

Committee	<b>Lead Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
Date	<b>28 July 2008</b>
Report By	<b>Director of Transport and Environment</b>
Title of Report	<b>Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Procedure</b>
Purpose of Report	<b>To consider a new assessment procedure for Pedestrian Crossings and to approve a new priority list of Pedestrian Crossings for construction, subject to available funding</b>

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Lead Member is recommended to**

- (1) approve (i) the revised Policy Statement shown at Appendix C; and (ii) the resultant priority listing at Appendix E, which is to be used as the basis for the future provision of pedestrian facilities; and**
  - (2) authorise the Director of Transport and Environment to initiate detailed investigations, in priority order, according to the funds available.**
- 
- 

**1. Financial Appraisal**

1.1 The main source of funding for pedestrian crossing schemes is the County Council's Capital Programme for local safety schemes and minor works. Sites are investigated and constructed in priority order within the available budget, with a target to construct two signalised crossings each year. The crossings being constructed during 2008/2009 are anticipated to cost a total of approximately £140,000.

**2. Supporting Information**

2.1 The current priority list for the provision of Pedestrian Crossings was approved by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment in July 2007. At that time the Lead Member requested that consideration be given to making amendments to the existing policy, to take account of social factors, and bring the policy more into line with the policy for assessing traffic calming requests. The existing Policy Summary PS 4/7, approved in March 2003, is attached at Appendix A.

**3. Revision of Policy Statement PS4/7**

3.1 The detailed rationale behind the revisions to Policy Summary PS4/7 is given in Appendix B.

3.2 The Scrutiny Committee for Transport and Environment considered the proposed policy at their meeting on 13 June 2008. At that time they agreed that the proposed amendments to the policy reflected the right balance of priorities for the implementation of crossing facilities and recommended that the amended Policy be supported.

#### **4. Assessment of Requests Received**

4.1 Since the priority list was last approved in July 2007 fifteen new requests for pedestrian facilities have been received by the County Council. Each of the requests has been considered against the pre-qualification criteria and the results are given in Appendix D.

4.2 Seven sites met the criteria in that they either achieved a sample  $PV^2$  value of at least 0.2, or there had been at least one pedestrian casualty in the last three years. The value of  $PV^2$  is determined by counting the number of pedestrians crossing within 50m of the site, P, and the two-way traffic flow along the road, V. P gives an indication of the level of demand for the crossing, while the higher the value of V the harder it will be for a pedestrian to find a safe gap in the traffic through which to cross. Research has shown that combining these in the form  $PV^2$  gives a realistic and reliable measure of the degree of difficulty in crossing the road. The sample survey is conducted over a one hour period at a time when pedestrians are most likely to be crossing.

4.3 Full surveys at each of the seven sites have been undertaken to enable a priority list for construction to be drawn up, based on their point score. The full survey is conducted over a 12 hour period and the determined value of  $PV^2$  is the average for the four busiest hours. All the existing sites on the priority list have been reviewed to calculate their point score under the proposed new assessment procedure. It is recommended that the design and construction of crossing facilities be undertaken at these sites in the priority order shown, subject to the necessary budget provision being available. The results of this assessment are given at Appendix E

4.4 Appendix F is attached for information and summarises the progress made on sites that were identified as having a high priority in 2007.

#### **5. Conclusion and Reasons for Recommendations**

5.1 The recommended revisions to the assessment procedure are designed to ensure that the relative priority of Pedestrian Crossing requests reflects all the issues that can be influenced by the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities rather than a simple demand led approach. The retention of the pre-qualification criteria and policy on the conversion of zebra crossings is intended to ensure the appropriate allocation of resources to the provision of new facilities. It is, therefore, recommended that the amended Policy Statement be approved.

5.2 A new programme of installation of pedestrian facilities needs to be drawn up and, subject to the approval of the new assessment procedure, the priority list shown in Appendix E is recommended for approval.

RUPERT CLUBB  
Director of Transport and Environment

Contact Officer: Helen Pace - Tel. No. 01273 482235  
Local Member: All

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Lead Member Meeting 3 March 2003 – Agenda Item 8

Lead Member Meeting 30 July 2007 - Agenda Item 12

Scrutiny Committee for Transport and Environment 13 June 2008 – Agenda Item 8

**CURRENT POLICY SUMMARY**

**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LEAD MEMBER – TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT**  
**POLICY SUMMARY**

<b>PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITIES</b>	<u>PS 4/7</u>
<b>PURPOSE OF POLICY</b>	
To ensure that pedestrian facilities are provided on the basis of impartially assessed need	
<b>SPECIFIC POLICIES</b>	
<p>(i) An initial assessment on any request for pedestrian facilities will be undertaken. Where a pedestrian casualty has been recorded that site will be fully assessed. Where there is no pedestrian casualty record a sample one hour count of pedestrians and vehicles will be undertaken and only sites with a sample PV<sup>2</sup> value of 0.2 x 10<sup>8</sup> will be put forward for full assessment.</p> <p>(ii) All sites meeting the pre-qualification criteria set out in (i) will be assessed in detail and the average PV<sup>2</sup> value, based on the four busiest hours, will be calculated. Priority for construction will then be given to the sites with the highest PV<sup>2</sup> value.</p> <p>(iii) The type of facility constructed will be determined by site assessment bearing in mind the site characteristics including casualty history, vehicle speeds and difficulty of crossing.</p> <p>(iv) Conversion of existing zebra facilities will only be considered where there is a safety hazard due to high approach speeds or there is a strategic need for a light controlled crossing.</p>	
<b>SUPPORTING STATEMENT</b>	
<p>PV<sup>2</sup> gives an impartial measure of the need for a pedestrian facility at any site, it is nationally accepted and has been tried and tested over many years. Using a pre-qualification criteria ensures that detailed assessment is only undertaken for those sites with a proven need and reduces the drain on limited resources.</p> <p>All types of crossing are considered to be equally safe - light controlled crossings can cost up to 5 times the cost of a zebra.</p>	
<u>References – Further Information</u>	<u>Date of Approval</u>
H & T Committee - Agenda Item 7	01.03.1977
H & T Committee - Agenda Item 8	09.11.1993
Lead Member for Transport and Environment - Agenda Item 8	03.03.2003

**REVIEW OF POLICY SUMMARY PS4/1**

1. The existing assessment process includes pre-qualification criteria before a site is assessed in detail. This ensures that sites with a proven pedestrian casualty record are investigated in detail. Sites with no casualty record and very low numbers of pedestrians are not considered further. This ensures that expectations are not raised unreasonably for sites that are likely to have a very low priority and also assists in maximising the funds available for construction rather than preliminary assessment. It is recommended that this pre-qualification criteria be retained in its current form.

2 Under the current policy, priority is given to those sites with the highest average  $PV^2$  (based on the busiest four hours, where P is the number of pedestrians and V is the number of vehicles recorded in one hour). This inevitably means that those sites with the highest traffic flows are given priority. Those sites with lower flows, but where there might be considerable social benefits from the provision of a crossing, are unlikely to proceed unless another source of funding can be found. It is for this reason that the Lead Member asked for a detailed review of the current policy.

3 A review of the procedures used by other authorities in the South East region has been undertaken and these broadly fall into two categories: a weighted  $PV^2$  procedure or a points scoring system. When the County Council's policy was last reviewed in 2003 consideration was given to using a weighted  $PV^2$  procedure which would have taken into account local factors such as the road width, speeds and the number of children or older pedestrians observed. In practice such a procedure makes little difference to the outcome of the assessment process as a weighting system simply increases the priority of those sites with the highest  $PV^2$  values. For that reason, it is recommended that a point scoring system is adopted, that takes account of the social factors referred to earlier and which may be addressed by the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities.

4 It is recommended that each site identified be assessed and scored against a series of factors as set out below. These factors are intended to reflect either the difficulty experienced in crossing the road or the benefits that could be derived from improved facilities. The relative priority of assessed sites will be based on their overall score.

**Factor 1 – Improvements for Mobility Impaired**

All pedestrian facilities will improve conditions for the mobility impaired and it might, therefore, be considered inappropriate to differentiate requests. However, a number of requests are received specifically to address this concern and it is recommended that those requests are given a relatively higher priority than other requests to reflect the additional benefit at these sites. The proposed score for this factor is 2 points.

**Factor 2 – Safer Routes to School**

Many requests are received for pedestrian facilities on routes to school and it is important to reflect the importance of provision for schools in the policy. However, it is recommended that this factor is only added if a local school has identified a particular crossing point in their School Travel Plan. This has two benefits; it ensures that those sites of most concern to the local school are given priority over other routes and it demonstrates to those schools who have developed a School Travel Plan, that their work is acknowledged and taken account of in the assessment processes used by the County Council. The proposed score for this factor is 3 points to reflect the importance of promoting Safe Routes to School.

### **Factor 3 – Access to Public Transport**

Requests often reflect the need for people to reach public transport facilities such as bus stops or stations. Improving accessibility to alternative forms of transport is an important objective of the Local Transport Plan and this factor is intended to reflect that. The proposed score for this factor is 2 points.

### **Factor 4 – Severance**

There are many sites where severance is a particular issue and this can lead to suppressed pedestrian demand. This factor is intended to reflect those locations where severance is a clear issue such as access to a sole village store or school which is severed by a heavily trafficked road. It is not intended that this score be included where the road is simply part of a wider urban network. The proposed score for this factor is two.

### **Factors 5 – Pedestrian Casualties and Factor 6 – Child Pedestrian Casualties**

Reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured, particularly children, is a key target for the County Council. These factors are intended to reflect this key priority by giving the very highest priority to those sites where there has been a fatality and doubling the score for child pedestrian casualties. The proposed scores are three for each pedestrian fatality, two for each serious injury and one for each slight casualty. Factor six doubles these where the casualty is aged 15 or under.

### **Factor 7 – Road Width**

This score reflects the relative difficulty of crossing wider roads and the additional exposure to danger. The proposed score is one point for roads which are 7 to 9m in width and two points for roads over 9m in width.

### **Factor 8 – Speed Limit**

Higher vehicle speeds increases the risk of fatal or serious injury to pedestrians. It is recommended that roads with speed limits over 30mph are given an additional score to reflect this increase in risk. Although it is acknowledged that vehicles may travel in excess of the posted limit using the actual limit gives a fair reflection of the relative priority of each of the sites. The proposed scores for this factor are three points for roads subject to the national speed limit, two for roads subject to a 50mph limit and one point for roads subject to a 40mph limit.

### **Factor 9 – Existing Pedestrian Facilities**

Requests for pedestrian crossing facilities are often received for sites where some form of facility already exists, such as a traffic island. Whilst these sites may well warrant the provision of a controlled crossing point they should be given a relatively lower priority than sites where there is no provision at all. The score for this factor is a negative to reduce the priority at these locations: minus one for sites with a pedestrian refuge, minus two for sites with existing traffic signals that do not include formal pedestrian facilities and minus three for sites where there is an existing footbridge or subway.

## **Factor 10 – Footpaths and Cycle Routes**

Some sites will serve existing designated cycling or walking routes such as a bridle path, public right of way or the national cycle network. Facilities for improving the links on these designated routes might be considered to have a relatively higher priority than other sites and it is proposed to add a score of one point at these locations.

## **Factor 11 – Street Lighting**

During the hours of darkness it can be more difficult for pedestrians to see and be seen. This factor increases the priority for sites by one point where no street lighting exists and by half a point where there is some lighting but it is below the current standard appropriate for the type of road.

## **Factor 12 – Average $PV^2$**

$PV^2$  is a nationally recognised measure of the level of difficulty in crossing (as measured traffic flow  $V$ ) and pedestrian demand ( $P$ ). It has been tried and tested over many years and is still the accepted measure for many authorities across the region. It can be objectively measured and is considered to give a fair assessment of the relative difficulty at each site. It is recommended that the average  $PV^2$  for the busiest four hours continues to be assessed for all requests. However, in order to reflect this measure in a scoring system it is suggested that the observed value is converted into a score which can then be added to all the other factors for that site to give a relative priority. To do this it is proposed to multiply the average figure by ten to give a point score.

5 No change is recommended to Specific Policy (iv) which states that conversion of zebra crossing will only be considered where there is a safety hazard or strategic need for a light controlled crossing. This is to ensure that limited resources are targeted at provision of new crossings and reflects the fact that well designed zebra and light controlled crossings are equally safe.

6 The revised Policy Statement, shown at Appendix C, has been drawn up in line with these recommendations and is recommended for approval

**PROPOSED POLICY SUMMARY**

**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LEAD MEMBER – TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT**  
**POLICY SUMMARY**

<b>PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITIES</b>	<u>PS 4/7</u>
<b>PURPOSE OF POLICY</b> To ensure that pedestrian facilities are provided on the basis of impartially assessed need.	
<b>SPECIFIC POLICIES</b> (i) An initial assessment on any request for pedestrian facilities will be undertaken. Where a pedestrian casualty has been recorded that site will be fully assessed. Where there is no pedestrian casualty record a sample one hour count of pedestrians and vehicles will be undertaken and only sites with a sample $PV^2$ value of greater than $0.2 \times 10^8$ will be put forward for full assessment.  (ii) All sites meeting the pre-qualification criteria set out in (i) will be assessed in detail and will be prioritised using an approved assessment procedure that takes into account factors such as pedestrian casualties, speed limits, severance, access to schools and existing conditions (See Appendix A to this policy).  (iii) The type of facility constructed will be determined by site assessment bearing in mind the site characteristics including casualty history, vehicle speeds and difficulty of crossing.  (iv) Conversion of existing zebra facilities will only be considered where there is a safety hazard due to high approach speeds or there is a strategic need for a light controlled crossing.	
<b>SUPPORTING STATEMENT</b> <p><math>PV^2</math> gives an impartial measure of the need for a pedestrian facility at any site, it is nationally accepted and has been tried and tested over many years. Using a pre-qualification criteria ensures that detailed assessment is only undertaken for those sites with a proven need and reduces the drain on limited resources.</p> <p>All types of crossing are considered to be equally safe - light controlled crossings can cost up to 5 times the cost of a zebra and, therefore, will only be provided where there is an identified need.</p>	
<b><u>References – Further Information</u></b>	<b><u>Date of Approval</u></b>
H & T Committee - Agenda Item 7	01.03.1977
H & T Committee - Agenda Item 8	09.11.1993
Lead Member for Transport and Environment - Agenda Item 8	03.03.2003
Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee – Agenda Item ?	
Lead Member for Transport and Environment - Agenda Item ?	

## PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS ASSESSMENT SCORE

Factor	Options	Score
1	<b>Improvements for Mobility Impaired</b> Score 2 for crossings specifically requested to improve conditions for mobility impaired	
2	<b>Safer Routes to School</b> Score 3 for sites specifically identified as an issue in a School Travel Plan	
3	<b>Access to Public Transport</b> Score 2 for sites which will improve access to public transport	
4	<b>Reduction of Severance</b> Score 2 for sites which reduce severance (e.g. to serve sole village store or where a village is severed by a heavily trafficked A or B class road)	
5	<b>Pedestrian Casualties</b> Score 3 for each pedestrian fatality Score 2 for each serious pedestrian casualty Score 1 for each slight pedestrian casualty	
6	<b>Child Pedestrian Casualties</b> Score 3 for each child pedestrian fatality Score 2 for each child serious pedestrian casualty Score 1 for each child slight pedestrian casualty	
7	<b>Road Width</b> Score 2 for roads over 9m Score 1 for roads between 7 and 9m	
8	<b>Speed Limit</b> Score 3 for roads subject to National Speed Limit Score 2 for roads subject to 50mph limit Score 1 for roads subject to 40mph limit	
9	<b>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</b> Score -3 for sites with an existing bridge or subway Score -2 for sites with existing traffic signals with no specific pedestrian facility Score -1 for sites with an existing traffic island	
10	<b>Footpaths and Cycle Routes</b> Score 1 for sites which serve an existing designated cycling or walking route such as the National Cycle Network, bridle path or footpath.	
11	<b>Street Lighting</b> Score 1 for sites with no street lighting Score 0.5 for sites with existing but sub-standard street lighting	
12	<b>Average PV squared value (busiest four hours)</b> Score equals average PV squared x 10 (e.g. PV2 of 0.25 becomes score of 2.5)	
	<b>Overall Score</b>	

The relative priority of assessed sites will be based on their overall score.

**REQUESTS FOR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES RECEIVED SINCE JULY 2007****APPENDIX D**

Parish	Road Number	Description of Site	Meets pre-qualification criteria?	Comments
Seaford	A259	near Claremont Shops	Yes	Sample PV2 2.60
Burwash	A265	High Street	No	Sample PV2 0.14
Etchingham	A265	High Street	No	Sample PV2 0.005
Heathfield & Waldron	B2203	Theobalds Green near Sandy Cross Lane	No	Sample PV2 0.06
Eastbourne	U2090	Green Street near Chamberlain Road	Yes	Pedestrian Casualty
Newhaven	B2283	Avis Road near Iveagh Crescent	No	Sample PV2 0.14
Eastbourne	U2082	Framfield Way	No	Sample PV2 0.00
Heathfield & Waldron	B2096	By Half Moon PH	N/A	Design of a pedestrian crossing for the B2096 is already in progress as part of the Heathfield LATS. This site has therefore not been assessed.
Eastbourne	U2270	Pennine Way near Trossachs Close	No	Sample PV2 0.00
Lewes	U5137	Church Lane near Barn Road	Yes	Pedestrian Casualty
Lewes	U5137	Church Lane near Police HQ	Yes	Pedestrian Casualty
Hastings	A21	Sedlescombe Rd North at SCP for Silverdale School	Yes	Sample PV2 0.80
Lewes	U5152	Mountfield Road	Yes	Sample PV2 0.25
Hailsham	U7221	Diplocks Way near South Road	Yes	Pedestrian Casualty
Hailsham	A271	near Bakers Farm Park	No	Sample PV2 0.01

**PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PRIORITY LIST**

**APPENDIX E**

Priority 2008	Priority 2007	Site	Average PV <sup>2</sup>	Factors													
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
1	-	Sedlescombe Rd North at SCP for Silverdale School, Hastings	3.47	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34.7	37.7
2	9	High Street between Washwell Lane & The Square, Wadhurst	0.60	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	0.5	6	13.5	
3	22	Battle Road near Old Harrow Road, Hastings	0.33	0	3	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0.5	3.3	11.8	
4	18	Lewes Road near Elphick Road, Newhaven	0.37	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.5	3.7	11.2	
5	5	A259 east of Denton Corner, Newhaven	0.81	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	-1	1	0	8.1	11.1	
6	31	Willingdon Road/Park Lane, Eastbourne	0.16	0	3	2	0	2	0	2	1	-1	0	0.5	1.6	11.1	
7	44	Albert Road jw A259, Hastings	0.89	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	-2	0	0	8.9	10.9	
8	6	Langney Rise o/s Langney Cottages, Eastbourne	0.79	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	0	0	7.9	10.9	
9	7	Hastings Road at Pebsham School, Bexhill	0.69	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.9	10.9	
10	4	George Street east of Victoria Road, Hailsham	0.92	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	9.2	10.7	
11	19	A259 near Gilberts Drive, East Dean	0.36	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	-1	0	1	3.6	10.6	
12	32	A275 by junction with Mill Lane, Chailey	0.15	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.5	10.5	
13	45	Collington Avenue nr Colebrook Road o/s Tesco Express, Bexhill	0.09	2	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0.5	0.9	10.4	
14	21	Lewes Road o/s Ringmer Community College, Ringmer	0.33	0	3	0	2	0	0	2	0	-1	0	1	3.3	10.3	
15	8	Eldon Road near Baldwin Avenue, Eastbourne	0.64	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	6.4	9.9	
16	13	Malling Hill, Lewes	0.41	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	-1	0	0	4.1	9.1	
17	-	Green Street near Chamberlain Road, Eastbourne	0.04	0	3	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	0.4	8.9	
18	17	London Road north of Buckhurst Place, Bexhill	0.37	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3.7	8.7	
19	14	Willingdon Road south of Victoria Drive (os Kestral House), Eastbourne	0.40	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	-1	0	0.5	4	8.5	
20	-	Mountfield Road o/s Priory School, Lewes	0.47	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	4.7	8.2	
21	16	North Street east of West Street, Lewes	0.39	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	3.9	7.9	
22	36	A259 near Bull PH, Hastings	0.13	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0.5	1.3	7.8	
23	-	Church Lane near Police HQ, Lewes	0.03	0	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.3	7.8	
24	-	Church Lane near Barn Road, Lewes	0.11	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	1.1	7.6	
25	41	Offham Road near access to Wallands School, Lewes	0.11	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	1.1	7.6	
26	33	Cambridge Road at Cornwallis Gardens, Hastings	0.15	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.5	7.5	

Priority 2008	Priority 2007	Site	Average PV <sup>2</sup>	Factors												
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
27	24	High Street east of Mayfield Lane, Wadhurst	0.30	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	3	7.5
28	-	A259 near Claremont Shops, Seaford	0.42	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	-1	0	0	4.2	7.2
29	26	Grange Road north of Old Wish Road, Eastbourne	0.27	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0.5	2.7	7.2
30	43	Victoria Drive near Broomfield Street, Eastbourne	0.10	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	7.0
31	29	Church Road o/s George PH, Rotherfield	0.20	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.5	2	6.5
32	38	Collington Avenue west of Sutherland Avenue, Bexhill	0.12	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1.2	6.2
33	12	Cross Levels Way west of Lottbridge Drove, Eastbourne	0.42	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	-1	0	0	4.2	6.2
34	58	Lydd Road near Pelwood Road, Camber	0.01	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0.1	6.1
35	25	Southfields Road near Grove Road, Eastbourne	0.28	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.8	5.8
36	57	Birkdale o/s Drake House, Bexhill	0.02	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	0.2	5.7
37	51	Western Road near Newick Drive, Newick	0.05	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	5.5
38	40	High Street near Church Street, Ticehurst	0.12	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	5.2
39	10	Whitley Road between Firle Road and Waterworks Road, Eastbourne	0.58	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-2	0	0	5.8	4.8
40	56	Crowhurst Road by Robsack Estate, Hastings	0.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0.5	0.2	4.7
41	55	West Parade, Bexhill	0.02	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0.5	0.2	4.7
42	34	Larkspur Drive near Milfoil Drive, Eastbourne	0.15	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.5	4.5
43	27	Friday Street near Oak Tree Lane, Eastbourne	0.23	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	-1	0	0	2.3	4.3
44	37	The Goffs near Park Entrance, Eastbourne	0.13	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.3	4.3
45	23	Lottbridge Drove north of Marshalls Roundabout, Eastbourne	0.31	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	-1	0	0	3.1	4.1
46	42	Terminus Road west of Reginald Road, Bexhill	0.11	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.1	4.1
47	59	Jevington Road near Village Hall, Wannock	0.003	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.03	4.0
48	20	A259, Pevensey Bay	0.34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	3.4	3.9
49	35	A259 jw Chyngton Gardens, Seaford	0.14	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	1.4	3.4
50	28	London Road north of Grovelands Road, Hailsham	0.21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.1	3.1
51	-	Diplocks Way near South Road, Hailsham	0.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	1.3	2.8
52	53	Southview Drive near jw High Street, Uckfield	0.03	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.3	2.8
53	39	Alfriston Road at jw Vale Road, Seaford	0.12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	1.2	2.7
54	50	Ferry Road west of Tillingham Avenue, Rye	0.05	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.5	2.5
55	46	Wellington Road near Castledown Avenue, Hastings	0.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	0.8	2.3
56	47	Church Street jw Summerdown Road, Eastbourne	0.07	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	-2	0	0.5	0.7	2.2

Priority 2008	Priority 2007	Site	Average PV <sup>2</sup>	Factors													
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
57	48	Crowborough Hill near Montargis Way, Crowborough	0.07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	0	0	0.7	1.7
58	54	Blatchington Hill near Sutton Drove, Seaford	0.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.2	0.7
59	52	Harley Shute Road south of Gillsman's Hill, Hastings	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0.5	0.5

**PROGRESS ON SITES IDENTIFIED IN 2007****APPENDIX F**

	Parish	Road Number	Description of Site	Comment
Constructed	Polegate	A2270	Near Esso Garage	Puffin Crossing constructed 2007/08
	Newhaven	A259	near Augustfields	Puffin Crossing constructed 2007/08
	Hailsham	A295	South Road o/s Spa Store	Zebra Crossing constructed 2007/08 as part of a traffic calming scheme
	Forest Row	A22	nr Highgate Road at SCP site	Puffin Crossing constructed 2007/08 – externally funded
Construction Programmed	Eastbourne	U2236	Brassey Avenue east of Elm Grove	Design and construction of Zebra Crossing programmed for 2008/09
	Eastbourne	A22	Highfield Link south of Shinewater Rbt	Design and construction of Puffin Crossing programmed for 2008/09
	Hastings	A2101	St Helen's Road near Parkstone Road	Design and construction of Puffin Crossing programmed for 2008/09
	Eastbourne	U2169	St Phillips Avenue near Ringwood Road	Design and construction of Zebra Crossing programmed for 2008/09 as part of a traffic calming scheme
	Chailey	A275	Outside St Peters CE School	Design and construction of Puffin Crossing programmed for 2008/09 – developer funding
	Hastings	U3029	Parkstone Road by Running Track	Design and construction of Puffin Crossing programmed for 2008/09 as part of a traffic calming scheme