

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

Chapter 5G: Getting Around

There were a total of 203 responses to this chapter. These consisted of 9 general comments on the chapter, 98 responses to question 15 and 96 responses to question 16. There were a total of 9 general comments on this chapter. These are summarised below.

National Agencies

National Highways:

- National Highways is concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe, reliable and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network, in this case the A27 in the vicinity of the A27/A283 Shoreham junction;
- 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;
- We will continue to liaise with the National Park and their transport advisers to discern impacts and any required mitigation;

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment:

- Opportunity for a bold, forward-thinking approach to site access, in line with the aspirations to create an exemplar;
- This 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;
- A more radical approach to travel planning could be developed to include in the preferred option version of the AAP. 3.2;
- An additional fourth scenario could usefully be covered by the Transport Assessment;
- No reference is made to improving the surrounding network of paths and lanes and open access areas. In particular the single track rural road to the east may offer an additional link for cyclists and walkers.

West Sussex County Council:

- Further work will be required to develop the transport evidence base;
- Section 3.6.3 on Movement 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- Further feasibility work will also be regarding improvements to the South Downs Way crossing of the A283;
- The location of the site will be a significant factor influencing mode choice, but need vision and proposals that will deliver a high sustainable transport mode share whilst ensuring the viability of the site;
- Viability to increase services on Route 106 to Worthing/Lancing and to Henfield should be explored;

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

- Washington Roundabout: WSCC are taking forward an improvement design for this junction. Proportionate contributions will be expected from the Cement Works site;
- Lancing Manor roundabout: the reliance of this improvement design on third party land constitutes a risk to delivery of this mitigation.
- the unique views SCW has, should be accessible by sustainable, non-motorised, active travel that (PRoW) provides for;
- 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;

Horsham District Council:

- 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;
- The provision of sustainable transport options and connections are considered critical as part of any scheme;
- The development could contribute towards Active Travel fund Projects;
- There is 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;

Mid Sussex District Council:

- Should ensure an appropriate balance of uses and quantum of residential development as this is crucial for being able to support viable sustainable travel interventions;
- 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'.

Parish and Town Councils

Washington Parish Council:

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.

Other Organisations

West Sussex Local Access Forum:

- Support the need to cater for NMUs and to encourage active travel;
- Active travel infrastructure and facilities should be provided within the site, which should be well connected to and integrated in the wider network;
- Non-motorised connections with the nearby public rights of way network should be maximised, including the Downs Link and the South Downs Way.

Individuals

2 individuals commented:

- The cement works could play host to a bigger and more dynamic transport hub into the future;
- A tram network similar to Croydon Tramlink, including a tram depot within the site would reduce reliance on car usage in this area;
- 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?

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

There were a total of 98 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

National Agencies

Historic England:

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.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

West Sussex County Council:

FP3139_2 runs adjacent to the River Adur and the part of the SCW labelled Riverside. 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 - 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.

Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment:

The location for a roundabout or other new infrastructure will depend on decision about the future of the buildings. 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. AAP refers to two further options: retention of the two all- movements junctions on both sides of the road plus the existing underpass; and the provision of two three-armed roundabouts plus the existing underpass. We would support further investigation on both these options as significantly less harmful in landscape terms than the four arm roundabout option.

Adur and Worthing District Council:

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 active travel design principles which the Council strongly supports. This is particularly important given the location of the site away from

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

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.

Parish and Town Councils

Upper Beeding Parish Council:

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.

Findon Parish Council:

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.

Kingsley Parish Council:

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 (it's a one-off cost).

Other Organisations

SDNPA Design Specialist:

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.

Greening Steyning:

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

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

CPRE Sussex:

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.

Friends of the South Downs:

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.

Cycling UK Brighton and Hove:

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.

Individuals

84 individuals made the following comments:

- principle of roundabout supported
- concerns about landscape impact
- improve current access points instead
- scheme should have least impact on environment and greatest traffic flow
- roundabout would slow traffic flow but may be safer (prevent some high speed motorbike accidents)
- pedestrian and cycle access needs to be taken into account / given priority

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

- car travel should be discouraged and non-car methods encouraged, for instance through e-bike hire
- reinstate railway line as requirement for developing the site - even if this was only a shuttle service from Shoreham
- sustainable and public transport is key to serve major employment areas on the coast and north of the site
- homes would have less buses and coaches than leisure development
- good road access compared to other sites
- enlarge existing underpass
- underpass should be made safer / more welcoming for pedestrians
- road 'improvements' induce more traffic
- needs more than one access point / roundabout
- traffic lights would be less disruptive to the flow of traffic
- bus routes should also be in place to access site
- widen the A283 to include a dedicated cycling lane
- a bridge would be better than a roundabout
- need a dual carriageway to A27
- with a nature recovery and public enjoyment option, there would probably no need for a any road or access improvements
- should look at wider impacts of development on the road network

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

There were a total of 96 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

West Sussex County Council:

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

Adur and Worthing District Council:

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

Parish and Town Councils

Upper Beeding Parish Council:

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.

Findon Parish Council:

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.

Kingsley Parish Council:

If possible, segregated routes would be preferred.

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

Other Organisations

Greening Steyning:

Support segregated routes.

SDNPA Design Specialist:

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

West Sussex Local Access Forum:

Interested to learn from the consultation event 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.

British Horse Society:

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.

Cycling UK Brighton and Hove:

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 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."

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

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

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."

CPRE Sussex:

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

Individuals

84 individuals made the following comments:

- supported segregated routes - roads for cars, paths for cyclists and paths for pedestrians with their pets and prams, and light rail
- supported shared routes, especially if speed of vehicles is restricted to 20mph
- raised concerns about safety of vehicles sharing with non-motorised users (NMU)
- No housing, no shops, just wildlife
- 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
- Provide residents carparks at various places around the edge of the housing area and then just pedestrian areas in the middle
- 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
- 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 (i.e. younger/older/families etc), access for pedestrians and cyclists alike
- 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
- If a roundabout is used for road traffic, then the existing underpass should be for NMU wanting to access the Downs Link or riverside
- apid,
- frequent and relevant local bus routes will need financial support to develop their services
- 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
- support a reduction in unsustainable motorised travel, the AAP's proposed options, if any were implemented, would do the reverse and increase traffic
- any truck transport for warehousing should have a dedicated road to that area(s)
- Use of the tunnel should be restricted to vehicles and cars only. Pedestrian routes should be at street level for reasons of personal safety
- Pedestrians and cyclists should only share routes if the cycling route is not considered a "fast highway"
- Shared use already troublesome on the Downslink between the cement works and beyond the footbridge over the Adur
- Don't forget water users if that's part of an outdoor learning offer or or a small hydro solution
- Minimise use of (im)permeable materials, currently a lot of run-off due to the chalk,

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

- Small pedestrian only areas could be nice as it is better for parents with young children.