout is considered surely indicates the potential for a huge increase in traffic. The road is already very busy, and too fast in my opinion, and will become gridlocked like Shoreham is at the busiest times. Potentially upwards of 400 extra cars on this road is ludicrous. Shoreham is being ruined as we speak, and now you want to allow massive housing in beautiful area which certainly cannot cope with a massive increase in traffic.

(R91/session 55861; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

If it helps traffic flow then yes

(R127/session 53652; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

If a roundabout is the best solution, then that seems like a good idea. Having seen all of

the background/evidence documents, a lot of work has gone into it!!

(R224/session 58050; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

Roundabout probably makes sense

Question 16: Do you support shared surface or segregated routes for vehicular traffic and pedestrians/cyclists for parts of the redeveloped site?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)

Created June 7th 2022

Segregated

(R197/session 53690; member of public)

Created June 8th 2022

Shared access for vehicles alongside pedestrians/cyclists is just asking for someone to be killed. This isn't viable with the speed people travel at along the road.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)

Created June 8th 2022

Ideally there should be roads for cars, paths for cyclists and paths for pedestrians with their pets and prams. Cyclists, cars and pedestrians all fight for space in other parks, so offering separate routes would be good.

(R154/session 53708; member of public)

Created June 8th 2022

Separating vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists should be the priority. Vehicular traffic should be discouraged

(R203/session 53949; member of public)

Created June 10th 2022

Segregated is the only option You shouldn't be looking at anything less The suggested transport options have the nasty taste of WSCC policies, and look where they have got us.

(R153/session 53964; member of public)

Created June 10th 2022

Segregated routes

(R90/session 54020; member of public)

Created June 10th 2022

Segregated - road is already too busy for its size

(R112/session 54076; member of public)

Created June 11th 2022

No, just wildlife please, and lots of it. Rewild this site as the SDNP is so wildlife depleted. No housing, no shops, just wildlife.

(R94/session 54186; member of public)

Created **June 13th 2022**

Segregated for safety

(R142/session 54348; member of public)

Created **June 14th 2022**

Segregation

(R166/session 54370; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

I support shared surfaces

(R216/session 54416; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Segregation

(R78/session 54414; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Segregated routes.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)

Created **June 16th 2022**

Don't care

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created **June 17th 2022**

For around the site, I'd support segregated over shared

(R209/session 54553; member of public)

Created **June 19th 2022**

no opinion

(R145/session 54557; member of public)

Created **June 19th 2022**

Segregated routes for vehicular and pedestrian/cyclists

(R134/session 54643; member of public)

Created **June 21st 2022**

Shared surfaces are welcome and very successful too. In the Netherlands, small villages have successfully integrated cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles within a predominantly 'vehicle free' zones. Traffic calming and trees are also welcome within the road design.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created **June 21st 2022**

segregated routes

(R129/session 54811; member of public)
Created **June 23rd 2022**

segregated, we need to make it safer for all users

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created **June 24th 2022**

I would try to avoid vehicles on site as much as possible. Provide residents carparks at various places around the edge of the housing area and then just pedestrian areas in the middle

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created **June 25th 2022**

Segregated routes

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**

Yes. If there's to be office space on site it needs to have easy provision for cycle access for people to be able to cycle to the site from Shoreham train station and town centre as the preferred transport route to site, as well as a bus service from the train station to the site as well.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)
Created **June 29th 2022**

We support segregated routes

(R172/session 55230; member of public)
Created **July 2nd 2022**

I would like to see a cycle/pedestrian bridge, where the railway bridge once was, to put the Downs Link northwards back on the railway route (past Passies Pond and Botolphs Church) to leave the riverside path for pedestrians only. Would provide safer, more inclusive (ie younger/older/families etc), access for pedestrians and cyclists alike.

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

Cycle and pedestrian access should be prioritised to help reduce car use and make the routes safer.

(R74/session 55269; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

Segregated use is my preference. For both health and safety if pedestrians and cyclists.

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Segregated.

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Shared surface is probably the most egalitarian approach, providing the speed of vehicular traffic is restricted to 20mph at most.

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

As long as they are well thought out, yes.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

I would prefer segregated routes as I often cycle with my children and choose cycle paths that are away from traffic to keep them safe.

(R146/session 55327; member of public)
Created July 5th 2022

Shared space

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

Neither

(R183/session 55368; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Yes

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

On site routes should be 20mph limit and traffic calmed, with separate pedestrian footways alongside the busier roads - otherwise shared use. CIL money should be used to upgrade the surface of the Downslink shared use path to all weather (resin bonded surface) from Shoreham to Bramber, with a new bridge over the Adur (where the railway bridge was) enabling by-passing of the all too narrow path between Dacre Gardens and the South Downs Way./

(R175/session 55405; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

shared

(R133/session 55416; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Segregated routes or road with designated cycle lane

(R104/session 55482; member of public)
Created July 9th 2022

I think segregated routes would make more sense.

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

Cycle lanes or shared walking/cycle lanes yes

(R98/session 56023; member of public)
Created July 15th 2022

I think there should be separate routes for pedestrians and cyclists ...

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

Bespoke safe cycle and pedestrian access ways. People still have a reliance on cars and a shuttle bus is being proposed. Pedestrians and cyclists don't mix very well with any other form of road traffic

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

Segregated where possible.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

Segregated - it's a fast road, and consideration should be given to how to link into the existing excellent cycle routes in the area.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

I am in firmly in favour of segregation. If a roundabout is used for road traffic, then the existing underpass could provide a viable solution to this, which would be beneficial for those wanting to access the Downs Link or riverside.

(R187/session 56735; member of public)
Created July 20th 2022

As the road is so busy, I prefer segregated routes. But roundabouts can be invasive and ugly unless planted and aesthetically pleasing.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)

Created July 21st 2022
Segregated where possible.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

Yes, as long as there's an element of safety.

(R148/session 56870; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

segregated cycle path

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

There must be a mixture of shared and segregated traffic. The area to the East of the bowl should probably be reserved as vehicle free - but parking should be appropriater not excessive. A great deal will depend on the provision of local public transport - the rapid, frequent and relevant local bus routes will need financial support to develop their services.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

Regard should be had to the best European practice on provision for active travel - Denmark, Belgium and The Netherlands. Proper separated infrastructure is essential for pedestrian & cyclist safety and there is an opportunity for this site to be a showcase example of what could be achieved in the UK.

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

that depends how it is redeveloped. vehicular traffic should be kept to a minimum - eg a small car park at the entrance, then foot/bicycle traffic further in

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

segregated, any areas to accommodate equestrians in the riverside area or to join access onto the Downs also

(R198/session 56976; British Horse Society)
Created July 25th 2022

I am responding on behalf of the British Horse Society, the UK's largest equestrian charity representing the country's 3 million equestrians. As with many areas in the country, and especially the south east, busy main roads have rendered connectivity of public rights of way to either side impossible. This particular area is no exception to this issue. Within the local area, there are just over 1700 passported horses contributing in the region of £10 million to the economy per annum, much of it local. Furthermore, the two National Trails in close proximity to the site means there are likely to be many more equestrians wanting to use these from further afield, either for days out or as part of a long distance ride or as a riding holiday to the area. Currently, however, non motorised users (NMUs) must use an at grade crossing point north of the Quarry site (bridleway 3209 – South Downs Way) which is a very dangerous crossing and has long been the subject of requests for a signalised

crossing. We believe the solution to crossing this road safely for NMUs would be to make use of the underpass running under the A283 (Shoreham Road), linking the riverside area on the western side of the road to the Cement Works on the eastern side. As this underpass was designed to be big enough for use by vehicular traffic, we believe the opportunity should be taken to use and restrict this underpass to NMUs and to create a link to the Downs Link on the western side with the South Downs Way on the eastern side for all users. The British Horse Society would be very willing to work with SDNPA and the developers to ensure the best outcome for NMUs.

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Yes. The site is not far from Shoreham and with cycles (pedal & electric), and perhaps even scooters, there should be access with surfaces suitable for walking & cycling

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Yes

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

Segregation.

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

If possible, segregated routes would be preferred...

(R184/session 57024; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

I support a reduction in unsustainable motorised travel, the AAP's proposed options, if any were implemented, would do the reverse and increase traffic.

(R103/session 56917; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

As in the Netherlands segregated routes for cyclists and pedestrians should be incorporated wherever possible into the design. The fact is that cars should be restricted from much of the site whilst any truck transport for warehousing should have a dedicated road to that area(s).

(R221/session 57159; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

Segregated

(R124/session 57177; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

There should be segregated routes and light rail

(R156/session 57287; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Segregated

(R84/session 57491; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

yes

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Shared, vehicular use minimised, parking at entrance only with green links throughout.

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

16. Do not support shared routes for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Use of the tunnel should be restricted to vehicles and cars only. Pedestrian routes should be at street level for reasons of personal safety.

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Segregated routes so that links to the existing cycle paths and walking routes can be enhanced

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Preferably segregated routes where possible.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Segregated routes for vehicular traffic and pedestrians and cyclists.

(R82/session 57785; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Idealistically I would support segregated routes, but doubt the viability of full segregation.

(R220/session 57858; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

Segregated routes.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

Segregated routes for vehicles and cyclists

(R96/session 57924; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Yes in principle - this depends on the overall plan for access to the site

(R126/session 57939; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

n/a

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Discourage driving in the site and then keep speed to 15/20mph for shared use of roads for cyclists and vehicles. Pavements for walkers

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

segregated routes for vehicles. Shared pedestrian and cyclist passage for under the A283 road from the Riverside development to main site.

(R163/session 57979; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Pedestrians and cyclists should only share routes if the cycling route is not considered a "fast highway"

(R158/session 57982; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

yes - I have seen it work well in cities but given the local surroundings (fast road, not much acceptance or consideration for cyclists) I would be cautious

(R143/session 57986; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Shared surfaces (to the extent used along Exhibition Road, Kensington) will just not be understood here! Segregated routes would be 100% better for pedestrians & cyclists, with segregation between pedestrians & cyclists too.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Segregated routes.

(R162/session 57996; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Segregated

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)

Created August 2nd 2022

Perhaps a combination of both, but depending on the vision and character of each area and the uses.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

We would prefer segregated routes where possible for the site. • The Downlink in the region of the Cement Works and Northwards must be provided at a standard at least equivalent to that of the current route towards Shoreham • There must be full access from the Downlink to all parts of the site.

(R66/session 60910; West Sussex County Council (WSCC))

Created August 2nd 2022

No PRoW can be segregated, the full width must be made available to all users.

(R20/session 60856; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

Pedestrians and cyclists need segregation. It's already troublesome on the Downlink between the cement works and beyond the footbridge over the Adur. A further influx of people will only exacerbate problems and confrontations. Segregated cycle lanes are always welcome.

(R68/session 60912; West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF))

Created August 2nd 2022

6 We were interested to learn from the consultation event (Shoreham Society, 19 June) that there is an existing tunnel under the road which connects the two parts of the site. We trust this tunnel will be kept, and included in any future plans, as it could provide a safe crossing for NMUs of the A283, a very busy road.

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)

Created August 2nd 2022

This discussion is premature and needs to relate to purpose, shared use should be a starting point.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)

Created August 2nd 2022

We support segregated routes

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

These could form a useful part of an integrated movement strategy and should be integrated into the design from an early stage.










(R69/session 60913; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

yes - essential and dont forget wate rusers if thats part of an outdoor learning offer or

environmental design or a small hydro solution

(R10/session 60845; Cycling UK Brighton and Hove)
Created August 2nd 2022

We are surprised to see this offered as a consultation question as though it were simply a design option, because there is extensive government guidance about best practice in transport infrastructure such as Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN1/20) on Cycle Infrastructure Design (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/906344/cycleinfrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf) and Gear Change cited above. LTN 1/20 includes core design principles for essential requirements to achieve more people travelling by cycle or on foot, based on best practice. Networks and routes should be coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive. Inclusive design and accessibility should run through all these five principles. Infrastructure should cater for the broadest range of people. LTN1/20, paragraph 6.5.4 says "In urban areas, the conversion of a footway to shared use should be regarded as a last resort. Shared use facilities are generally not favoured by either pedestrians or cyclists, particularly when flows are high. It can create particular difficulties for visually impaired people. Actual conflict may be rare, but the interactions between people moving at different speeds can be perceived to be unsafe and inaccessible, particularly by vulnerable pedestrians. This adversely affects the comfort of both types of user, as well as directness for the cyclist." For your information, I have included some further points below from government guidance for cycling and walking infrastructure. Government guidance on cycling The government's cycling and walking plan, "Gear Change" looks to a future where "a travel revolution in our streets, towns and communities will have made cycling a mass form of transit. Cycling and walking will be the natural first choice for many journeys with half of all journeys in towns and cities being cycled or walked by 2030." It encourages low-traffic neighbourhoods and says that "the quality of cycling infrastructure installed on our roads must dramatically improve". Key design principles are that:  Cyclists must be separated from volume traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them.  Cyclists must be separated from pedestrians.  Cyclists must be treated as vehicles, not pedestrians  Routes must join together; isolated stretches of good provision are of little value.  Routes must feel direct, logical and be intuitively understandable by all road users;  Routes and schemes must take account of how users actually behave;  Purely cosmetic alterations should be avoided.  Barriers, such as chicane barriers and dismount signs, should be avoided.  Routes should be designed only by those who have experienced the road on a cycle. Gear Change says: "We will ensure that all new housing and business developments are built around making sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, the first choice for journeys."

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

We would prefer segregated routes where possible for the site.

(R199/session 58013; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Yes, but I don't want lots of houses built

(R91/session 55861; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

segregated routes to help encourage cycle use

(R127/session 53652; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

shared surfaces I think is a good idea. The less permeable materials that is needed to be used will be a good thing, particularly because of the nature of the site currently. There is a lot of run-off due to the chalk, which could be an issue in high rain fall. However, small pedestrian only areas could be nice as it is better for parents with young children.

(R223/session 58070; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

Yes

(R224/session 58050; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

Segregated routes where possible