

# Uckfield Traffic Improvements

## Consultation Results

April 2012

Transport Development Control Team  
Economy, Transport and Environment  
May 2012



## **Contents**

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. The Proposed Options
4. Consultation
5. Questionnaire Results Summary

Appendix A – Questionnaire Results

Appendix B – Questionnaire Written Responses

Appendix C – Consultation Option Drawings

## 1. Executive Summary

Uckfield town centre already suffers from congestion and with the additional housing already being built and further developments planned over the next fifteen years; this is forecast to get considerably worse. To keep Uckfield as a vibrant and flourishing town it is vital we address the problem and not wait until the situation becomes critical. As the highway authority, East Sussex County Council is responsible for roads and transport across the county. We need to take action to implement a solution that reflects the views of the people who live and work in and around Uckfield. This report contains the findings from the Uckfield Traffic Improvements Consultation.

The consultation was carried out between 15 March and 23 April 2012.

A flyer was sent out to approximately 4,500 households in the Uckfield area inviting them to attend an exhibition and give us their views on the following options:

- Option A – Smarter Choices (making different travel choices),
- Option B – More parking
- Option C – A northern road and
- Option D – A southern road.

The exhibition was open to the public from Thursday 15 March 2012 until Saturday 17 March 2012. 773 people visited the exhibition, representing 7% of the population of Uckfield.

Facebook and Twitter were used to generate interest in the consultation and to help inform people about the exhibition and engage them in discussion about the current traffic situation in Uckfield. An online survey was available on the website along with detailed plans and information about the scheme. A paper version of the same survey was available at the exhibition or sent out to interested members of the public.

A total of 572 responses were received to the survey (276 on line and 296 on paper). There were 429 visits to the webpage, 42 Facebook likes and 107 Twitter followers (this is still ongoing).

We additionally received a petition with 53 signatures expressing an objection to the Northern Road Option C because of the potential impact the scheme will have on the Holy Cross School.

The findings show that:

### General Preference of Respondents

We outlined the options that are available to address traffic congestion in Uckfield and wanted to know which of them respondents felt would address the issue. The respondents gave the following results; this may have included more than one choice.

Option B - Car Parking	51%
Option D - Southern Road	37%
Option A - Smarter Choices	33%
Option C - Northern Road	23%

### Option A - Smarter Choices Option

Some respondents chose the Smarter Choices Option and highlighted the following travel mode preferences which they found important; this may have included more than one choice.

Cycle parking and routes	55% found it important
Pedestrian Facilities	78% found it important
Bus Improvement	69% found it important
Car Sharing	41% did not see it as important
Car Club	43% did not see it as important

### Option B - Parking Option;

We asked respondents what requirements were necessary if a parking scheme was chosen.

There is a demand for the car park	84% agreed
The car park is in the right place	66% agreed
There are enough car parking spaces	51% disagreed
Parking should be managed better	54% agreed

### Options C and D - Northern Road Option & Southern Road Option

How would it relieve congestion?	Northern Road Option	Southern Road Option
It would help with congestion	28%	37%
Congestion would remain the same	28%	26%
It would make congestion worse	29%	23%
Don't know	10%	9%

When asked which of the road schemes people would prefer, 36% of respondents favoured the Southern Road option with 22% favouring the Northern Road option.

### Conclusions

The exhibition was well attended with people providing some very useful feedback. The consultation period was open for over a month which also provided very useful comments and feedback on the proposals. The results showed considerable interest in Smarter Choices and extra car parking as possible solutions. However, particularly for Smarter Choices, respondents have said that they would have liked to have seen more details of the measures proposed.

### Next Steps

In consideration of the views expressed in the consultation exercise we will work up further details for both short and long term solutions and discuss these further with all interested parties. The recommendations for the next steps will then be considered by the Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment. The Lead Member meeting date has not yet been agreed but we will publicise it widely and the public are able to attend. Depending on the decisions made by the Lead Member there may be a need to consult again.

## **2. Introduction**

Uckfield town centre already suffers from congestion and with the additional housing already being built and further developments planned over the next fifteen years; this is forecast to get considerably worse. To keep Uckfield as a vibrant and flourishing town it is vital we address the problem and not wait until the situation becomes critical before taking action.

To be successful, town centre shops and businesses need people to be able to reach them easily and safely, by car, public transport, on foot or by bike. This means traffic needs to be able to flow freely, pedestrians need to be able to move about safely, and there needs to be easy access to good public transport and sufficient car parking.

As highway authority, East Sussex County Council is responsible for roads and transport across the county. We need to take action to implement a solution that reflects the views of the people who live and work in and around Uckfield. This report contains the findings from the Uckfield Traffic Improvements Consultation.

### **How will transport improvements be funded?**

Wealden District Council has proposals, as part of its Local Plan, for extra houses and shops in the town over the next 15 years. This increased housing has an impact on town centre congestion, so we ask for financial contributions from developers to help us deal with this. £4m is already being collected from developments with planning permission. Additional funding for necessary improvements will be secured from future developments.

### **How traffic moves around Uckfield**

In November 2010, we carried out traffic surveys in an area that included the town and the bypass. The results showed that changes need to be made to accommodate both existing traffic and proposed growth. Excluding traffic solely using the bypass, the survey showed that:

- only about 10% of existing traffic in the town is through traffic;
- about 30% of traffic stays within the town;
- approximately 30% of traffic on the High Street between Bell Lane and Framfield Road is associated with town centre car parks;
- around 60% of the journeys that start in Uckfield leave the town; and
- 60% of traffic in Uckfield started its journey outside the town.

We also found that some junctions in the town centre are almost at capacity during peak hours, particularly:

- the amount of traffic going through the High Street / Bell Lane junction means it doesn't work effectively; and
- the traffic going through the High Street / Bell Lane junction and Tesco roundabout means they do not work together effectively. The same is true of the High Street / Bell Lane and Framfield Road / High Street junction. Extra traffic generated by developments in Uckfield will make the congestion worse in the town centre, affecting everyone using the roads. That is why we need to deal with the problem.

## **3. The Proposed Options**

There are a number of things we could do to reduce the impact of congestion in Uckfield.

We consulted on the following options:

Option A – Smarter Choices (making different travel choices)

Option B – More parking

Option C – A northern road

Option D – A southern road

Each option could be introduced on its own or together with one or more of the other proposals. Detailed drawings of Options B, C and D are contained in Appendix D.

### **Option A - Making different travel choices in Uckfield - Smarter Choices**

People often make the car their first choice for travel because it's easy, comfortable and provides a feeling of security. Whilst the car has real benefits, it also brings with it familiar problems such as congestion and pollution. Congestion doesn't just make journeys slower than they need be; it affects the cost of the transport and goods caught in the traffic. Businesses have higher costs that have to be recovered and this means everyone pays more. Increased traffic on our roads damages the environment, with buildings, plants and wildlife all being affected by the vibration, noise and exhaust fumes of passing vehicles.

- Smarter Choices could reduce car journeys by between 1 and 3%;
- Smarter Choices could be combined with all other options; and
- Smarter Choices might not solve the congestion issues on their own.

Some of the changes that could be introduced are:

- making it easier to walk and cycle in Uckfield;
- encouraging car sharing;
- introducing car clubs in Uckfield; and
- improving facilities for bus users in Uckfield.

The cost of this option is in the region of £3 million

### **Option B - Providing more parking spaces**

Most parking spaces in Uckfield are at the northern end of the town centre which means that traffic comes into the town centre just to park. There is an opportunity to build a new car park for approximately 130 vehicles on land close to the station. This would mean that some traffic would be able to park at the southern end of the town centre and reduce town centre congestion.

This car park would also:

- reduce traffic through the Bell Farm Lane /High Street junction;
- help to satisfy existing demand for parking near the railway station; and
- reduce on-street parking.

A new car park on this site would:

- not solve congestion issues alone;
- have an impact upon the flood plain; and
- Potentially attract more traffic.

The cost of this option is in the region of £1 to 2 million.

### **Option C - Northern road**

This option is a road from the traffic lights in Bell Farm Lane to a traffic light junction in the centre of the High Street. The route between is yet to be decided and will be subject to discussions with land owners. This road would be designed to be sympathetic to the area and a pleasant place for cyclists and pedestrians as well as encouraging low vehicle speeds.

This option would:

- ease congestion at the existing Bell Farm Lane / High Street junction;
- reduce traffic through the High Street to create a more attractive town centre environment;
- provide formal pedestrian crossing facilities at all junctions;
- enable bus priority technology to be implemented at key junctions; and
- minimise the impact to the flood plain.

The option could impact on:

- Holy Cross School;
- Tesco store;
- High Street properties at Civic Way junction; and
- Luxford Field.

The cost of this option is in the region of £5 to £8 million

### **Option D - Southern road**

This option is to be considered in two phases. Phase 1 is a road at ground level from the Bell Farm Lane roundabout travelling south with a bridge across the river. Phase 2 is a road that bridges both the river and the railway line. Both phases would then link into the southern end of the High Street. Both phases would then link into the southern end of the High Street. The section of High Street between River Way and Mill Lane is shown as being closed to traffic but open to cyclists and pedestrians, but could be left open for traffic under Phase 1. However the High Street would have to be closed to traffic if the railway line was reinstated.

Network Rail's study, which looked into the reinstatement of the Lewes / Uckfield railway line, concluded there is no business case to reopen the line at this time. However, if a business case was to be made in future, then Phase 2 would bridge the railway line and allow the Lewes / Uckfield line to be reinstated. The location of our proposed Phase 2 bridge is very similar to that envisaged in the Network Rail study.

This option would:

- ease congestion through the Bell Farm Lane / High Street junction;
- allow improvements to be made to pedestrian facilities in the High Street; and
- have no impact upon Holy Cross School and Luxford Field.

This option would:

- have an impact on the flood plain, which would require mitigation work to reduce future flood risk;
- impact on the public house, petrol station, private retail premises, public parking and access to Waitrose; and
- have environmental and visual impact of the large structure (Phase 2).

The cost of this option is:

Phase 1 in the region of £5 to £8 million.

Phase 2 in the region of £15 to £20 million.

## 4. Consultation

The consultation was carried out between 15th and 23rd April 2012.

A flyer was delivered to approximately 4,500 households in the Uckfield area inviting them to attend an exhibition and give us their views on the following options:

- Option A – Smarter Choices,
- Option B – More parking
- Option C – A northern road and
- Option D – A southern road.

The exhibition was open to the public from Thursday 15 March 2012 until Saturday 17 March 2012. 773 people visited the exhibition, representing 7% of the population of Uckfield. (2001 census figures - Population in Uckfield 10,723)

Facebook and Twitter were used to generate interest in the consultation and to help inform people about the exhibition. An online survey was available on the website along with detailed plans and information about the scheme. A paper version of the same survey was available at the exhibition.

A total of 572 responses were received to the survey (276 on line and 296 on paper). There were 429 visits to the webpage, 42 Facebook likes and 107 Twitter followers (this is still ongoing).

## 5. Findings

This section contains a summary of the findings from the survey. For ease of reading these findings follow the order of the questions in the survey which is included as Appendix A. More detailed tables of analysis and charts are included as Appendix A. A summary of all the written comments that were given is included as Appendix B.

### Option A - Smarter Choices

This option gives various town improvement measures that would encourage a more sustainable form of transport.

Of the respondents that chose the Smarter Choices Option they highlighted the following travel mode preferences which they found important, this may have included more than one choice.

Cycle parking and routes	55% found it important
Pedestrian Facilities	78% found it important
Bus Improvement	69% found it important
Car Sharing	41% did not see it as important
Car Club	43% did not see it as important

Most respondents believed that traffic congestion would remain the same and the option would have little effect.

However there were comments that there was a need for improvements to the bus services with detail of specific routes and school buses, possible park and ride schemes. There is a requirement for cycle and pedestrian improvements, along with High Street parking regime to be looked at in more detail with regard to traffic lights, lay-bys and restricted parking.

## Option B - Parking Scheme

This would be a new car park providing 130 car parking spaces near to the railway station. Of those that chose Option B the respondents gave the following responses;

There is a demand for the car park	84% agreed
The car park is in the right place	66% agreed
There are enough car parking spaces	51% disagreed
Parking should be managed better	54% agreed

Most respondents believed that it would help to relieve traffic congestion.

Most written responses requested that parking remain free however it was recognised that this should apply to short stay (shoppers) and charges apply for commuters in long stay areas. There were comments that parking should be controlled with wardens and enforcement.

## Option C - Northern Road

This option is a road route from Bell Farm Lane to a junction with traffic lights in the centre of the High Street. The respondents that chose Option C gave the following responses;

How would it relieve congestion?	Northern Road Option
It would help with congestion	28%
Congestion would remain the same	28%
It would make congestion worse	29%
Don't know	10%

The questionnaire responses above showed that it was split with regard to how they believed that it would affect traffic congestion. However there was concern over the effect on the school, Luxford Field and the allotments. Additionally it was considered that it would just move the congestion further up the High Street.

We additionally received a petition with 53 signatures expressing an objection to the Northern Road Option C because of the potential impact the scheme will have on the Holy Cross School.

## Option D - Southern Road (Phases 1 & 2)

This option is to be considered in two phases. Phase 1 is a road route from the Bell Farm Lane (Tesco) roundabout travelling south towards the station with a bridge across the river. The phase 2 road route bridges both the river and the railway line. Both phases would link into the southern end of the High Street.

How would it relieve congestion?	Southern Road Option
It would help with congestion	37%
Congestion would remain the same	26%
It would make congestion worse	23%
Don't know	9%

From the questionnaire most respondents believed that it would help to relieve traffic congestion. However there was concern over its cost to build and only Phase 2 would be necessary.

## Both Road Schemes

It was asked in the questionnaire of which of the road options would be your preferred option. The responses showed that out of the two road schemes 36% of respondents favour the Southern Road Option with 22% favouring the Northern Road option.

## All Options

We outlined the options that are available to address traffic congestion in Uckfield and wanted to know which of them respondents felt would address the issue, this may have included more than one choice. Respondents told us the following:

Car Parking	51%
Southern Road	37%
Smarter Choices	33%
Northern Road	23%
Don't Know	7%

The additional comments that were received in response to this question are contained in Appendix B.

## General

Of the 51% of all respondents that told us that they travelled daily into Uckfield said they used the following modes of transport:

Car	74%
Pedestrian	53%
Car Passenger	26%
Train	21%
Bus	19%
Cycle	12%

The respondents were able to choose more than one answer option.

53% of all respondents were residents of Uckfield and 33% were a resident of a surrounding town or village. Of the respondents 3% considered themselves disabled.

Respondents found out about the consultation in the following ways:

A leaflet	36%
In a newspaper	23%
Another person	19%
The County Council website	10%

## Lewes-Uckfield Railway Line

Within the consultation responses there was considerable support for the re-opening of the Railway line (Smarter Choices Question 3 showed that 70% were in favour), and there were a small percentage of respondents who were against it. The question of whether people were in support of the rail line was not asked as part of this consultation process; however, the schemes presented would not prevent the re-opening. The full results are contained in the Appendices A and B.

The County Council continues to support the reinstatement of the Lewes-Uckfield line, as set out in our Local Transport Plan, despite the outcomes of Network Rail's 2008 study which identified that although it is feasible to reinstate the line, there is not a strong enough business case for Government and the rail industry to fund the project. Network Rail has recently advised that the revised major transport schemes appraisal process would not positively affect the 2008 assessment of the reinstated Lewes-Uckfield line.

The Lewes-Uckfield railway line is protected within relevant local planning documents and the County Council, along with other partners, will continue to make representations to the rail industry in support of reinstating the line.

## **Conclusions**

The exhibition was well attended with people providing some very useful feedback. The consultation period was open for over a month which also provided very useful comments and feedback on the proposals. The results showed considerable interest in Smarter Choices and car parking as possible solutions. However, particularly for Smarter Choices, respondents have said that they would have liked to have seen more details of the measures proposed.

## **Next Steps**

In consideration of the views expressed in the consultation exercise we will work up further details for both short and long term solutions and discuss these further with all interested parties. The recommendations for the next steps will then be considered by the Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment. The Lead Member meeting date has not yet been agreed but we will publicise it widely and the public are able to attend. Depending on the decisions made by the Lead Member there may be a need to consult again.

## APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

## Uckfield Traffic Improvements

### Smarter Choices

These are a selection of things which can be put in place to encourage a greener form of travel and reduce car travel. They may include cycle parking, improved walk and cycle routes, bus improvements, car share scheme or car club. The cost of this option is in the region of £3 million.

#### Q1

	important	neutral	not important	don't know
Cycle parking and routes	312 (55%)	106 (19%)	121 (21%)	5 (1%)
Pedestrian facilities	447 (78%)	59 (10%)	37 (6%)	5 (1%)
Bus improvements	397 (69%)	108 (19%)	42 (8%)	5 (1%)
Car sharing	136 (24%)	155 (27%)	232 (41%)	13 (2%)
Car club	109 (19%)	156 (27%)	244 (43%)	20 (3%)

#### Q2 Do you think that smarter choices will help to relieve traffic congestion in Uckfield? Please select one answer

173 (30%)	They would help to relieve traffic congestion	52 (9%)	They would make traffic congestion worse
284 (50%)	Traffic congestion would remain the same	40 (7%)	Don't know

#### Q3 Is there anything else that you would like to address that hasn't been included above?

266 (47%)

### Parking

There is an opportunity to build a new car park with around 130 formalised car parking spaces near to the railway station. The cost of this option is in the region of £1 to £2 million.

#### Q4 Do you think that a new car park will help to relieve traffic congestion in Uckfield? Please select one answer

267 (47%)	It would help to relieve traffic congestion	89 (16%)	It would make traffic congestion worse
181 (32%)	Traffic congestion would remain the same	23 (4%)	Don't know

#### Q5

	agree	neutral	disagree	don't know
There is a demand for the car park	477 (84%)	34 (6%)	28 (5%)	9 (2%)
The car park is in the right place	377 (66%)	92 (16%)	52 (9%)	13 (2%)
There are enough car parking spaces	111 (19%)	99 (17%)	293 (51%)	30 (5%)
Parking should be managed better	305 (54%)	132 (23%)	71 (12%)	24 (4%)

#### Q6 Are there any other comments that you would like to make about this option?

344 (60%)

## Road Options

Each of these options addresses the congestion problem, but there is no need to do both. We are therefore interested in your preference.

### Northern Road Option

This option is a road route from Bell Farm Lane to a junction with traffic lights in the centre of the High Street. The route in between is yet to be decided and will be subject to further discussions with the land owners.

The cost of this option is in the region of £5 to £8 million.

- Q7 Do you think that this road option would help to relieve traffic congestion in Uckfield?** Please select one answer
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 161 (28%) It would help to relieve traffic congestion | 165 (29%) It would make traffic congestion worse |
| 162 (28%) Traffic congestion would remain the same    | 58 (10%) Don't know                              |

- Q8 Are there any other comments that you would like to make about this option?**

350 (61%)

### Southern Road Option

This option is to be considered in two phases. Phase 1 is a road route from the Bell Farm Lane (Tesco) roundabout travelling south towards the Station with a bridge across the river. The phase 2 road route bridges both the river and the railway line. Both phases would link into the southern end of the High Street. A section of the High Street between the rail crossing and Mill Lane is shown as being closed to traffic but open to cyclists and pedestrians. It could be left open for traffic under Phase 1. However the High Street would have to be closed if the rail line was reinstated.

The cost of this option is: Phase 1 in the region of £5 to £8 million and Phase 2 in the region of £15 to £20 million.

- Q9 Do you think that this road option would help to relieve traffic congestion in Uckfield?** Please select one answer
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 212 (37%) It would help to relieve traffic congestion | 130 (23%) It would make traffic congestion worse |
| 147 (26%) Traffic congestion would remain the same    | 52 (9%) Don't know                               |

- Q10 Are there any other comments that you would like to make about this option?**

356 (62%)

- Q11 Which of the road options would be your preferred option?** Please select one answer
- |                                |                                     |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 144 (25%) Northern Road option | 124 (22%) I don't have a preference |
| 207 (36%) Southern Road option | 38 (7%) Don't know                  |

- Q12 Why is this?**

467 (82%)

**Your preferences**

We have outlined the options that are available to address traffic congestion in Uckfield. We would like to know which of them you feel would address the issue.

**Q13 Thinking about the options available, which do you feel would address the issue?** Please select all that apply

- 189 (33%) Smarter Choices (Q1 to Q3)
- 293 (51%) Car Parking (Q4 to Q6)
- 129 (23%) Northern Road option (Q7 to Q8)
- 212 (37%) Southern Road option (Q9 to Q10)
- 41 (7%) Don't know

**Q14 Are there any other comments that you would like to make about these options?**

299 (52%)

**Is there anything else that you would like to say about addressing traffic congestion in Uckfield? If your comment relates to a specific area of road in Uckfield please could you provide details of the location that your are referring to.**

**Q15 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about?**

341 (60%)

**About you...**

We want to make sure that everyone is treated fairly and equally and that no one gets left out. That's why we ask you these questions. We won't share the information you give us with anyone else. We will only use it to help us make decisions and make our services better.

If you would rather not answer any of these questions, you don't have to.

**Q16 How often do you travel into Uckfield.** Please select one answer

- |                                |                               |                          |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 289 (51%) daily                | 43 (8%) once or twice a month | 4 (1%) never             |
| 143 (25%) once or twice a week | 36 (6%) once or twice a year  | 6 (1%) prefer not to say |

**Q17 If you never travel into Uckfield why is this?**

30 (5%)

**Q18 How do you travel to Uckfield?** Please select all that apply

- 304 (53%) on foot
- 111 (19%) by bus
- 2 (0%) by community transport
- 119 (21%) by train
- 424 (74%) by private car (driver)
- 151 (26%) by private car (passenger)
- 16 (3%) by taxi
- 9 (2%) by motorbike or scooter
- 67 (12%) by bicycle
- 6 (1%) other

If other, please specify

17 (3%)

**Q19 Are you a ...** Please select one answer

- 334 (58%) Resident of Uckfield

189 (33%) Resident of other town or village (please answer Q19a)  
 11 (2%) Commuter (please answer Q19a)

**Q19a If you are a resident of another town or village or a commuter where did you travel from?**  
 194 (34%)

**Q20 Are you.....?** Please select one answer  
 349 (61%) Male 164 (29%) Female 17 (3%) Prefer not to say

**Q21 Which of these age groups do you belong to?** Please select one answer  
 3 (1%) under 18 28 (5%) 25-34 113 (20%) 45-54 74 (13%) 60-64 44 (8%) 75+  
 8 (1%) 18-24 74 (13%) 35-44 50 (9%) 55-59 123 (22%) 65-74 15 (3%) Prefer not to say

**Q22 What is your postcode?** 494 (86%)

**Q23 To which of these ethnic groups do you feel you belong?** (source: 2011 census)  
 Please select one answer  
 451 (79%) White British 1 (0%) Mixed White and Asian 0 (0%) Black or Black British African  
 4 (1%) White Irish 0 (0%) Mixed other\* 0 (0%) Black other\*  
 0 (0%) White Gypsy/Roma 1 (0%) Asian or Asian British Indian 0 (0%) Arab  
 0 (0%) White Irish Traveller 0 (0%) Asian or Asian British Pakistani 1 (0%) Chinese  
 7 (1%) White other\* 0 (0%) Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi 38 (7%) Prefer not to say  
 2 (0%) Mixed White and Black Caribbean 0 (0%) Asian other\* 3 (1%) Other ethnic group\*  
 0 (0%) Mixed White and Black African 1 (0%) Black or Black British Caribbean  
 \*If your ethnic group was not specified in the list please describe your ethnic group. 13 (2%)

The Equality Act 2010 describes a person disabled if they have a longstanding physical or mental condition that has lasted or is likely to last at least 12 months; and this condition has a substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day to day activities. People with some conditions (cancer, multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS, for example) are considered to be disabled from the point that they are diagnosed.

**Q24 Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010?**  
 Please select one answer  
 18 (3%) Yes 466 (81%) No 29 (5%) Prefer not to say

**Q24a If you answered yes to Q24, please tell us the type of impairment that applies to you.**  
 You may have more than one type of impairment, so please select all that apply. If none of these apply to you please select other and write in the type of impairment you have.  
 15 (3%) Physical impairment  
 6 (1%) Sensory impairment (hearing and sight)  
 15 (3%) Long standing illness or health condition, such as cancer, HIV, heart disease, diabetes or epilepsy  
 2 (0%) Mental health condition  
 1 (0%) Learning disability  
 1 (0%) Prefer not to say  
 1 (0%) Other\*  
 \*If other, please specify 5 (1%)

and finally...

**Q25 How did you hear about this consultation?** Please select all that apply

132 (23%)	In a newspaper	55 (10%)	The County Council website
38 (7%)	On the radio	16 (3%)	A district or borough council website
37 (6%)	Via Social Media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter etc)	47 (8%)	Other website
51 (9%)	A poster	108 (19%)	Another person
207 (36%)	A leaflet	42 (7%)	Other* please specify below
23 (4%)	An invitation or personal letter		
			44 (8%)

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey, your views are important to us.**

## **APPENDIX B – QUESTIONNAIRE WRITTEN RESPONSES**

<b>Comments received in response to Q3 - Option A -Smarter Choices</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Repeated Comments</b>		
It is important to have the rail re-opening	70	26%
A need for bus infrastructure improvements	11	4%
A Need for bus service improvements	32	12%
Improvements to cycle routes and infrastructure	28	11%
A need for pedestrian improvements	24	9%
<b>Total Number of Comments</b>	<b>266</b>	

<b>Other Comments</b>
Better connectivity with other transport
20mph speed limit in town
High Street Parking restricted
Free School Transport
Parking fees
Lay-bys in the High Street
More parking
Park and ride scheme
Promote public transport
Traffic wardens and enforcement
Traffic calming in the High Street and Church Lane
Examine and improve the traffic light phasing

<b>Comments received in response to Q6 - Option B - Parking</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Repeated Comments</b>		
Should charge for parking	18	5%
Will only be used by the Rail Station and Commuters	41	12%
Do not charge for parking	35	10%
Restricted parking times	25	7%
Would like more space than the 130	15	4%
<b>Total Number of Comments</b>	<b>344</b>	

<b>Other Comments</b>
3hr stay other car parks
Regulated by a disc system
Traffic wardens and enforcement
Will attract more commuters
Should be funded by the railway
High Street Parking restricted
Residents parking permit
More central parking needed
Need more all day parking
Park and ride scheme
Concern about flooding
Luxford Field car park increased in size
More disabled spaces
Should not encroach on to the railway track bed

<b>Comments received in response to Q8 – Option C - Northern Road</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Repeated Comments</b>		
Effect on allotments	7	2%
Effect on the school	95	27%
Effect on Luxford Fields	47	13%
Move the queue up the High Street	36	10%
Cuts the town in half	5	1%
No more junction / traffic lights	12	3%
Not cost effective	16	5%
<b>Total Number of Comments</b>	<b>350</b>	

<b>Other Comments</b>
Road too narrow and would not allow for articulated lorries
Worries about the loss of club and fire station
Tesco's should move out of town
Road should go through Luxford car park
Dual the bypass
Needs to be a cycle/pedestrian friendly
Should link to Church Street
Be enough lanes to queue in parallel
Make a one-way system
Will affect Rocks Park and West park housing
Will make it difficult to access the industrial estate

<b>Comments received in response to Q8 – Option D - Southern Road</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Repeated Comments</b>		
Phase 2 should only be built	25	7%
Not cost effective option	30	8%
Transfers the problem	8	2%
Not aesthetically pleasing	12	3%
<b>Total Number of Comments</b>	<b>356</b>	

<b>Other Comments</b>
Does not help the Framfield Road Congestion
Access to Waitrose will be more difficult
Access to the Industrial Estate will be difficult
The High Street should remain open
There needs to be more pedestrian facilities
Install MOVA on traffic lights
Traffic lights need to be removed
Make a one-way system
Any option should span both the river and rail
A complicated route for drivers
Can cause speeding on the fly-over

<b>Other General Responses to Q14 &amp; 15</b>
Provision of a high frequency low cost minibus service
£15 congestion charge
Promote more cycling, walking
Wider pavements
Remove traffic lights at Tesco roundabout/bell lane
A new car park should be free to use. restrict on-street parking
More sustainable patterns of development
Charge for in-town parking for over four hours and add more run about buses for short journeys
Better road markings needed
Widening the bypass
Parking space on the industrial estate where there is empty warehouses with extra land could be used for parking as well as land next to the railway line. There could be a bus service from the car park; perhaps a charge of £1 for 3 hours, £2 for 6 hours would be reasonable.
A better location for further development would be off the Eastbourne Road
Car parking long term pay - short term free for shopping
Close the whole high street to traffic. link industrial estate direct to bypass
Remove on street parking south of Grange road
School transport
Park n ride
traffic could be diverted to "town only"
Only buses to turn right at Bell Lane
Encourage a cafe style area with planting greenery
Ticked car parking
Congestion being caused by cars going in and out of Waitrose car park
Only buses /taxis allowed up the high street
Safe bike parking
Bus station were to be sited in the proposed new car park this would probably enhance bus operation
Tesco contribute
Damaging the flood plain
A new entrance to the Luxford Field car park from western side reducing the number of cars going right to the centre of the town
Congestion made worse by pedestrian crossing at Tesco and Framfield road traffic lights
A car park near the new doctors surgery or to the side of the fire station or on the Industrial estate is necessary
Nearby villages do not have a formal bus service
Tesco should be re-located to Maresfield Industrial Park
Traffic light phasing and filter lanes
A local bus service serving the southern estates
Satellite centres enabling people to avoid the main town
Use Belmont Road and link to Library Way with Civic Approach to Library Way as service access
Lack of synchronised traffic lights
Try and make the high street a pedestrian area as much as possible
Purchase and demolish the property to improve Church Street

A mini-roundabout at the junction with Waitrose car park. Church Street - a 20 mile speed limit would help safety
Church Street/High Street junction, especially during school hours and 3:15pm to 3:30pm
Open a 1 way system
Browns lane needs speed bumps
Build a flood alleviation tunnel alongside Bell Farm Lane discharging to River Uck beyond the by-pass
Close the exit from Hempstead Lane between the Cinque Ports entrance and the High Street
Limit time for delivery vans - perhaps 9:30am to 12:00 noon
Working with schools
A forum with locals
A slip road on the Uckfield by-pass to left traffic on and off at the flyover between Uckfield and Shortbridge, then upgrade the road to Rocks Park and Church Street
30moph limit on Church street- with a 7 tonne weight restriction
Loading bays in the High Street
Stop parking on the pavements
Open a link between Rocks Park Estate and the Link Road (e.g. by the lower end of Streatfield Road)
Stop the waste disposal tankers going to the sewage works via the town centre
A survey could be carried out, to find out how many people would be likely to use the bus, if it ran more often.
The junctions need yellow boxes
Manor Oak onto the High Street at peak times either a filter lane or a no right turn would improve this
The pavement outside The Station pub is dangerously narrow
Dedicated cycle route along the river Uck from Buxted to Uckfield
Reducing street clutter
Sponsor road surfacing by allowing them to have their name displayed on the road surface
A route to the bypass from the north which doesn't involve going through town
Cameras to catch traffic light jumpers
The bollards should be removed from between West Park and Rocks Park thus creating a through-route from the north of the town to the by-pass

# APPENDIX C – CONSULTATION OPTION DRAWINGS