



## Local Transport Plan 2011-2026

### Appendix F

# Consultation comments and responses



<b>Analysis of comments received during consultation on East Sussex draft Local Transport Plan 3</b>		
<b>Comments from all respondents are entered under 5 headings:</b>		
	Vision	
	Transport objectives	
	Strategy	
	Priority Areas	
	Any other comments	
<b>They have then been coded according to the following themes:</b>		
1	Generally positive	
2	Generally negative	
3	Wants greater emphasis on rural issues and/ or place outside priority areas	
4	Supports / wants greater emphasis on environmental issues	
5	Supports / wants greater emphasis on bus services	
6	Supports / wants greater emphasis on cycle facilities	
7	Supports / wants greater emphasis on pedestrian facilities	
8	Supports / wants greater emphasis on rail	
9	Supports / wants greater emphasis on car travel (e.g. reduce congestion)	
10	Supports / wants greater emphasis on safety (e.g. 20mph safety zones)	
11	Supports / wants greater emphasis on travel planning	
12	Better integration of modes	
13	Pro sustainability and/or anti road improvements	
14	Wants clearer policy on SDNP	
15	Specific points	
16	Concern re implementation / funding / delivery	
17	Information rather than comment on LTP3	
18	Document too long or unclear	

<b>Vision</b>			
<b>Code</b>	<b>If you do not support our vision why is this?</b>	<b>ESCC response</b>	
4	I feel east sussex is losing its rural identity and becoming more like West Sussex. The damage done by development is irreversible and more thought should be given to the long term effects we are having on our environment.	LTP3 has been developed with a great awareness of the need to conserve and protect the environment. This is evidenced in the vision and the objectives and in the preferred strategy. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) developed in conjunction with LTP3 has guided the work. Development will be considered through the Local Development Frameworks and their requirement to consider the the environment. The final strategy has been amended to give greater clarity on our approach to rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	
18	load of old waffle	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	
2 4	The vision is too generic and indefinate to help direct the rest of the LTP. Support the reference to high quality environment, but this could also reflect the fact that 2/3rds of the area is AONB / National Park and that this may influence how transport is delivered.	We feel it is important to state in the vision the kind of place that well planned transport investment can help East Sussex to become. LTP3 recognises that protecting the environment is important to maintain the character of the county and that this is important to residents. Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended
18	However, how you propose to achieve this aim is difficult to ascertain since the documents are inaccessible to the everyday person.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
15	"...Better access to jobs, leisure and services...." people should be able to easily access areas for leisure (exercise, sporting venues etc)	Agreed. The document has been amended to include reference to access to leisure as well as other services.	Document amended
1 3	Whilst we support the vision we have reservations about the application and interpretation of the data upon which the Strategy and Vision are based. As a parish council attempting to find solutions to local transport problems we find the breadth of the contents of LTP3 to be too extensive.	The LTP is a high level, countywide strategy. However transport issues contribute to a number of agendas at local and county wide level and therefore cannot be seen in a vacuum. The context and people's changing expectations are all relevant when seeking the most effective solutions to transport problems. This is reflected in the chapter/background paper on wider context and also in the chapter/background paper on local issues. However the document has been amended to give greater clarity on how local people and bodies can contribute to addressing the issues in their area.	Document amended

1 16	<p>para 2.4 The vision for LTP3 - Support the vision but would like further clarity on what will be achieved by 2026. LTP should provide a clear context to explain what will be achieved by 2026 or provide a clear position on modal shift. The vision should give shape and direction to the LTP. Given that LTP3 is delivering an integrated transport system for East Sussex, it should reflect this localised context.</p> <p>Further clarity is sought on what will be achieved by 2026. A clear define position on modal shift is also sought.</p>	<p>The strategy sets the direction over 15 years and will guide investment into the relative priorities for the county. The objectives of the plan and the preferred strategy support the vision and set the direction of travel in terms of where we want to be in 2026. However the document has been amended to give greater clarity on how local people and bodies can contribute to addressing the issues in their area.</p> <p>The objectives include encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport and in particular encouraging and enabling increased physically active travel (walking and cycling) to help reduce car dependency .</p>	Document amended
1	<p>The County's objectives in particular to 'reduce congestion and improve the efficiency of the transport network', and 'reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured in road crashes' are aligned with our own objectives with regard to the SRN and can therefore be supported.</p>	Noted.	
1	<p>The objectives of improving connectivity of communities to facilitate economic and spatial growth; reducing pollution; increasing resilience to climate change; protecting and enhancing the environment; improving road safety; improving health; reducing congestion etc are all important to quality of life and economic opportunities in the county and should be supported.</p>	Noted.	
1 11	<p>It would be a fool who disagreed with the visions and objectives of the LTP3 all are worthy aspirations. The Plan identifies most of the Transport challenges together with how it affects individuals and the plan has to be welcomed. Most of it states the blindingly obvious and mixes it with common sense. What I would like to lay out here are practical proposals as to how we can achieve the plan and highlight points which I think may not have been given full consideration.</p>	Noted.	
16 9	<p>I am not sure about the vision, but the detailed documents are very much along the same lines as the previous ones, contain huge amounts that ESCC can or has done nothing about and much of it amounts to what the Local Government Secretary Eric Pickles and Transport Secretary Philip Hammond called "the war on the motorist". See <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/newsroom/1809347">http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/newsroom/1809347</a></p>	<p>The strategy encourages greater use of sustainable modes of transport but also aims to manage and maintain the road network, reduce congestion and make improvements where possible.</p>	





1	We agree with and support the strategic vision, broad objectives and transport-specific objectives outlined in LTP3. In particular, we are pleased to endorse the need to work with the County Council to enable the delivery of the priorities of the Sustainable Community Strategy, our emerging Local Development Framework and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan. However, we hope that the following detailed comments on LTP3 will be taken into account in finalising the document, which we consider will provide a clearer indication of how the vision and specific objectives will be delivered in the Wealden area.	Noted.	
1	In responding to the previous consultation a year ago we endorsed the Plan's draft objectives and particularly those relating to quality of life, the reduction of congestion, improving health, climate change, safety and social inclusion. We said we would look to the LTP to promote the more sustainable forms of transport.	Noted.	
14 4	Key objectives include "improving economic competitiveness and growth" and "tackling climate change". These need to be followed through. Delivering "green transport" options within the Park will reduce carbon footprint while assisting rural economies – the presence of the national park will contribute to economic wellbeing, not hinder it! Moreover, it is important not to overlook the environmental impact on rural areas of economic activity elsewhere – for example, regeneration in Newhaven will prompt increased traffic levels on the C9 through the Ouse Valley, requiring appropriate mitigation measures to protect rural communities and vulnerable road users. Development contributions should be applied to these knock-on implications as well as to more direct effects.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park. The impact of the types of measures included in the strategy have been assessed through the Strategic Environmental Assessment which was carried out as the plan developed and influenced the draft strategy. Other land use plans and proposals pay regard to the requirements of sustainable development and the relevant guidance and duties regarding the environment.	Document amended
2 15	We believe Central Government guidance shows a user hierarchy which should mean that pedestrians, cyclists and public transport are given priority in local transport plans. We do not see this priority reflected in the draft consultation.	The preferred strategy is to provide transport solutions that support and encourage sustainable growth. This will be achieved by a combination of measures to make the possibility of travelling by foot, bicycle or public transport more attractive, while recognising that they are not a practical alternative for all journeys.	

14	<p>Given that the key objectives identified by you are 'improving economic competitiveness &amp; growth' &amp; 'tackling climate change' it is regrettable that the creation of the South Downs National Park &amp; the implications for the region do not seem to have been fully thought out &amp; explored. The SDNP could strongly deliver on both your aspirations by delivering a network of green transport options ...good public transport, improved cycling &amp; walking networks at key spots throughout the Park. The opportunities for the development of the tourist trade &amp; welcome knock on economic effect for rural communities needs to be explored.</p>	<p>The key objectives, reflecting local priorities, are to improve economic competitiveness and growth and improve safety, health and security while still working towards tackling climate change, improving social inclusion and quality of life.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.</p>	Document amended
1	<p>Thank you for consulting SEEDA. We note the broad aims/objectives and Vision of the Plan and support them.</p>	Noted.	

<b>Transport specific objectives</b>			
<b>Code</b>	<b>If you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the above objectives, why is this?</b>	<b>ESCC response</b>	
1	There are 8 healthy, environmentally friendly aspirations that improve quality of life for everyone yet the last two always seem to take priority. The answer to safe, health improving, sustainable transport policy is not to build bigger faster roads but to encourage alternative transport choices.	Maintenance of the existing road network and other infrastructure is a statutory duty however it is balanced by the commitment in the preferred strategy to encourage and provide alternative transport choices. The option which emphasised road investment above all else was rejected because overall it did not contribute as well to the objectives of LTP3 compared to the preferred "sustainable growth" option which seeks a balance between growing the economy and improving safety and sustainability. A number of strategic transport improvements have been identified though these would need to be funded at national rather than local level and any other major infrastructure improvements would be dependent on development contributions.	
10	traffic congestion encourages people to think of alternative methods of transport and it slows drivers down. a lot of accidents are speed related if you reduce congestion you may well encourage more drivers to travel at speed	Reducing congestion has many benefits: the individual driver and business gain from reliable journey times, if traffic moves smoothly carbon emissions can be reduced and air quality improved. Reduced congestion does not automatically mean higher overall speeds.	
15	climate change not an issue for local action	Local action to tackle climate change will be effective if we work together as a community, alongside the actions being taken at national and international levels. By making changes to their lifestyles, including their travel habits, individuals can help to tackle climate change. Around two out of three trips we make are less than 5 miles in length, many of which could be easily cycled, walked or taken by public transport.	
9	It depends what you mean by "road safety" - if it's just more signs and traffic islands it won't really help, and could make congestion etc worse.	The road safety strategy identifies that engineering interventions are only one element to be taken forward as well as enforcement and education measures. It is recognised that there may be tensions between road safety measures and increased congestion and the LTP3 strategy aims to strike the right balance.	
6	Particularly want to see cycle networks improved ie seafront	LTP3 sets the framework for work to proceed with partner authorities to enable the facilities and regulations for seafront cycling to be improved. The strategy for Bexhill and Hastings, for Eastbourne and South Wealden, and Newhaven all refer to the aim of developing cycle routes along seafronts and linking coastal communities.	

9	Improved access to jobs will add the economic recovery. Improving efficiencies in the maintenance and management of the network should help avoid unexpected journey delays because emergency works would be reduced. Reducing congestion and ensuring the efficiency of the transport network would mean that journey times would be more predictable, and reduce the frustration of drivers and passengers leading to happier people at their destination.	This comment agrees with the LTP3 objectives.	
1	I don't disagree with the survey, apart from the simple fact that it is almost impossible to disagree with such vague and generically biased questions, which leads the reader to "strongly agree" with all of it content. A somewhat pointless exercise, which as a result has no strategic value.	The survey was designed using best practice to give everyone the opportunity to agree or disagree with the various elements of the plan. The objective of the consultation was to ensure that the plan is one that is acceptable to the residents of East Sussex and therefore as well as asking the questions, comment boxes were provided for anyone who wanted to make further points or expand on their answers.	
16	Some of these objectives are impossible without continuous funding - it would be best to focus on the objectives that can be obtained and a tangible result achieved.	The LTP strategy will guide investment over a period of 15 years. It is recognised that there are many uncertainties about levels of funding but by adhering to the preferred strategy and the objectives we wish to achieve, we can make progress in the right direction.	
13	Aiming to reduce congestion etc will simply encourage people to use cars even more.	Aiming to reduce congestion is balanced by the larger part of the strategy which seeks to encourage travel by more sustainable modes and by making best use of the network. There are many reasons why people choose to travel by other modes than the car including choosing healthier options.	
13	Economic and spatial growth is not compatible with dealing seriously with climate change or sustainability	These two objectives are not mutually exclusive and they reflect the two priorities of the coalition government which are highlighted in the recently published Transport White Paper.	
2 9	congestion removing measures along A259 botched up. Don't trust ESCC to get future projects right, so please leave alone. Thanks	The A259 bus priority measures have been successful in achieving improvements in bus reliability between Newhaven and Brighton and has seen a significant increase in the frequency of services and in the number of people using them.	
5 8	Transport from Newhaven to Brighton and back is inadequate after 11pm and makes it impossible for young unemployed people in Newhaven to work in the catering and hospitality industry in Brighton where there is work readily available as there is no bus between midnight and 2am and night buses take hours to get back. Rail and bus services should be improved in order to give local youth a fair chance of employment.	We will continue to work with the bus and train operators and to lobby for improved services. There are night buses on this route but we will also raise the issue with the train operator to see if there is any scope for increased provision of such a service.	

13	With regard to road 'improvements', these can be counter-productive by encouraging increased road usage.	Targeted road improvements have a number of benefits in terms of safety and access to jobs and help deliver economic regeneration. The strategy attempts to balance this with an emphasis on sustainable modes of travel.	
13 6 7	I am not in favour of expanding the road transport network. I would suggest that network which promote walking and cycling would be beneficial.	Noted.	
5 8	Trains / buses should be able to cope with snow!	Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies are working to minimise disruption from severe weather events and the Secretary of State for Transport has asked Network Rail to examine the case for replacing the third rail in southern England with alternative systems that are more resilient to severe winter weather. Access to bus depots and bus routes are being incorporated in the winter gritting schedules.	
1	We support the improvement of strategic and local connectivity of communities, but only where this is decoupled from facilitating economic and spatial growth.	The high level objectives apply to the whole county however local connectivity and accessibility is reflected in the preferred strategy. Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
9	I am assuming here that the main method used to achieve this will be lower road speed limits. My personal view is that some are already too low. (Obviously overall I would like to see less casualties etc)	There is a programme of reviewing speed limits on A and B class roads and in villages where the speed limit is greater than 40mph, however this is not the only measure aimed at reducing the number of casualties on the county's roads. Further detail is contained in the Road Safety Strategy which promotes a combination of engineering, enforcement and education measures to tackle road casualties.	
1	The Society recognise that this document sets the strategic objectives that ESCC intend following on transport issues in the next 15 years and accepts the high level objectives that have been set. It notes that most of the general issues that it put forward on 30 November 2009 are mentioned in some way and is content with the specific transport objectives put forward although it would be helpful if the word transport were defined to include use of public rights of way and cycling.	Noted. Both rights of way and cycling are mentioned at various points in the strategy and we feel it is clear that these are considered as part of transport. The approach to both issues are outlined in LTP3 chapter 4 and maintenance of rights of way is listed as a statutory duty.	
1	It is good to see in National Goals that the new Coalition Government has indicated that the economy and climate change are the highest priorities, though due regard also needs to be paid to the other three goals.	Noted.	

1 8	<p>“Tackling climate change” is a highly laudable aim and has the support of URLPC – but it will require action by the ESCC that goes beyond merely “improving” services to attain a desirable change to the County’s carbon footprint. Specifically, the promotion of electrification, improved services through re-doubling, and future line extensions would be worthy environmental aspirations for ESCC to champion for the County’s residents.</p>	<p>Transport is just one element in the Climate Change Strategy for East Sussex and other bodies and individuals are working towards the same aim in many different sectors.</p> <p>The County Council has actively promoted electrification of the lines in East Sussex which are not currently electrified - the Uckfield line (to Hurst Green) and between Ashford and Hastings. These schemes will be promoted by the County Council at all appropriate opportunities. The document has been amended to include reference to lobbying for dual tracking parts of the Uckfield line. The strategy supports the reinstatement of the Lewes - Uckfield line.</p>	Document amended
8	<p>Page 4, Specific Transport Objectives 10 – it seems that ESCC has declared action to reduce congestion but this relates only to road transport – and then refers only to “improving the efficiency of the transport network”. Encouraging people away from cars and onto better/more rail services will also “reduce congestion”. Specifically (and in the short term) it would be desirable for ESCC to be at the fore in requesting an increase in the available rolling stock on crowded peak hours services on the Uckfield line. A more medium term aspiration would be for the ESCC to press for re-doubling of the track to allow a more intensive, efficient and reliable service to be operated. In the opinion of the URLPC it would seem logical that an inevitable longer term aspiration would be the reinstatement of the rail lines between Lewes and Uckfield and Tunbridge Wells and Eridge.</p>	<p>One of the ways by which the County Council aims to reduce congestion is by encouraging more people to use sustainable transport, including rail. We have lobbied for additional rolling stock in the past and will continue to do so at all appropriate opportunities. We will request that in the short term, consideration be given to providing additional rolling stock on the Uckfield line and on the East Coastway (Ashford-Hastings) rail service. It may be that electrification of other routes will free up diesel units which can be used on these lines.</p> <p>LTP3 states the County Council’s continuing support for the reinstatement and electrification of the Lewes Uckfield line in its strategy for the Uckfield area and also in its strategy for rail.</p>	Document amended
3	<p>The LDF process does very little to support the local economy in our market town . I do understand that Uckfield/Hailsham/Polegate are given strategic priority and agree with those conclusions but Crowborough has no strategic emphasis and there is little (if any) action by any one local authority to sustain what we currently have.</p>	<p>While we have identified four priority areas it does not preclude schemes coming forward from other areas of the county. Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.</p>	Document amended
2	<p>I disagree with most of these because of the way they are phrased</p>	<p>Noted. The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.</p>	Document amended
6	<p>Encouraging cycling meets ALL the high level AND specific transport objectives for the LTP3. It may be worth changing 10. below to “reduce congestion by encouraging other modes of transport use”</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	Document amended

15	<p><b>REDUCE THE NEED FOR TRAVEL:</b></p> <p>This is mentioned in the preamble to the Vision but seems to have dropped off the main list of Visions and Objectives. Transport accounts for a significant proportion of CO2 emissions and the UK commitments to reduce CO2 mean that this reduction has to be an important objective of the transport strategy for all types of vehicles fuelled by oil. It would also be appropriate for the strategy to address a future where the need to travel will be reducing anyway. The daily commute to work will be seen as wasteful in energy and human resources as the nature of work and electronic communications improve. Distribution of goods – especially food stuffs may also change as local sourcing and consumption patterns change and the costs of transport increase.</p>	<p>Reducing carbon emissions is one of the key priority objectives of the strategy. Included in the strategy is our commitment to work with other bodies to look at non transport measures including the location of development and services in terms of reducing the need to travel. We also support the roll out of faster broadband in the county and any other measures which reduce the need to travel and as a consequence reduce emissions.</p>	
1	<p>The Sussex Community Rail Partnership (SCRIP) welcomes the general thrust and direction of the draft LTP3. It agrees with the vision and objectives.</p>	<p>Noted. A transport specific objective has been included to contribute to the protection and enhancement of the local and natural built environment.</p>	
1 15	<p>The objective – to improve quality of life (Para 2.6) is welcomed, however reference to taking opportunities to develop transport measures that actively enhance the natural and historic environment, and improve our quality of life, would bring the objective in line with DASTS goals on the need to promote a healthy environment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
10	<p>VCS would like to see:</p> <p>Objective 1. Improving safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reducing and enforcing speed limits for child safety and other pedestrian safety</li> <li>- There need to be safe, level, well repaired pavements for all</li> <li>- Promoting the safer routes to school project</li> <li>- Cycle paths not shared with pedestrians</li> </ul>	<p>These issues are all addressed in the preferred strategy.</p>	
5	<p>VCS would like to see:</p> <p>Objective 2. Improving Travel Choices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote wider the existing on-line resources</li> <li>- More information on community transport for the individuals</li> </ul>	<p>These issues are all addressed in the preferred strategy.</p>	
5 15	<p>VCS would like to see:</p> <p>Objective 3. Improving Accessibility and Inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plan for access to public transport for people in sheltered accommodation</li> <li>- Smaller buses but more often and on more routes</li> <li>- More information on transport/traveller rights</li> <li>- Timetable reading on the 'national curriculum'</li> </ul>	<p>Where Community Transport schemes exist they are open to people living in their own homes or in sheltered accomodation as long as they meet the eligibility criteria. We are willing to work with the Adult Social Care department to explore the needs of people in sheltered accomodation.</p> <p>We understand that timetable reading is often covered in the Citizenship element of the curriculum. Other points noted.</p>	

13 6	<p>VCS would like to see: Objective 4. Reducing congestion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cross department and cross sector working on promoting sustainable tourism - local jobs to reduce travelling; business hubs and home working (also Objective 7. Improve Economy)</li> <li>- Orbital rail - Gatwick -Ashford to reduce cars (also Objective 6. – Tackle Climate Change)</li> <li>- Integrated bus/rail/bike interchange, e.g. in Lewes</li> <li>- Lighter later campaign - safety for bicycles</li> <li>- Off road cycle routes</li> <li>- Cycling hire schemes with baby carriers, with luggage racks etc., private and/or public</li> </ul>	<p>All points noted. We will continue to work with colleagues and other partners to promote sustainable tourism in East Sussex. We understand that Kent County Council have lobbied the rail industry for the Gatwick - Ashford link and it may be addressed in future Rail Utilisation Strategies.</p>	
13 12	<p>VCS would like to see: Objective 6. Tackling Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Taxing car users</li> <li>- Use a small proportion of the roads budget in favour of other road users - cyclists and pedestrians</li> <li>- Increasing cycle facilities</li> <li>- Improved publicity of cycle lanes (Also Objective 8. Enhancing Quality of Life)</li> <li>- Better education of road users to learn cycle safety</li> <li>- More planning obligations to supply cycle and walking routes – connectivity (Also Objective 8. Enhancing Quality of Life)</li> <li>- Educate and encourage people not to use their cars, then enforce</li> <li>- Enthuse employers to make arrangements for cyclists</li> <li>- Lower cost pedestrian crossing model to encourage more walking</li> <li>- Cycle paths that actually go to places</li> <li>- Cycles on trains. Station cycle hire. Cycle provision. Bikes to be left at station. Linking cycle ways to stations.</li> </ul>	<p>All points are noted. Car users already pay tax on fuel. There is no 'roads budget' however maintenance of the road network does benefit all road users including pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers. The preferred strategy does include our aim to improve facilities for cyclists, Bikeability training for children will continue funded through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund and our approach to travel planning is set out in the strategy section of the document.</p>	
15	<p>There is a need for a transport policy regarding sport and young people. Here in Herstmonceux, football club members need to be taken to all weather pitches for coaching. There is a need for developers to contribute to the problems they are creating. That is to say on the road network.</p>	<p>The strategy encourages the promotion of car sharing and the use of public or community transport where available. Developer contributions are requested as part of our response to planning applications to Borough and District Councils to mitigate the impact of development on transport networks.</p>	
6 7	<p>There needs to be more emphasis on sustainable transport, in particular more emphasis on walking and cycling promotion and a programme of 20mph zones which would facilitate this.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy is designed to support sustainable growth and the use of sustainable forms of transport. There is currently no policy to introduce default 20mph speed limits but the new Road Safety Strategy will give greater clarity about the use of 20mph zones.</p>	

<b>Strategy</b>			
<b>Code</b>	<b>If you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the above statements, why is this?</b>	<b>ESCC response</b>	
1	In general terms the strategy seems appropriate but this question is rather vague.	The survey was designed using best practice to give everyone the opportunity to agree or disagree with the various elements of the plan. The objective of the consultation was to ensure that the plan is one that is acceptable to the residents of East Sussex and therefore as well as asking the questions, comment boxes were provided for anyone who wanted to make further points or expand on their answers.	
8	I was disappointed that the reinstatement of the Lewes to Uckfield rail link was not given a higher priority. Reinstatement of this link is a good first stage. Electrification of the line would provide an opportunity to form an alternative route to relieve congestion on the Brighton main line.	LTP3 states the County Council's continuing support for the reinstatement and electrification of the Lewes Uckfield line in its strategy for the Uckfield area and also in its strategy for rail. There are a number of key aspirations for rail improvements in East Sussex which would benefit different communities in different ways.	
16	The Strategy is both obvious and common sense, eg: how can anyone disagree that a good transport plan should reduce the KSI incidents? Time and money would be better spent actually building what we need not creating another strategy stating the obvious!	There is a statutory requirement to develop LTP3 which comprises a strategy and an implementation plan. The strategy sets out what we would like to achieve and the priorities for investment which will guide decisions over the next 15 years and ensure that the public and other stakeholders are aware of the reasons for decisions.	
2	It's not right for the economic growth of the County - and that's what the government push is at the moment, and what the priority of the county should be.	Supporting sustainable economic growth is the major priority of the Local Transport Strategy. This aligns with the priority of creating growth and cutting carbon as set out in the government white paper.	
15	A link to ch 5 would be useful here for those with little time.	The Executive Summary and the summary sections at the beginning of each chapter were designed to give an overview of the strategy. The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise..	Document amended
18	It is far too long and repetitive. The same thing could have been said in half the words.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	Some of the wording in the aims is very difficult to understand - too much jargon, e.g. Improve strategic and local connectivity of communities to facilitate economic and spatial growth through the Local Development Framework process	The document has been amended to make it more concise and where possible use less jargon.	Document amended

2	Seems to me the statement is unspecific and a lot of hot air. Impossible to disagree with since all the sentiments are virtuous but not enough detail given for us to see what implementing it will involve. Questions are clearly designed to get the answers you want.	The survey was designed using best practice to give everyone the opportunity to agree or disagree with the various elements of the plan. The objective of the consultation was to ensure that the plan is one that is acceptable to the residents of East Sussex and therefore as well as asking the questions, comment boxes were provided for anyone who wanted to make further points or expand on their answers. The priorities for all areas of the county are set out in chapter 4 of the LTP3 strategy. Greater detail on schemes and initiatives will be included in each year's Implementation Plan.	
18	It is written by, and evidently for, people who are used to reading such documents.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	the strategy is difficult to follow and it is absolutely clear that funds will be used to benefit walking and cycling and public transport.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	Unable to form an opinion due to inaccessible information for the everyday person.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	Haven't read strategy fully - document too large	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	Large chapter, not clear	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
2	As a rural parish council we find the overall strategy and approach of LTP3 to be, at least in part, inappropriate for our local transport needs. In our opinion the Strategy is too focused on economic development.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority regeneration and development areas. The two key priorities are to reduce carbon emissions and to support economic competitiveness and growth in the county.	Document amended
3	We find the consideration of rural transport issues in LTP3 to be minimal, to a degree that is unacceptable. Community transport is not the solution as it will not function without funding and volunteers to run it.	Further consideration has been given to the issues of transport in rural areas.	Document amended
15	We believe that transport solutions for rural areas should be decoupled from the highlevel LTP3 objectives viz. economy and climate change.	Further consideration has been given to the issues of transport in rural areas.	Document amended
3	Require amplification of the use of ASLA areas to define issues for rural areas and more detail re 'corridors of movement'.	Further consideration has been given to the issues of transport in rural areas.	Document amended
18	It isn't clear. Some parts are repeated. In some ways it covers everything, in some it promises little. Some sections very vague!	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended

14	<p>ESCC need to recognise that Lewes will be a gateway town to the eastern part of the South Downs and encourage a better public transport interchange in the town than exists at present. In addition the quality of roads such as Station Street need to be enhanced to provide a better visitor experience whilst more generally other aspects of the public realm, such as pavements, need to be brought up to a better standard for a town where visitor numbers are likely to increase.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
15	<p>para 5.3 Support the potential positive impact of Broadband in the local economy. Consideration should be given to how such initiatives are implemented and how LTP3 can influence this process. A commitment should be made to incorporate high-speed broadband cabling in new road schemes and other major improvement works.</p>	<p>We support the roll out of faster broadband across the county and are working with the appropriate partners to discuss ways of doing it with least disruption to residents and travellers.</p>	
16	<p>Strategy Priorities Support the Strategy Priorities but clarity is sought on how this will be achieved in light of the economic spending cuts. LTP3 acknowledges that funding will limit the ability of the strategy to progress. However there is no alternative strategy direction if key strategies are not implemented. Stronger guidance is required in light of recent spending cuts. LTP3 should be strategy-led rather than infrastructure-led especially in the SPA areas which LTP3 has identified for special attention. Amend the strategy to reflect this.</p>	<p>The draft strategy is, unlike previous plans, a long term strategy covering the next 15 years and acknowledges that clarity could not be given on investment levels until both government and local decisions had been made. We have identified that for the strategy to be successful, we need to prioritise our investment in the four priority areas for regeneration and development. The strategy is led by the priorities set out by the administration, highway maintenance, road safety, passenger and community transport and planning infrastructure.</p>	
5	<p>Passenger Transport and Community Transport Para 5.9 – para 5.11 Public Transport plays a key role in rural communities especially for people who do not have access to cars. Increasing commercial bus patronage should be encouraged as well as Community Transport provision. RDC welcome the opportunity to work with ESCC to realise the objectives. RDC welcome participation in this process.</p>	<p>Noted. The development of Quality Bus Partnerships and corridors in the Bexhill area could achieve similar increases in commercial patronage as have been achieved in the Hastings area. This has been included in the strategy for the Bexhill and Hastings area.</p>	
15	<p>Transport Asset management para 5.15 - para 5.24 Supports ESCC's commitment to make the best use of its resources but would welcome participation in the process to ensure maintenance and improvements priorities are not to the detriment of economic competitiveness or social cohesion. Clarity is sought on how ESCC intends to identify maintenance priorities. RDC welcome inclusion on this process.</p>	<p>Maintenance priorities are identified according to the processes and criteria set out in the Transport Asset Management Plan. All improvement interventions will be assessed through the Scheme Prioritisation Framework which weights economic growth and competitiveness highly and includes consideration of social cohesion through issues of safety, accessibility and connectivity of local communities.</p>	

10	<p>Road Safety and Transport Education para 5.25</p> <p>In 2008, there were 2,187 casualties on the County's road network, with Rother recording 428 road casualties. In terms of road safety, indicators demonstrate Rother is significantly worse than the regional and national average. RDC welcome LTP3 commitment on the delivery of a range of transport education/road safety training programmes.</p> <p>Commitment should be made to the development of road safety initiative with funding ring-fenced to ensure an effective programme in school, colleges and vulnerable communities.</p>	<p>A new Road Safety Strategy is being developed to give greater clarity on the methods that will be used to achieve the objectives of the LTP and reduce casualty figures. There will be funding allocated to deal with local accident crash sites. All schemes will be assessed through the Scheme Prioritisation Framework which gives due weight to safety as an important criteria.</p>	
13	<p>Planning and Provision of Infrastructure: Spatial Context</p> <p>The focus for good planning continues to be focused on sustainable development, therefore whatever the level of development requirements, the key urban areas of Bexhill and Hastings will continue to play the principal roles of service and business. Transport infrastructure is a pivotal part of sustainable growth.</p> <p>LTP3 should reflect the local context. RDC would welcome participation in the process.</p>	<p>The priority areas in the strategy are designed to reflect the areas where regeneration or major sustainable development is proposed and therefore where improvements to the transport infrastructure will be needed to support that.</p> <p>As part of the modelling of potential housing development in the Bexhill/Hastings area we have worked with Hastings and Rother Councils to identify where the existing transport network will suffer stress and the impact of different mitigating measures including those aimed at improving walking, cycling and public transport use.</p>	
15	<p>LTP3 has identified three strategy options to govern and guide the remainder of any available transport investment in planning and providing infrastructure. RDC consider there was a lack of consultation and transparency on this process with stakeholders and partners. An alternative would be to have a Regeneration Option would have contributed to High Level LTP3 objectives.</p> <p>RDC welcome further consultation on the development and refinement of the strategy options.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy option of sustainable growth and the priority areas for infrastructure investment, support regeneration as well as development. There have been a number of opportunities for the local Borough and District Councils to be involved in this process including through the continuous involvement of the East Sussex Strategic Partnership, the Planning Liaison Group and invitations to feed in their concerns and suggestions at pertinent points in the LTP3 development process.</p>	
5	<p>Passenger Transport and Community Transport</p> <p>We would support measures that improve the quality of public transport in the County. We are encouraged by the principal objectives of the proposed new Bus Strategy which seeks to promote and improve existing bus services which could assist in dampening the demand for private vehicle trips.</p>	Noted	
10	<p>Road Safety</p> <p>We support measures such as Transport Education which can impact road safety on all roads including the SRN and will continue our work with you through the Casualty Reduction Steering Group.</p>	Noted	

15	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Supporting Strategies</p> <p>We would welcome consultation on the relevant 'daughter' strategy documents where they could affect the SRN as and when they are to be reviewed. In particular, strategies relating to parking, walking, cycling, public transport and behaviour change can have a positive impact on the demand for single-occupancy vehicles which in turn could dampen the stress on the SRN.</p>	<p>Noted. The essential elements of all modal and intervention based approaches have been incorporated into LTP3. We will continue to include the Highways Agency in any consultations on future reviews.</p>	<p>Document amended.</p>
11	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Supporting Strategies</p> <p>We would encourage the County to continue their important role in monitoring the progress of agreed travel plans' targets. We feel that the delivery of the agreed travel plan targets can be influential to the success of a travel plan in the ability to manage the demand for private vehicle trips which can in turn reduce congestion, improve accessibility and address road safety. We are keen to work with the County and respective local authorities to ensure that targets are being met which will benefit the local and strategic highway network over the course of the plan period. We can do this by continuing to promote the importance of effective travel planning at the planning application stage and this will assist with a joined up approach.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
1 13	<p>Strategy Options and Preferred Strategy Options</p> <p>We broadly support the preferred sustainable growth option which would focus on public transport, walking, and cycling improvements and which would dampen demand for private vehicle trips.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
15	<p>Broadband</p> <p>The Strategy does mention encouraging the greater use of and faster access to Broadband as a non- transport intervention - given the much reduced programme of investment in strategic transport infrastructure, this policy direction should be fleshed out and given greater prominence in the LTP3.</p>	<p>More detail on the strategy of rolling out faster broadband connections will be given as part of the ESCC Economic Development Strategy and the work of the Local Enterprise Partnership.</p>	
15	<p>Developer contributions</p> <p>The Strategy does not mention by name the Local Sustainable Accessibility Contributions which the County Council seeks as developer contributions. Research has shown these contributions amounted to £1.25m across the county in 2007/08. It would be helpful if the LTP3 acknowledged the role of these contributions in achieving the aims of transport planning across the County and included a breakdown of how the funding has been obtained and spent across the County along with a commitment that this funding will be directed to areas of greatest need.</p>	<p>Developer contributions are requested in our response to planning applications received by the Borough and District Councils in order to mitigate the impact of development on the transport network and cannot be invested according to need but only in the vicinity of the sites from which they were secured.</p>	

1	<p>The Strategy identifies 3 main options a) Infrastructure - economic competitiveness and growth, b) changing travel behaviour - tackling climate change and c) sustainable growth - a combination of both a) and b). These are fairly basic options and not surprisingly, when they are subjected to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), option a) economic competitiveness and growth performs least well overall against SEA objectives which are weighted towards environmental issues such as climate change, biodiversity and landscape and heritage. Option a) was also the option which would require the greatest level of investment Option c) sustainable growth is the preferred option. This option puts greater emphasis on the implementation of infrastructure to support integrated sustainable travel, walking, cycling, public transport and car share rather than focusing on increased traffic growth and improved accessibility through road infrastructure improvement, which was the focus in option a) economic competitiveness and growth. Option c) should be supported.</p>	Noted	
1	<p>WOW what a process having read the three options and the Strategy – Plan – Assessment – Appraisal – Report – Consultation - Etc. I'm very pleased to see that option 3, Sustainable Growth, was the preferred option. This is what we have been waiting for and will be the only way forward in 21st century.</p>	Noted	
5	<p>Leisure – Old and Young In Bexhill specifically we have one of the highest concentration of elderly in Europe. East Sussex has an elderly bias, with nearly 12% of the population aged 75+ compared to around 8% regionally and nationally. East Sussex still ranks highest of all 35 counties in England for the percentage aged 85+ and aged 90+. Most if not all have achieved their primary social needs, ie food, clothing and shelter, catered for. Many go out for social reasons, just to get out and enjoy travel for their own wellbeing. We have already a very good bus service in the TN40 post code area and a well designed drop area in Town. The challenge is to make more aware of it and to use it. The only way as I can see it is to price vehicles off the road either by pay for parking or congestion charging. As we are a rural County distances between conurbations is large compared with cities. If a young person wants to visit Eastbourne and stay out late, after midnight, the public transport network effectively closes down. A subsidised service similar to that given to buses might have to be consi</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The LTPs strategy identifies the need to ensure information is available and up to date on public transport services. Paying for parking is an appropriate demand management tool for encouraging some journeys to be undertaken by bike, on foot or by public transport but needs to be balanced with ensuring it is used to address local issues.</p>	

19	Figure I - LTP3 summary: LTP3 includes supporting strategies which includes "Air Quality" and air quality is highlighted as a key environmental challenge and has been identified as being strongly linked to "Climate Change" (page 59) however no actions were associated with the statement?	Action plans have been developed by the relevant local borough or district authority, in partnership with East Sussex County Council, for each of the Air Quality Management Areas. (Hastings Borough and Lewes District Councils)	
15	Chapter 5, 5.102 - ESCC supports the Air Quality Strategy developed by the Sussex Air Quality Partnership (Sussex-air) however does ESCC have an air quality "daughter" document independent from the Sussex Air Quality Partnership strategy? What is it? Does one need developing?	East Sussex has an Environmental Strategy in which the principles of reducing air pollution, reducing the impact of travel on the environment and reducing greenhouse gas emissions are embedded. This is reflected in the objectives of LTP3.	
11	HUB supports the development of Travel to Work plans and School Travel Plans and wants to see more work done to encourage employers, educational establishments and supermarkets to promote cycling and provide improved facilities for cyclists.	Noted	
6	HUB supports the generally positive statements about the action needed to make cycling safer by road improvements and new on and off road cycle ways. The comments about training and safety information for cyclists and cycle awareness raising and enforcement directed at other road users are also welcomed.	Noted	
6	HUB supports the need for a requirement for proper cycling audits of all new road and junction schemes and all major residential and business developments and calls for cycling facilities and improvement work to be included in planning approval conditions.	Noted. Cycle audits are completed for all road improvement and safety schemes and requirements for cycling facilities are requested to be included in planning conditions where appropriate.	
10	HUB also wants to see more audit work and remedial action for dangerous junctions and sections of road and for the greater use of 20 mph zones and other traffic calming measures.	A new Road Safety Strategy is being developed which will give greater clarity about the use of 20mph zones and traffic calming schemes.	
6	In particular, HUB wants local authorities to take the lead in encouraging residents to take up utility and recreational cycling and their employees to consider the option of cycling to work.	East Sussex County Council promotes cycling among employees and local employers through activities such as Cycle to Work Week and by providing secure cycle storage and other facilities (showers, lockers etc.).	
13	HUB calls for a serious commitment to the local implementation of the National Car Free Day.	We have previously had involvement with car free day both in promoting it among ESCC staff and working on specific initiatives in various towns with our partners in the county. Where funding levels allow, we will continue to engage in this work.	
12	HUB supports the case for better integration of cycling and public transport and believes that pressure should be put on railway companies to make much better provision for cycle on trains, including at commuter times of travel.	We continue to work with train operating companies and Network Rail to lobby for improvements to cycle provision on trains and at stations.	
6	HUB supports more secure cycle storage provision.	Noted	

6	HUB welcomes more cycling proficiency training and information for all age groups and cycle safety awareness raising campaigns for all road users.	Noted	
10	Great efforts must be taken to improve road safety for all vulnerable road-user groups. In particular, it would be very beneficial to reduce speed limits (to, say, 40mph) on minor roads in East Sussex, as this would encourage more people to cycle because they would feel a lot safer.	A review of speed limits on A and B class roads and in villages where there is a speed limit of 40 mph or greater is being undertaken and where appropriate speed limits are being reduced.	
6	There needs to be far more cycle-parking available in prominent places. This would not only provide the much-needed parking itself, but it would also send out the message that cycling is a mainstream activity and it would encourage people to use their bikes.	Work is continuing with local planning authorities, employers, schools and other agencies to increase the provision of cycle storage. Cycle parking is provided as appropriate as part of transport schemes implemented using LTP funding.	
10	20mph speed limits need to be introduced into towns, to improve road safety, to encourage more people to cycle and to walk and to improve the urban environment. It can be noted that, although great efforts have been made to train children to cycle safely, very few children indeed actually cycle on the roads.	There is currently no policy to introduce default 20mph speed limits but the new Road Safety Strategy will give greater clarity about the use of 20mph zones.	
6	A low-cost initiative to improve the safety of cyclists would be to bring in advance stop lines at all traffic lights. Each set of traffic lights with advance stop lines not only improves cyclists' safety but also serves as a reminder to motorists that cyclists may be about.	Advanced stop lines are implemented where appropriate and where considered safe for all road users.	
12 16	There are no radical proposals. We need better connections to London by Train and Motor Way, also to Europe, maybe hovercraft or further development of the ferry services. Your proposal are very similar to the ones that have been proposed many times previously without actually achieving them.	The need for better strategic connections by both road and rail is acknowledged in the strategy and work will continue to lobby Department for Transport for improvements and also other bodies who can fund and implement them.	
18	I would understand it better if it was written in clear english	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
16	These have been common objectives since 1964. I cannot see any difference that will make the aims come true this time .v. all the past efforts.	Noted.	

16	I can see the strategy is probably right for the County but despair that Crowborough is being neglected as far as the LFD/local economy is concerned. I believe I have contributed to the vast majority of consultations possibly within the last 7/8 years, providing feedback from local businesses and emphasising the need to recognise the opportunities in north wealden to capitalise on and recognise actively support the 3/4k homebased businesses in the immediate rural catchment area. A pointless exercise, as far as I am concerned.	The document has been amended to include greater clarity on our approach to Crowborough and other areas outside the four priority areas for infrastructure investment. The County Council's policy of rolling out faster broadband and the LTP objectives of improving economic competitiveness and growth and improving accessibility to enhance social inclusion are aimed at supporting rural and homebased industries across the county.	Document amended
15	I believe the strategy needs to focus as strongly as possible on supporting economic growth as a priority over public transport.	The preferred strategy is to support sustainable growth which is attempting to ensure that while schemes are taken forward which support or facilitate economic growth they are also encouraging reduced levels of travel and use of more sustainable modes of transport.	
18	The implementation plan is strongly in favour of cars. The whole document is too unwieldy to be clear and understandable.	The Implementation Plan in the draft document was not complete due to uncertainty on the levels of investment that would be available which meant the Integrated Transport and Road Safety improvements were not included. (See paragraphs 6.2 to 6.5) The highway improvement programme was included as this was already agreed and will benefit all road users not just cars. A fuller Implementation Plan will be produced with or shortly after the final LTP3 strategy.  The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	The strategy is overlong and repetitive - would benefit from editing and a more succinct approach	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
18	It is an immensely long suite of documents hard for people outside the planning world to understand, even the summary document is long.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended

<p>4 15</p>	<p>there is no clear strategy to reduce CO2 (and air pollutant) emissions by 3% /annum through "increasing reliability and attractiveness of passenger transport, walking and cycling(page 58 LTP3 consultation draft). Emissions from journeys to work are identified, however there are limited actions/initiatives cited to "reduce" these in LTP3. ESCC needs to lead on low emission initiatives, such as electric vehicle charging, alternative fuel provision (anaerobic digestion - methane (ref: DEFRA Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Framework Document (November 2010) ) for HGV, buses RCV's in ESCC own fleet. TA of planning applications should be more insistant on the provision of EV/low emission parking charges and charging point provision to encourage the up-take of LE vehicles and infrastructure.(ref: Sussex-air Low Emission Strategy draft).</p>	<p>The Sussex Air Quality Partnership is leading on an initiative to develop a package of low emission measures for the county to reduce emissions of air pollution and CO2 by March 2012. The objectives in LTP3 include the commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution from transport and the preferred option of sustainable growth supports the the use of better technology including electric charging points for vehicles. The principal of reducing the impact of travel on the environment is embedded in the Environment Strategy for East Sussex produced by the East Sussex Environment Strategy Group. We will continue to work to implement the measures necessary to achieve the Air Quality Action Plans for Hastings and Lewes.</p> <p>We would welcome the use of low emission refuse collection vehicles by the waste collection authorities and the inclusion of planning conditions encouraging the use of low emission vehicles and electric vehicle charging points.</p>	
<p>18</p>	<p>I think it needs to be presented properly as it is too long and complex. It also needs to be consulted on properly as although I brought this up at a recent HBC area management board it was just dismissed as not important. Where as I think it is vital to ESCC &amp; Hastings to get this right judging by our performance to date</p>	<p>The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise. The consultation was designed to include as many people and organisations as possible including local authorities at all levels in recognition that it is important to all residents and businesses in the county. It ran for 3 months and was drawn to the attention of over 300 organisations and groups as well as being publicised in Your County magazine in March and July 2010. Hastings Borough Council was a key contributor to the consultation.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

3 8	<p>Whilst agreeing with the overall strategy, there seems to be a lack of consideration of rural areas. Also, I consider more emphasis should be given to rail improvements, and more investment to make cycling safer, rather than always putting cars first.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and vilages outside the priority areas.</p> <p>The preferred strategy of sustainable growth supports greater investment in cycling initiatives.</p> <p>The rail section has been reworded emphasising that we want to encourage passengers (and freight) to travel by rail, although we understand that this is not always possible, and that due to the rural nature of the county the car may form part of the total journey. The rail improvements that could be implemented in East Sussex which would improve the service for passengers, and also enable freight to be transported more widely on the rail network have been identified in the rail section. These would benefit the enviornment by reducing numbers of cars on the road (thereby reducing carbon emissions), benefit the economy by enabling passengers and businesses to enable a wider range of goods and services and by enabling operators to transport freight on rail, and be of benefit socially by enabling people to access facilities, events and locations more quickly and at more flexible times.</p>	Document amended
6 8 12 10	<p>very little attention to cycle or rail transport which have health and environmental benefits. No evidence of joined up modes of transport to decrease reliance on the car. Little sign that the plan would help to reduce serious injury and death which have high nos, Deaths--32 children and 373 adults which would be lessened by cycle, rail and bus use. How will health, physical and mental be improved by continued reliance on the car, which is passive and sedentary.</p>	<p>The plan acknowledges that people's health and safety can be improved by reduced reliance on the car and greater use of physically active and sustainable forms of transport. The preferred strategy is aimed at achieving that outcome by increasing the attractiveness and availability of other forms of transport.</p>	
6	<p>We believe that the convoluted and obscure assessment of strategy options on pages 12,13 and 14 of the LTP3 draft executive summary underestimates the contribution investing in cycling can make to all the LTP objectives. Bikeability training is particularly valuable as it gives the younger generation the skills to take up cycling and to remain healthy and active throughout their lives, continually contributing to government's health and environmental objectives. Cycling is a particularly good option in times of recession as the cost of other forms of transport for distances of only a few miles becomes prohibitive for many people leading to greater social exclusion.</p>	<p>The preferrred LTP3 strategy and the specific approach to cycling as set out in the LTP3 Strategy aim to maximise the role of cycling as a mode of transport for utility trips and everyday journeys. While we acknowledge that levels of investment may be restricted during the early part of the plan period it is still the direction we wish persue. Funding for Bikeability training has been secured for the foreseeable future through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.</p>	
10	<p>Bricycles strongly supports the reduction of traffic speed to a default maximum of 20mph where people are i.e. in streets, towns and villages. <i>Evidence base supplied, see full submission.</i></p>	<p>There is currently no policy to introduce default 20mph speed limits but the new Road Safety Strategy will give greater clarity about the use of 20mph zones.</p>	

13	We support measure to reduce traffic both in town and in the country and a switch to sustainable transport. We oppose road schemes that on the basis that they increase traffic.	Noted.	
13	Switch investment to sustainable transport to reduce dependence on the private car.	The preferred strategy of sustainable growth is aimed at reducing reliance on the private car, however this is balanced by the requirement to maintain the current transport infrastructure and not let it deteriorate and where appropriate support strategic transport infrastructure improvements that improve the county's connectivity.	
15	Strongly oppose the Bexhill Hastings Link Road.	Noted	
5 12	Want continued investment in community and rural bus services, good integration of bikes and trains and integrated transport by encouraging train operators to carry bikes on trains and provide secure cycle parking at stations.	Noted	
8	Support reinstatement of Uckfield to Lewes rail line and the link to Tunbridge.	Noted.	
15 8	Section 5.40 says A259 is not the 'sole east - west transport corridor at this point of the coast' but this ignores the railway line. Previous consultation on the BHLR also ignores the railway line on its maps. This indicates a lack of commitment by ESCC to real sustainable transport despite stated sustainable transport policy.	Final document has been amended to include reference to the rail line. Improvements to the rail network is an integral part of our strategy and we continue to lobby for improvements to the East Coastway between Brighton and Ashford, the Uckfield line to London, and the Hastings line to London (via Tunbridge Wells). All these routes are vital for the economy of East Sussex providing access for work and social purposes, encouraging businesses to locate to the county, and also encourage more companies to transport freight by rail should the appropriate infrastructure be provided.	Document amended
6	Section 5.83 All roads should be made safe for cycling. Newhaven with its race track one way street layout needs to get control of motor traffic by reducing speeds and discouraging car journeys. One way streets should be two way cycling. Any cycling facilities put in place should be consistent and coherent. Cyclists should not have to give way at every side road and junction. Many measures to assist cyclists would also assist pedestrians, children and the mobility impaired and support greater social inclusion.	Our priority for cycling is to encourage urban utility cycling and where possible provide on road facilities through use of quiet streets or designated lanes. Where appropriate we will consider two way cycling on one way streets. We undertake cycle audits as part of development of all schemes so that the needs of cyclists are considered even if it is not a cycling scheme.	
6	Finish Ringmer cycleway.	Further work is being undertaken to identify the most appropriate scheme to complete the western section of the Lewes/Ringmer cycle route.	

11	Strongly support sustainable workplace travel plans and understand that ESCC officers have been doing some good work in getting school travel plans completed. We would also like to see a process that requires ordinary businesses and freight companies to have a travel plan.	Noted. We have and will continue to work with businesses on their travel plans where they are associated with development.	
14	Keen to see a commitment by the council to ensuring and supporting sustainable access to the South Downs National Park. Lewes is a frequent cycling destination and with its good sustainable transport links could be promoted as the cycling gateway to the SDNP.	Further consideration has been given to transport issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended
1 10	Strongly support measures to maintain Newhaven as a successful ferry port . We also want slower speeds and far better standard of driving on the C7 and the A259 which are the main access roads to/from the ferry for many cyclists. Partnership with the police to enforce responsible driving and lower speeds is essential on many rural roads such as the C7.	Noted	
7 9 12	We are unclear how it answers: a) Improvement needed to footpaths along roads b) Improvements needed to trans-Sussex road network which is currently poor c) Need to improve access to Newhaven port which would aid Sussex businesses to be more profitable in accessing export market more easily d) Needs to be a clearer integrated transport plan between the different modes of transport eg trains/bus network linkages are patchy	Maintenance of footways is prioritised according to the criteria in the Transport Asset Management Plan. Schemes to improve or provide new footpaths will be assessed against a range of criteria through the Scheme Prioritisation Framework described in the draft document. The aspirations for strategic network improvements were set out in chapter 4 of the draft LTP, however decisions on the delivery of strategic improvements to the road network will be made by DfT. The strategy in relation to access to Newhaven is set out in chapter 4 of the final LTP3 Strategy. The County Council works with both train and bus operators to achieve integration between modes where possible.	Document amended
13	4. Road growth: It is sad that so much space is given to the possible Bexhill to Hastings road (p.98-109), when the mention of possible cycle routes which would be far cheaper is concluded with a comment about lack of funding (p. 129).	Noted, however the link road is the top priority of the County Council to complement other initiatives and enable the regeneration of the area and to facilitate housing growth.	

15	<p>There is emphasis on the ESCC agenda on parking. You should realise how hugely contentious this has been. Increasing areas of parking charges may indeed reduce congestion in towns, but may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. reduce the business in towns and</li> <li>ii. increase car journeys to out-of-town shopping precincts</li> <li>iii. increase social exclusion for those without cars to get to the shopping areas</li> </ul>	<p>The policy on parking and the potential roll out of civil parking enforcement is designed to increase the economic viability of town centres by reducing the incidence of indiscriminate parking, improving the urban environment by reducing traffic and associated air and noise pollution and increasing reliable access by public transport, walking and cycling. It aims to provide short term and high turnover of spaces in town centres while long term parking is encouraged in off street car parks. Residents are provided with dedicated parking spaces. National research has shown that people who travel to the shops on foot, by cycle or by public transport can spend as much, if not more than those arriving by car.</p>	Document amended
10 12 6 7	<p>What should be added as key areas to focus on:</p> <p>9. Safety and enforcement</p> <p>We have questionnaire surveys showing that people do not cycle because they are scared.</p> <p>10. Safer routes around schools and networks around schools, shops and workplaces</p> <p>Other regions have explored different road rules at certain times.</p> <p>11. Linking up areas: eg rail travel. Reduce restrictions on carrying bikes on trains. Have trains with more carriages (for school children, workers and cyclists) Have more space for bikes on trains.</p> <p>12. Cycle parking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need loops, rather than complex antiquated contraptions.</li> <li>• Could all planning applications be rejected until they include prominent parking for bicycles?</li> </ul> <p>13. Changing the ethos so that cycling and walking are considered FIRST</p> <p>The implementation plan needs to promote this.</p>	<p>It is undersood that safety is an issue in people's decisions re cycling. Work is continuing with train operators to improve integration and capacity to include better cycle provision on train carriages. Agreed that some cycle parking is better designed than other. We do seek cycle parking as appropriate through the planning process and as part of transport improvement schemes. LTP3 seeks to support all modes of sustainable travel but accepts that not all journeys can be made by these modes..</p>	
6 11	<p>14. Much greater emphasis on the health benefits of cycling</p> <p>If people were fitter, we would not have the on-going financial cost of health and social care. We need to increase the fitness levels of the whole population. Cycling is the best form of exercise. It reduces the incidence of obesity, heart disease, vitamin D deficiency, depression, respiratory diseases and some cancers. We have thousands of people in the local population who are supported by social care due to conditions which would have been preventable.</p> <p>Nudge theory suggests that public bodies need to help with multiple small hurdles to allow people to make better decisions.</p>	Noted	

6 11	<p>15. Much greater emphasis on the economic benefits of cycling The LTP3 plan puts “changing travel behaviour” and “improving sustainability” low on the chart for economic growth compared to road building. This is short-sighted. We have 7% unemployed and 25% of households with no car. If cycling infrastructure were better, more people would have access to employment opportunities. (Eg it would be cost effective to do shifts stacking shelves if you did not have to pay petrol costs and could get yourself there on time on a bicycle.) Similarly, with better provision for cycling, some educational opportunities might be possible for future economic option. With less money spent on petrol, some may have more disposable income for shopping or recreational activities. There is also great tourist income potential in embracing cycling for visitors to the area.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy is for measures which support sustainable economic growth through changing people's travel behaviour and improving sustainability. This includes support for cycling and walking and relatively little emphasis on road building save for identified improvements which will help the connectivity of the county to the rest of the south east, London and beyond.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
6	<p>BIKE HIRE/ ELECTRIC VEHICLE HIRE These schemes such as the “Boris Bikes” are being successfully launched in large urban areas but there could be models that would work in more rural parts of the country, particularly at Railway stations. This personal hire of bicycles and electric cars is an extension of the car clubs that are supported in the strategy. The strategy should support these schemes.</p>	<p>The strategy does support the implementation of this type of scheme but as yet there is little evidence to show viability in areas of smaller population density.</p>	
8	<p>Rail infrastructure. (page 54 and page 137) Within the main report the references to detailed very important rail infrastructure improvements are welcomed and strongly supported. However the SCRP would appreciate somewhat stronger terms being used to give these necessary improvements greater weight and thereby encourage partners to work more constructively and quickly towards finding ways of bringing them about. The plan should also have a more urgent time line against these projects as they have a long lead time and strong clear leadership and action to get the process started is urgently needed.</p>	<p>The County Council takes every opportunity to lobby the rail industry through the appropriate channels to progress rail infrastructure and services with the assistance of other stakeholders and other interested parties. Further lobbying for rail service and infrastructure improvements is currently being undertaken through the London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy consultation process, and we have already engaged with commuter groups and other stakeholders regarding the lack of consideration for rail improvements in this county. Responsibility for delivering rail improvements rests with the rail industry.</p>	
5	<p>Real time bus information. (page 86) The provision of more transport information within the Plan by the County Council and by other transport service providers is welcomed especially the implied reference to real time information provision of bus services at rail stations and vice versa.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

5	Community Bus. (page 87) The SCRCP would welcome increased encouragement in the draft plan for local community bus groups to consider the provision of short distance commuter services to local stations. Such support could well be in terms of administrative and marketing support rather than significant direct subsidies	Community bus services can be set up to address any issue of local transport need including commuting to local stations. The County Council would support and encourage local initiatives of this sort where they can become financially sustainable.	
8	Freight. (page 136) While it is inevitable in the short term that freight movements within East Sussex will be predominately by road the SCRCP would welcome a reference within the draft LTP to supporting research into the potential for increasing rail freight, perhaps by the re-introduction of a local freight siding(s) at appropriate stations to allow the delivery of local construction materials and the removal local waste.	Our freight strategy, which has been consulted upon alongside the draft LTP3, does include our support for and aspiration that more freight can be carried by rail. A summary of the key objectives of the Freight Strategy are outlined in the draft document.	Document amended
15	Parking. (page145) The provision of additional parking capacity at stations is contentious but the draft plan should make reference to the comparative advantage of encouraging car use for access to local stations in areas not well served by other forms of public transport rather than the car being used for longer journeys. Therefore provision of additional reasonable priced car parking adjacent to those selected appropriate stations would be a positive move (with the parking provided by a range of partners, not exclusively the TOC and/or Network Rail).	It is recognised that due to the rural nature of the county that some passengers will have to use the private car to access railway stations. The absence of strong public transport links in rural locations contributes to dependency on the private car. Car sharing to stations is encouraged and we will be discussing priority spaces for car sharers in station car parks to further encourage this. However, additional car parking at stations should be complemented with improved sustainable access.	
12 11	Integrated transport. There is a tendency in the plan to deal with road, walking, cycling, bus and rail issues in isolation. Their collective impact on social, environmental and economic objectives is regularly acknowledged in the plan but the actual working together of these different groups is far less well supported. For example while station, school and workplace travel plans are recommended and supported their joint implementation by partners is not given weight and backing. The SCRCP would welcome a stronger lead by the County Council within its LTP.	The preferred strategy is for support for all sustainable modes of travel however it is important to detail how each mode can contribute to the overall objectives. It should also be noted that the County Council is not the only body which can implement the actions in travel plans or initiate joint working.	







1 11	The commitment in Para 2.1, to sustainable travel is good – and whilst the plan recognises the need for facilities and information (para 5.110), it is not clear how the key messages will be integrated to encourage cultural change and bring the associated economic, environmental and health benefits	We aim to work with partners and colleagues particularly in the health and environment sectors to ensure that messages are integrated and complementary in order to achieve the best outcomes.	
7	The work on RoWs is welcomed (paras 5.127 – 5.128), however it is unclear whether consideration has gone beyond the challenge of making the best of what we have; to consider the need for, and opportunity to deliver, new routes to plug gaps in the network, deliver necessary links for sustainable trips to work, facilities and services, and to ensure access to the natural environment, particularly for communities suffering poor health. Perhaps this could be considered during the annual surveys referred to in paras 6.11/12.	The purpose of the annual surveys is to manage the assets and paths already in existence. We do not have the surveying resources to incorporate a significant access improvement aspect into our inspection methodology. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) details how we would like to improve the network and we are gradually implementing many of its more easily achievable aims. However, there is currently no funding available to implement most of the more costly access improvements detailed in the Plan. The Rights of Way team regularly receives access improvement suggestions from residents and local communities. We are happy to investigate and advise on these on a case by case basis.	
4 16	Whilst the plan commits to delivering a 3% reduction in CO2 per annum (page 58), and sets out the means by which this may be achieved, it is unclear what level of investment in each measure will be required and what the associated reduction will be.	The levels of investment in particular types of measure are not yet known and will be dependent on the level of funding available. In addition the relationship between investment and carbon reduction is not exact. We will seek to move in the right direction while measurement and evaluation processes are refined to the point where real benefits can be assessed.	
1 4	The value of high standard facilities and good urban design that encourage safe, sociable walking journeys is recognised in para 5.105, however the plan does not appear to seek to “green” walking and cycling routes and other transport related development, such as car parks and interchanges to generate a network of habitat links and landscape benefits.	An objective of the plan is to contribute to the protection <i>and enhancement</i> of the local natural and built environment. Where appropriate we will endeavour to "green" routes and other transport related development.	
4 15	Section 5.62 of the LTP3 and Sections 39 to 41 in Appendix A refers to air quality impacts but does not address the issue of air quality on designated sites. Ashdown Forest is a particular issue as the A26 and the A22 run through parts of the forest, the area is subject to significant housing growth and the critical load of the forest is already exceeded.	The impact of air quality and background levels of pollution on designated sites is addressed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report.	Document amended
16	The Plan refers to a number of possible schemes - but there is limited indication of the scale, location and nature of the schemes, or their potential impact; nor is it clear whether there are further proposals that the Plan will seek to bring forward in the plan period.	These will be identified in the short term Implementation Plan and the scale / location will be dependent on the level of funding available.	

<p>1 15</p>	<p>Natural England is satisfied that the SEA covers all relevant issues but has the following comments that we would like to see addressed. The LTP3 SEA Objective regarding air quality (number 4) has been related to human health and AQMAs but has not addressed the issue of increased nitrous oxide (and other pollutants) on designated sites. This is a particular issue for roads that are within 200m of designated sites as outside of this distance, the effect is not considered to be significant. Amongst other, the A22 and A26 run through Ashdown Forest and the critical load for this site is already exceeded. Section 6.5.7 does refer to designated sites (Ramsar, SACs, SPAs etc) but does not consider the possibility that the LTP3 may have a likely significant effect from air quality impacts. We recommend that the monitoring proposals for noise and air pollution as detailed in Table 8-1 include monitoring of designated sites within 200m of roads.</p>	<p>The impact of air quality and background levels of pollution on designated sites is addressed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>The Council does not support road building without a thorough understanding of the impacts and considerations of other options. Therefore the Council expects that any new road proposal must be considered in the light of its full environmental impact. Also the Council would expect there to be a full analysis of other possible options, including public transport, before considering the construction of a new road.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	
<p>13</p>	<p><i>(following comment on BHLR)</i> We do not understand why there are not better developed alternative strategies which could include packages of cheaper measures with high likelihood of a high 'bcr' that could be implemented fairly quickly. LTP3 could include a draft programme of these packages. The timing is perfect: there is a Local Sustainable Transport Fund for such measures and no excuse, and every reason, for inclusion of a draft of such a strategy as an addendum or supplement to this LTP3 process. That would save time. You are uniquely placed as you have staff with the expertise to draw up the packages and resources to assess and access best practice elsewhere in the UK and Europe. In para 5.92, you open this possibility. The above approach could steer us away from unsustainable patterns of development which litter the county. We have already offered to help.</p>	<p>It is still felt that the Bexhill Hastings Link Road is the best solution to the problems of access, connectivity and air quality issues in that area. It will also facilitate a package of complementary measures which would encourage more sustainable travel on the A259 between the two towns.</p> <p>The County Council intends to bid for funds from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.</p>	

11	3.6 Repeats the historic 'poor infrastructure' claim which sidesteps the question: 'Are we making best use of what we have?' A focus to start with on 'Travel to Work Areas' and meeting their needs through sustainable transport measures and 'smart choices' would then give a clear picture of what infrastructure was required because the clarity of its appropriateness would be evident.	It is part of the preferred strategy of sustainable growth that we make the best use of the infrastructure that we have through a high standard of maintenance and measures to increase the use of sustainable modes of transport.	
15	3.9/5.155 The Climate Change Strategy has not demonstrated (to the best of my knowledge) how the CO2 emissions anticipated for the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road would be offset. I believe that the offsetting must be delivered via the transport sector. How would this be achieved?	When a decision has been made as to whether funding will be available for construction of the BHLR, measures will be put in place to mitigate the amount of CO2 released through construction and the Climate Change Strategy will be reviewed to include measures to offset the balance of this plus any operational balance not offset by the complementary transport measures planned in the area. This does not have to be met exclusively by transport measures but they will play their part.	
5	3.27 Older people and access. The concessionary bus pass has given freedom to many thousands in East Sussex. The value to individuals in the form of health and social benefits is unclear but must be significant; and the value to local shops where this sector of the population will often be heading must be considerable. These considerations might usefully inform development of the scheme in the lifetime of the LTP3. Is there any research on this?	We are not aware of any evaluation of the impact of the concessionary fares scheme at a local level though there is a vigorous debate nationally as to the impacts of the scheme. Should evidence of impact emerge it will be taken into account in the future development of transport strategy within the county.	
14	South Downs National Park. There is support for sustainable access to SDNP but not by name. There is no commitment to 'sustainable access' as such though, but there is a worrying statement of support for strategic investment to support SDNP objectives. This could quite easily mean the A27 upgrade (p59). We should instead first look imaginatively (as we have in the past) at a 'Tourism without Traffic' approach.	SDNP objectives include sustainable access to the park therefore strategic investment to support the National park objectives is a commitment to sustainable access. Further consideration has been given to transport issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended
15	p50 We note that ESCC supports 75% of bus services, but another useful statistic would be the percentage of bus trips that are supported ones.	Currently the data we receive from operators is not analysed in this way but it is thought that only a relatively small proportion of the total number of trips taken are subsidised although this is very important in terms of rural connectivity and access to services and added social value. As a benchmarking tool trip subsidies can be misleading.	
6 7	p60 'Safety'. Should include explicit commitment to changing hierarchies to encourage walk/cycle.	The LTP3 preferred strategy is one that supports all types of sustainable transport including walking and cycling but it does not prioritise them.	

4	p61 Manual for Streets emphasises importance of high quality design. There are many examples of poor quality design which doesn't give reassurance. Hastings pedestrian environment o/s the new FE college is very poor indeed and is in need of a complete re-assessment. Money has been wasted here. The hierarchy is upside down.	The importance of high quality design is recognised as being important particularly in pedestrian environments and we will endeavour to protect and enhance both the built and natural environment.	
13	p62 Social implications should acknowledge the benefits that would flow from mode shift and should include a commitment to incentivising this. Bullets 3 and 4 should acknowledge this need; it is not enough to meet the needs of those without access to a car. Alternatives should be for all.	Agreed that there are social benefits to reduced car use. The strategy aims to achieve modal shift through increasing the attractiveness of sustainable modes by supporting the infrastructure necessary to facilitate travel by those modes and by the use of 'Smarter choice' measures.	Document amended
5	5.9.1 Promoting a stable bus network might suggest to some that the status quo is satisfactory. It would be better to insert 'and developing' after 'stable' because the network needs development and expansion.	The bus strategy states its aim of maintaining <i>and improving</i> the quality of commercial services.	
10	5.34/(Bullet 6 on p95) 20mph zones are fundamental to strong growth in walking and cycling, and are important not only for vulnerable road users, but for the encouragement of people to shift to walking and cycling from their cars. This second advantage is not captured.	Noted, however though 20mph zones will be considered, there are local and national criteria to comply with and not all schemes are appropriate.	Document amended
10	The danger for cyclists and pedestrians on the C7 could be acknowledged and this issue should be addressed by the LTP. There is an excellent e-w bus service, and a rail line with spare capacity. Bus services on the C7 could be usefully strengthened to benefit the villages on the west of the Ouse and complement the rail service.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
15	5.83 Lewes could be usefully included as a cycle trip origin/destination.	Agreed	Document amended

8	<p>5.86/7 The reinstatement of the Lewes - Uckfield line, together with the link to Tunbridge Wells, is a piece of infrastructure we have supported for 25 years. We believe it would not only be an essentially valuable scheme in the context of anticipated development, but could influence the nature and quality of that development by reducing car dependency and supporting sustainable modes. It would contribute greatly to the quality of peoples' lives.</p> <p>The opportunity to arrive at re-instatement through developer funding which has now been allowed to slip away is hugely regrettable. We can only hope that if there is a 'next time' then the chance cannot be missed.</p> <p>p124 Panel. The rail reinstatement referred to above would resolve many of the accessibility/social equity issues experienced in the North Weald towns.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the development contribution issue is one which was considered at the time of the study but was deemed as not being viable. This was because developer contributions from all proposed housing (as per the South East Plan figures) in north Wealden at approx £10k per dwelling would not have covered the costs of reinstatement as predicted in Network Rail's Lewes-Uckfield railway reinstatement study. The development contributions from all this housing (up to 2026) would also have had to fund improvements to infrastructure such as doctors' surgeries, schools, other highway infrastructure etc and could not have solely been allocated towards the reinstated railway line.</p>	
5	<p>5.90 Rest of the County. Better bus links on the A21/265, potentially limited stop services, could also resolve the issues described in 5.90. Bus links with the Hastings - Charing Cross line could also help.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.</p>	Document amended
15	<p>Parking charges at the edge of town supermarkets should be used to support rural bus links: this would help to level the playing field and give village shops a little help. Supermarkets have diverted money from both the rural and town centre spend. There is a case for carrying out this measure to redress the negative impacts of supermarkets.</p>	<p>The County Council has no plans to introduce or call for supermarket parking charges.</p>	
1 6 7	<p>5.104 - 8 Support the general thrust of policies to secure greater levels of walking/cycling. Evidence so far of traffic management (signals, railings, etc) claimed to improve walking/cycling environments in urban centres gives us cause for concern. There is too much emphasis on traffic flow and too many railings which conflict with desire lines. This creates and perpetuates the existing hierarchy, placing cars/motorcycles at the top which is plainly wrong in urban centres and in many other locations.</p>	<p>Work has been undertaken at appropriate sites in the county to reduce the amount of railings e.g. at Kings Road Hastings. It is envisaged that schemes such as this including the use of shared space and pavement widening will continue where possible and funding is available.</p>	

15	p131 Panel. The advantages of zebra crossings (not mentioned here) should be captured and they should be included as an option. They are superior to signal controlled crossings, since they offer the motorist the opportunity to defer to the pedestrian which in most cases they do. Through a 'mental operation' on the part of the driver, this reinforces in the mind of the motorist the hierarchy that places the most vulnerable - pedestrians - first. The eye contact which accompanies this 'mental operation' further reinforces the hierarchy. This doesn't happen with signal controlled crossings.	Noted	
11	p133 Panel. Support the 'behavioural change' direction but although the science informing the measures described is fairly robust, application is patchy or non-existent. The measures have not been applied with vigour and are undermined by ease and cheapness of parking and also the low cost of motoring.	Achieving substantial behavioural change is dependent on many more factors than can be influenced locally. The strategy sets out the continuing commitment to this type of measure in terms of producing travel information, travel plans, awareness campaigns and in particular promoting sustainable travel to schools.	
16	p134 Panel. Support this in principle but note that the provision of 'real-time' bus information has been policy for almost a decade, but isn't working in Eastbourne and has yet to arrive in Hastings. This is in need of immediate attention.	We are working with bus operators to overcome the technical problems with real time information in Eastbourne and are working to identify the most appropriate technological solution for future roll out to other areas for he county.	
1	p135 Panel. Support the principles and measures and recognise hard work of ESCC staff responsible.	Noted	
11	p137 Panel. Cross reference this panel with P133 Panel and ensure that businesses concerned adopt 'workplace travel plans' and collaborate to get their workforces to work and home by sustainable modes. The record of businesses on this is not always good, while they intuitively support major road schemes. There is a contradiction here. Include in the frame the potential and need to explore the potential for rail to handle freight. It appears to have been ruled out.	The County Council fully supports initiatives to increase the amount of freight transported by rail. This was fully set out in the draft freight strategy which was consulted on alongside the draft LTP3. Work will continue with existing and new employers to support travel by sustainable modes.	Document amended
15	p139 Panel. Support rail strategy with exception of the Wilting Farm proposal. This would undermine the 'passenger base' of urban stations in Bexhill and Hastings and threaten closure of Crowhurst. A significant incidence of 'railheading' would result, increasing traffic, with many new car trips originating in the urban areas. Strategy should be pursued more energetically than to date as little has been achieved for decades.	A station at Wilting Farm has been a long standing aspiration of the County Council and a study undertaken by Mott MacDonald on behalf of SeaSpace (February 2010) identified that whether or not Crowhurst station is retained, it appears that there is a positive business case for Wilting station. However, further analysis would need to be undertaken, for example, to verify the likely levels of passenger demand and to give a higher level of confidence as to capital costs; non-monetary aspects would also need to be assessed.	

1 10	p141 Panel. Support and suggest that the problem of inappropriate driving styles and speeding in lanes and urban environments should be simultaneously addressed as they also offer important pedestrian/hiker/cycle links in rural and urban areas.	Driver behaviour is addressed through the road safety strategy and education measures.	
13	p143 Panel. ITS systems should be used to give priority to sustainable modes, especially walking and cycling. Too often, even in urban centres, traffic flow is the number one priority thus deterring pedestrians and cyclists and encouraging more people to take the car. Hastings and Eastbourne offer examples of this back to front hierarchy.	Intelligent transport systems are used to prioritise the passage of some sustainable modes e.g. buses through traffic lights. We acknowledge the tension between allowing free flowing traffic and congestion which can be detrimental to the health and well being of both cyclists and pedestrians.	
15	p145 Panel. Policies should recognise that levels of parking charges, and above all, parking availability, have a marked effect on the quality of our urban environment and the 'shopping experience', and the quality of life of those in residential streets where most car trips originate. A parking 'free for all' undermines public transport, leads to increased traffic and urban degradation, and deters pedestrians and cyclists.	LTP3 supports the enforcement of parking controls and the introduction of civil parking enforcement where appropriate. The policy on parking and the potential roll out of civil parking enforcement is designed to increase the economic viability of town centres by reducing the incidence of indiscriminate parking, improving the urban environment by reducing traffic and associated air and noise pollution and increasing reliable access by public transport, walking and cycling. It aims to provide short term and high turnover spaces in town centres while long term parking is encouraged in off street car parks. Residents are provided with dedicated parking spaces.	
15	From experience elsewhere, we know that when free travel for all students was introduced in London, this removed at a single stroke money worries from thousands of households in poverty in the capital. This would help to tackle deprivation and thus promote regeneration. We would like LTP3 to consider this option that would also reduce traffic and lead to greater social equity and community cohesion that appears to follow the creation of less car dominated streets. There are no 'hard infrastructure' costs associated with this approach.	There are no plans currently for a scheme of this type and in the current economic climate it is unlikely to be considered in the short term. However we do encourage bus operators to develop and promote discounted fares for children and young people.	
1	5.156 We believe that 'Option 3' - 'Sustainable Growth' is the closest to our aspirations.	Noted	
10	p174/5 Future Integrated Transport Schemes and Road Safety transport schemes. We hope that this will include a move towards 20mph zones as a default arrangement in residential streets, and a stronger emphasis on walking and cycling provision in our urban centres through changing the hierarchy so that these modes are at the top. Pedestrians and cyclists are 'traffic' with a negligible carbon footprint and their ease of flow should be enhanced.	The strategy includes the consideration of 20mph zones where appropriate but not as a default option.	

15	<p>We welcome the various references to the anticipated growth arising from constituent Authorities' LDFs / Core Strategy work. However, we believe that, in reality, it is this not inconsiderable level of housing growth that will be the key driver in seeking and securing enhanced transport infrastructure. This point could maybe be more clearly emphasised in the early sections of LTP3, and the expectation that the development industry will need to assume responsibility for delivery of the necessary infrastructure in a timely fashion.</p>	Noted.	Document amended
15	<p>On a general, but significant point: from the Wealden perspective, we are concerned that, whilst the draft refers to a number of major strategic schemes and improvements to support sustainable growth - the reinstatement of the Lewes - Uckfield railway, the Folkington Link, Willingdon Chord and a Polegate Parkway Station - that our own emerging Core Strategy and accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan ( IDP ) do not include these as they are simply not deemed to be realistically deliverable on the basis of current evidence. Their inclusion within LTP3 does not, therefore, appear to align well with Wealden's core strategy (and possibly not with those of Eastbourne and Lewes). We suggest that there should be greater clarity or caveats as to how, by when, and by whom these proposals might realistically be delivered within the lifespan of LTP3: otherwise there is a risk that communities will feel let down when such improvements do not materialise. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>We recognise that the requirements of LDFs are different to those of a local transport plan. There are transport aspirations which we do not feel we can omit from LTP3 even if they are unlikely to be delivered during the plan period. If we do not include schemes such as Lewes-Uckfield reinstatement, Willingdon Chord etc and at a future date an opportunity arises to progress that project, then we would have no statutory strategy which would support this. We cannot predict what will happen in terms of policy, investment etc over the coming years therefore all potential rail and road schemes and which would be of benefit to travellers and freight transportation will be retained in LTP3. LTP3 does therefore include references to proposed infrastructure or schemes that are long term aspirations for the County.</p>	
	<p>As far as we are aware, the schemes identified above have not been included in the modelling undertaken as part of our own recent transport studies jointly commissioned with Eastbourne. Their potential effects upon the growth of the area are therefore not possible to evaluate in a robust way.</p>	<i>See comment above</i>	
15	<p>Page 31, para 2.18 refers to the focus of infrastructure provision and specifically mentions Uckfield and Hailsham/Polegate. We welcome this inclusion which mirrors the focus for growth in Wealden as outlined in our pre-submission LDF Core Strategy. However, as these areas will also be the principal locations for new employment growth in Wealden District, there is also a need to establish and improve 'local connectivity of communities' (Specific Transport Objectives 1), as part of the overall focus on infrastructure, to achieve both local and wider objectives. <i>continued below</i></p>	The document has been amended to make reference to better local connectivity.	Document amended

	<p>Although this is mentioned in para 5.38 on Page 97, we suggest that greater prominence to these needs should be afforded earlier in the document to reinforce the importance of improving local connectivity to main towns and growth areas. This will also support the priorities outlined in the Spatial Priority Areas strategy for Eastbourne /Hailsham and Polegate outlined in para 5.58 on Page 110. The need is further reinforced by the reference to accessibility by public transport, particularly to/from Heathfield and Hailsham (one of our principal growth areas) on page 207 in the section on local picture and challenges in Appendix A.</p>	<p><i>See comment above</i></p>	
15	<p>Page 35, para 3.4 We have concerns about the reference to the construction of a parkway station, public services centre and provision of 10,000 jobs in the Eastbourne Hailsham / South Wealden area. This seems to mirror the 'vision' outlined in the GVA Grimley report of November 2008 - 'Eastbourne - Hailsham Triangle - Towards a Masterplan: Economic Strategy and Spatial Scenarios'. We suggest it would be helpful to ensure that the wording clearly reflects that recently agreed in the LEP proposal, with an update on the current situation regarding the LEP itself which now seems to have less focus on benefits for parts of East Sussex. <i>See below</i></p>	<p>The aspirations referred to are included in the East Sussex Local Enterprise Partnership bid document</p>	
15	<p>We recognise the transport sustainability merits of this aspiration in the longer term economic development of the area. However, this vision has not been fully tested through a full master planning feasibility exercise or sustainability appraisal. We believe it is over ambitious, particularly for the Polegate area, given the current economic climate. The Sussex Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) process considered and rejected a proposal for a parkway station at Polegate. It may be, therefore, that these 'project areas' are premature or unrealistic for delivery within the LTP3 period. Our own LDF process is in significant part, to be tested on soundness in terms of its deliverability and justification. In this regard LTP3, whilst referencing the above should not risk losing sight of what is realistically achievable. If LTP3 is to align with adjoining authorities' LDF work, these references, without any qualification, seem difficult to rationalise.</p>	<p>We have included many potential improvements in the plan that are aspirational and that may not be delivered during the LTP3 period but we do not want to exclude them from consideration should circumstances allow. <i>See comment above.</i></p>	

15	<p>In developing our Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the LDF Plan period (2006 - 2030), Wealden District Council has worked closely with, and appreciated the support of, colleagues at East Sussex County Council. Although a parkway station is included in the list of potential improvements as part of the spatial priority areas strategy of Eastbourne / Hailsham / Polegate, listed on page 115 of the consultation document, we have not, hitherto, been given any indication by other County colleagues of a strategic transport requirement for a parkway station in this general location. As we have no robust evidence to show that these 'projects' are deliverable, they have not been included in our pre-submission Core Strategy growth scenarios, Sustainability Appraisal or Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In this respect the LTP and our LDF are not seemingly in alignment as referred to in para 1.2 of the Introduction to LTP3. Reference is also made to this project again in Section 4 on pages 53/54</p>	<p>We have included many potential improvements in the plan that are aspirational and that may not be delivered during the LTP3 period but we do not want to exclude them from consideration should circumstances allow. See comment above.</p>	
15	<p>If these principal project areas are to be retained in LTP3, for any realistic chance of delivery we urgently need access to robust evidence to support their inclusion in our LDF, IDP and any subsequent CIL charging regime. We also need to quickly understand any impact regarding the location and spatial implications, particularly land take, that this may have on our LDF growth scenarios, and the projected timescale and delivery mechanisms envisaged. At this stage, we could only envisage inclusion of these projects as part of any future review of our draft Core Strategy. LTP 3 would need to make this very clear, so that Wealden communities are not potentially offered unrealistic expectations.</p>	<p>We have included many potential improvements in the plan that are aspirational and that may not be delivered during the LTP3 period but we do not want to exclude them from consideration should circumstances allow. See comment above.</p>	
15	<p>Page 54 - Rail This section recognises that there is currently little possibility of large scale investment in the local rail system, but includes reference to a number of improvements that are 'likely to be required to meet the needs of new housing'. This list includes the reinstatement of the Lewes/Uckfield line, although the business case for such was recently independently established as weak. If LTP3 is intended to cover the period to 2026 , and our own Core Strategy the period to 2030, this document needs to reconcile the fact that at this juncture we cannot include the likelihood of delivery of this scheme " to meet the needs of new housing " and expect to pass any test of soundness on deliverability of this proposal. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>We have included many potential improvements in the plan that are aspirational and that may not be delivered during the LTP3 period but we do not want to exclude them from consideration should circumstances allow. See comment above</p>	

15	the reinstatement of the Lewes / Uckfield link has not been included in the Sussex RUS either, nor in Wealden District Council's IDP accompanying the pre-submission Core Strategy, nor in respect of the Willingdon Chord the current consultation draft of Eastbourne Borough Council's Core Strategy . The spatial implications of reinstatement of the Lewes - Uckfield link, particularly in the Uckfield area, need to be understood to ensure that the long term aspirations of the Wealden LDF and LTP3 are complementary.	Noted.	
15	Page 70, para 4.23 (and Rail strategy box on page 139) Cross boundary working with Kent:. We recognise that lobbying activities and partnership working on rail reinstatement and new station provision schemes is likely to continue. However, we have to reiterate that these projects are not currently included in our Core Strategy and IDP as infrastructure required within our plan period 2006 - 2030. Once again, we do need to understand what this may mean in terms of possible impacts upon future development as soon as possible.	We recognise that the requirements of LDFs are different to those of a local transport plan. There are transport aspirations which we do not feel we can omit from LTP3 even if they are unlikely to be delivered during the plan period. If we do not include schemes such as Lewes-Uckfield reinstatement, Willingdon Chord etc and at a future date an opportunity arises to progress that project, then we would have no statutory strategy which would support this. We cannot predict what will happen in terms of policy, investment etc over the coming years therefore all potential rail and road schemes and which would be of benefit to travellers and freight transportation will be retained in LTP3. LTP3 does therefore include references to proposed infrastructure or schemes that are long term aspirations for the County.	
18	This section could be construed as the meat of the document and that the key actions and initiatives constitute the overall proposals that the County Council will progress with its partners. However, the key actions could be presented more coherently, and strongly so that this intention is made clear. We assume that, in figure 6, page 82 'Priority spacial areas' should read 'Priority spatial areas'.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
1 16	Para 5.4, Page 85 We are pleased to see the inclusion of south Wealden and Uckfield as priority areas for the provision of infrastructure, and again in relation to the planning and provision of infrastructure at para 5.26 on page 96. This accords with the principal proposed growth areas within Wealden District. We will continue to work with the County Council to ensure the timely provision of infrastructure to support growth within Wealden in line with our IDP and LDF Core Strategy housing trajectory. Here again, we would urge that clear mechanisms, funding streams and timescales for delivery of these should be set out in this LTP3 document.	At this point it is not possible to set out the detail requested with regard to delivery. The LTP Implementation Plan will include programmes of work which will be taken forward in the coming year and a fuller LTP Implementation Plan will be developed for the rest of the period to 2014/15.	

5	<p>Para 5.9 - 5.10, Pages 86/87- Bus Strategy We welcome all transport initiatives included in the bus strategy that will contribute to the specific transport objectives of 'improving strategic and local connectivity of communities to facilitate economic and spatial growth through the LDF process.' Connectivity and accessibility to public transport is a significant issue in Wealden, particularly in rural areas. We would encourage you to strengthen the objectives outlined in the table at para 5.9 to reflect the need to reduce isolation in rural areas through encouraging additional public transport initiatives, in addition to the community transport initiatives referred to in para 5.13 on page 88.</p>	Agreed	Document amended
15	<p>We would encourage you to place stronger emphasis on working with partners to improve the network and frequency of commercial bus services across the County rather than just focusing on the key coastal towns referred to under BUS point 1 on page 86. In relation to supported services (BUS point 2, p 86), it would assist the LDF process if growth areas could also be added alongside key centres, education and employment areas etc in b, c and d.</p>	The establishment of Quality Bus Partnerships will be rolled out over the period but are focused initially on areas of Bexhill, Eastbourne and south Wealden as well as key bus corridors such as Lewes - Uckfield - Tunbridge Wells.	
15	<p>Rest of the County - The first bullet point on page 125 regarding access to healthcare also applies to Wealden, particularly Heathfield, as evidenced in the findings at the 3rd bullet point on page 207.</p>	Noted.	Document amended
1	<p>We support Option 3 as the Preferred Strategy Approach.</p>	Noted.	
14	<p>In the current document we note with concern an insufficient emphasis on the national park. Its creation places a statutory duty (S. 62 of the 1995 Environment Act) on the County Council and other bodies to have due regard to the purposes for which it was created. In purely transport terms the LTP unsurprisingly focuses on those areas of potential economic growth and those perhaps offering scope for the greatest modal shift – but the new duty requires the authority to give due weight to the special characteristics of the protected landscape. There needs to be a specific programme of measures aimed at the national park to ensure this duty is being met.</p>	Further consideration has been given to transport issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park. Many of the measures referred to in the strategy for areas such as Eastbourne and Newhaven, but also in other places both inside the park and acting as gateways to it, will complement the aims of the park authority to encourage and enable sustainable access to the park and limit the impact of transport on the natural environment.	Document amended

12	The inclusion of the town of Lewes within the Park came after due consideration at the public inquiry, and that decision must be seen to make a difference. The town will serve increasingly as a high profile gateway to the Park. Improved public transport interchange will be essential, together with an emphasis on improving the public realm, including attention – long overdue – to improving the appearance of Station Street as an introduction to the town.	Further consideration has been given to transport issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park. We are working with partners to develop a programme of transport improvements in Lewes which will incorporate measures for Station St.	Document amended
4	In rural areas particularly – but also applying elsewhere – attention should be directed to reducing sign clutter, reducing light pollution from road lighting, and avoiding urban “solutions” in the countryside. Local consultation is essential. Pressure should be renewed on the Highways Agency to reduce traffic noise on the Lewes bypass by changing surface materials – unacceptably high levels of noise cover the town and follow walkers across the downs.	Delivery of the transport objective of contributing to the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment will also include the reduction of signage and 'clutter' and light spillage. The transport objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, local air pollution and noise from transport allows us to continue lobbying the Highways Agency for noise reducing surface to be applied to the A27 round Lewes.	
5 8	We would wish to see a greater emphasis on public transport, including creative ticket discounting initiatives. The Plan reads very much as car-centred. We support efforts to reopen the Lewes to Uckfield line, urge the greatest feasible support for rural bus services and ask that support be directed to low emission buses. We also fully support efforts to improve broadband in the rural areas which would assist home working and small rural enterprises.	Noted	
15	It is important that the Rights of Way Improvement Plan be regarded as an integral element of the LTP and its potential for encouraging modal shift be realised. We welcome the plan for an interactive online map of the rights of way network – even if current broadband capacity means it will be hard for some of those in rural areas to download it!	Both the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the regular maintenance of rights of way are integral to the Local Transport Plan and its objectives. The interactive rights of way map is now functional on the East Sussex County Council website.	
2 6	Although the LTP does pick up the challenge of road congestion and the opportunities for alternative approaches it does not in our view deal with it adequately. Public transport is mentioned but little is made of possible role of cycling in this connection. Cycling does reduce road congestion in many crowded towns and cites, and in our view, cycling could make a more significant contribution in improving air quality and reducing congestion in East Sussex.	Measures to improve facilities and encourage cycling are referred to in the individual sections on the priority areas as well as more generally across the county. Its role as part of the options for sustainable travel and as an alternative to the private car is recognised.	

6	<p>Public health responsibilities</p> <p>There are many other reasons to promote cycling, and it is noted that East Sussex County Council is shortly to become a public health authority. Central Government Public Health policy has the need for getting people active as a key priority: active travel has a major role in providing solutions.</p> <p>Also under this heading it is to be noted that there are a number very poor air quality roadside locations where a shift towards cycling and walking would bring very significant health benefits to residents.</p>	<p>Para 5.107 of the draft plan acknowledges the potential benefits of increased levels of cycling to people's health. However, the plan does need to recognise the new public health responsibilities coming to the County Council.</p> <p>Air quality comments noted and referred to in Air Quality section of the strategy.</p>	Document amended
6	<p>Cycle planning and provision in East Sussex is currently underfunded and totally inadequate. There are some routes which are suitable, but there is no realistic plan to link them. What is required is a professional approach to planning facilities, and a determination to deliver, in order to encourage greater participation in cycling and to give cycling its due role in transportation.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy supports measures to improve facilities for cyclists, particularly focused on utility journeys, and encourage increased cycling. Networks of routes have been identified which could be implemented, however with limited funding available, cycling schemes will be assessed along with other potential interventions against their ability to contribute toward achievement of the LTP objectives and also in terms of their value for money. Contributions from developers will be sought to augment any public funding available.</p>	
6	<p>Cycling can often provide an important stage in a journey, if not for the whole journey. In this respect the LTP should to deal with the need for cycle parking at railway stations (most of the UK population lives within 15 cycling minutes of a railway station and the majority of car journeys are less than 5 miles in length). As a transport authority ESCC should be pressing for the adequate provision for the carriage of cycles on trains – again this helps provide “choice” for the user (which the LTP declares is an important aim).</p>	<p>Work with the train operating companies is continuing with the objective of increasing and improving cycle parking at stations and the provision of carrying capacity on trains is an issue we are taking up.</p>	
14	<p>The new National Park is an opportunity to promote the business opportunities and green tourism. The Downs offer an extraordinary experience for walking, running and cycling, to name only a few activities. What is lacking is a cohesive plan to encourage access by means other than more private motor vehicles.</p>	<p>Further consideration has been given to transport issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.</p>	Document amended

15	<p>The LTP offers the opportunity to include in the Implementation Plan a response to the Government's Big Society challenge. Currently many requests for improvements in transportation stand little chance of being funded in the usual way. We wish to see this aspect addressed in the LTP. By this we mean that ESCC should work with local groups and other organisations and have a positive approach to overcoming difficulties.</p> <p>For example Cycle Seahaven has suggested practical funding alternatives for a cycle route that is urgently needed (A259 between Exceat Bridge and Seaford, part of the Avenue Verte). This would involve partnership with a number of other organisations, in particular Sustrans. We would wish to see ideas taken up and developed as a possible way of delivering improvements.</p>	Agreed.	Document amended
16	<p>Whilst the Strategy Option Appraisal for Planning and Providing Infrastructure (5.150) comes out clearly in favour of Option 3 Sustainable growth, an option which emphasises cycle infrastructure and other cycling measures, we do not see these priorities reflected in concrete terms in the implementation plans or elsewhere in the strategy document.</p>	The Implementation Plan at the time of publication of the draft LTP3 was incomplete as announcements from both central government and locally regarding funding levels were awaited.	
10	<p>Many roads in East Sussex are narrow and twisty. This is part of their charm. However we know from experience these roads are dangerous because of the inappropriate speed of motor vehicles. We wish to see speed limits reviewed from the point of view of all road users rather than based upon the average current speed of motor vehicles instead of a safe speed. There is a need also to use more signs warning motorists of the likely presence of walkers, equestrians and cyclists.</p>	Speed limits are reviewed in accordance with national guidance which does include consideration of pedestrian and cyclist needs. Getting the most appropriate level of signage is a delicate balance between encouraging safe driving behaviours and minimising the 'clutter' particularly in rural locations.	
6	<p>Cycle Seahaven has already supplied ESCC with a list of local transport priorities and we trust these will be incorporated in the revised LTP. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe cycle routes North from Seaford/Newhaven to Alfriston and Lewes.</li> <li>• Completion of NC2 between Newhaven and Seaford, through Seaford and between Seaford and Exceat.</li> <li>• Shared pedestrian/cycle access on Seaford promenade</li> <li>• Coherent cycle routes and improved cycle parking within both Seaford and Newhaven</li> <li>• Improved cycle routes to schools</li> <li>• 20mph speed limits in all central urban areas and at school locations</li> </ul>	<p>There is currently no policy to introduce default 20mph speed limits but the new Road Safety Strategy will give greater clarity about the use of 20mph zones.</p> <p>The development and implementation of routes in Newhaven, east to Seaford and west to Peacehaven is identified in the Newhaven section of the strategy.</p>	Document amended

3	We are particularly concerned that there are no specific measures identified for Seaford, one of the largest settlements in East Sussex. Cycle links from Seaford to the East, West and North are fragmented or non-existent and have the effect of cutting off Seaford from the rest of the county.	Further consideration has been given to the issues of transport in rural areas and in towns and villages outside the priority areas. Links to Seaford are referred to in the Newhaven section of the strategy.	Document amended
15	We absolutely agree that the development of faster broadband speeds are key ..it is slightly ironic that downloading this draft consultation from the internet is simply not an option for many of us in Rodmell where some battle with internet speeds little better than dial-up. If this service was improved more of us could work successfully from home.	Noted	
15	We agree that the amount of road signage needs to be minimised and physical characteristics are sympathetic to the characteristics of the local area but find it frustrating that we at the grass roots are rarely consulted about such measures..signs just appear overnight!	The 'Strengthening Local Relationships' liaison initiative involving the County Council and Town and Parish Councils, is a forum for dealing with these sorts of local issues.	
7	We are supportive of the emphasis on the encouragement for people to increase the amount of short journeys they undertake on foot...we would love a complete footpath between Rodmell & Northease to save the residents (including children to Rodmell Primary School) from having to walk along the edge of the C7 for part of the way!	All proposals for schemes will be considered through the Scheme Prioritisation Framework described in the strategy chapter.	
6	Likewise we are fully supportive of developing a network of cycle paths & feel a scheme to construct a route between Newhaven & Lewes down the Ouse Valley (perhaps following the River Ouse?) would be an excellent project which ticks B,C & D in your prioritisation list!	Our priority for investment in cycling is in utility cycle journeys, however other schemes are not precluded if external funding becomes available to fully fund their delivery. All proposals for schemes will be considered through the Scheme Prioritisation Framework described in the strategy chapter.	
6	Conversations and emails within Village Connections have focussed around.... the need to take a more holistic approach to the provision of local cycle paths. The Transition Town Lewes Local Development Framework submission suggested this in relation to Newhaven. The development of leisure cycling can be a valuable way of regenerating more sustainable local economies through the associated generation of additional tourism. eg. The Avenue Verte and Copenhagen. Brighton - Demonstration City.	Noted	

8	<p>The Local Transport Plan should make provision for appropriate support to be provided to Parish Councils, and other appropriate bodies, with respect to improving the utilisation of existing transport assets, particularly the enhancement of train services in response to local demand where railway stations already exist. As an example, within Hamsey Parish the station of Cooksbridge is currently under-utilised with a very limited "rush-hour" service only despite the fact that there is demonstrable support from local residents for an improved service.</p>	<p>We would welcome further involvement with local communities on what they would like to see in terms of rail service improvements in their area. It is suggested that representations are either made to the County Council through the local commuter group, or if one is not in place, via the local County Councillor. Direct representation to the rail industry is also suggested, although we would welcome suggestions from appropriate representatives to feed into our discussions with the Train Operating Companies and Network Rail.</p>	
6	<p>With respect to sustainable transport and improving health and safety, the Local Transport Plan should make provision for cycle routes. Within Hamsey Parish, a need exists for the provision of a safe cycle route along the A275 particularly between Cooksbridge and Lewes as a viable alternative to existing transport modes.</p>	<p>The priority for investment in cycling is in utility cycle journeys, however other schemes are not precluded if external funding becomes available to fully fund their delivery. All proposals for schemes will be considered through the Scheme Prioritisation Framework described in the strategy chapter.</p>	
13	<p>Bexhill - Hastings Link Road should be dropped in favour of more sustainable transport schemes.</p>	<p>The Bexhill Hastings link road is the highest priority of the County Council and its partners in order to address the need for regeneration of that area. A decision on funding for the link road will not be received until the end of 2011. Construction of the link road will allow schemes for sustainable transport to be implemented to complement the scheme and encourage a reduction in single occupancy car use.</p>	

<b>Priority Areas</b>			
<b>Code</b>	<b>If you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the above priorities, why is this?</b>	<b>ESCC response</b>	
15	Routing traffic through the centre of a small market town does not fit in with the policies of healthy, sustainable, quality of life improving transport policy. Read "Manual for Streets2" for guidance on creating healthy town centres.	It is assumed this comment refers to the strategy for Uckfield. The LTP3 strategy recognises the particular problems of Uckfield town centre and the final document states the intention to develop a suitable scheme for the town. All scheme designs will be guided by the guidance in 'Manual for Streets' and 'Manual for Streets 2'.	
8	Please see my comments above about the reinstatement of the Lewes Uckfield rail link	LTP3 states the County Council's continuing support for the reinstatement and electrification of the Lewes Uckfield line in its strategy for the Uckfield area and also in its strategy for rail.	
1 16 3	All of the strategies set out above are good and what we all strive for, but having objectives and actually carrying them out are two very different things. Your list above identifies the towns in the county. You have not considered the rural areas. If you want to implement the above, at what cost will it be? You have removed subsistence on buses to cross border children going to school, placing a heavy financial burden on families. You appear to remove one service then come up with some other scheme. Please stop creating the illusion of cost cutting when it appears that you are cutting costs in areas only to spend it on other hair brain schemes like car sharing. Doesn't work rurally.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas. Also Passenger Transport and Community Transport are priority service areas much of which is specifically aimed at solving rural accessibility issues. Car sharing can work in some rural situations e.g. on the school run. There are also successful community car schemes running in rural areas.	Document amended

5	<p>As I live in Hastings, the only plan I feel I can comment on is the one for my area. I am glad to know you're looking into the bus service to the Conquest Hospital. We definitely need a dedicated service to and from the hospital. It takes almost a 1/2 hr to get there from the Town Centre and that just shouldn't be acceptable. An issue that is very important to me and my neighbours is that there is no service up Priory Avenue past 5:17pm. The Hastings No. 27 bus is the only bus that goes up the hill of Priory Avenue. The last bus of the day (during the week) departs the Town Centre at 5:17pm. This time is very difficult to catch for people who work 9-5. Also, there are several people who work in St. Leonards and when they depart work at 5pm to catch the 5:09pm train back to Hastings, it is impossible to catch the last No. 27 bus. The hill of Priory Avenue is one of the steepest in Hastings and can cause damage to hips and other joints of those who have to walk up it everyday. If the last No. 27 bus of the day were moved forward to depart the Town Centre at 5:30pm instead of 5:17 it</p>	<p>Comments have been passed to the Passenger Transport team and will be incorporated in the responses to the Hastings and Rother review of bus services.</p>	
15	<p>Newhaven town centre is isolated in an island of traffic and is a choke point of the coast road, especially with the swing bridge operations that have timings dictated by the tide rather than traffic flow. The incinerator currently under construction will certainly increase the movement of lorries in and out of the area which will reduce the life span of the roads with this extra wear and tear. The development of this waste facility could also increase the number of ships needing to pass through the bridge which will add to the traffic congestion.</p>	<p>The problems of severance and congestion in Newhaven are acknowledged and the strategy for resolving some of the problems and investigating potential solutions to accommodate the further development of the town and port is set out in the final document.</p>	
2 3	<p>Why does the survey not include Lewes or Ditchling, both of which have horrendous traffic problems? What's so special about Eastbourne, Hailsham and Polegate, Bexhill and Hastings, Newhaven and Uckfield. Why is my council tax being spent on these areas and not equally on ALL areas that have traffic problems? I object to this.</p>	<p>Our statutory duties and the four priority services areas of road safety, highway maintenance, passenger and community transport apply equally across the county. The four spatial priority areas for investment in transport infrastructure are chosen because it is the County Council's policy to regenerate Bexhill, Hastings and Newhaven and because of the prospect of large scale development in the Eastbourne /south Wealden and Uckfield areas. These focus investment where the economic, social and development pressures are greatest. Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.</p>	

3	I feel these is a need to look at the rural areas of the County and far too often the likes of Eastbourne are provided with support. What about to the East of the County. For your information - Travelling East - East Sussex continues after Hastings	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
19	Newhaven is desperately in need of a good transport policy.	Newhaven is one of the four priority areas for transport investment in the county and our aspirations for improvements to the infrastructure underpinning people's ability to travel more efficiently and sustainably are set out in the plan.	
3	It is important to remember rural locations who need an up to date transport system so as to be able to get to the towns to work and to shop. Don't forget the villages.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
18	Unable to form an opinion due to inaccessible information for the everyday person.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
3	Priority areas are not relevant to Barcombe Parish	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
15	Planning and Providing infrastructure: Bexhill/Hastings Spatial priority areas: issues and comments relate to the numbered interventions in the draft LTP) 1. Strategic improvements to the A21 including the Baldslow Link, Kippings Cross to Lamberhurst and Flimwell to Robertsbridge have all been cancelled as part of the CSR programme. Clarity is sought on strategy alternatives as these schemes are not progressing.	Despite the cancellation of these schemes we will continue to press for these improvements to be included in future programmes as they are important to the economic regeneration of Bexhill and Hastings and their connectivity with Kent, London and beyond.	
1 8	2. RDC welcomes and supports joint working with stakeholders and partners to improve strategic rail infrastructure. Improving transport networks to the wider South East is a key component of East Sussex Community Strategy: Pride of Place. It is important to improve capability and shorten journey times of strategic and local rail services. Support is given to working with the rail operators and Network Rail.	Noted.	
15	3. Stronger wording is required on the implementation of the schemes listed in the criteria. The schemes listed are connected to the implementation of the Link Road. The decision on the Link Road has been deferred until the end of the 2011. Clear guidance on the implications of Link Road decision being deferred until the end of 2011.	We await the decision on the Link Road and will investigate other options should funding be denied.	

15	<p>4. The policy covers many routes and corridors, but clarity is needed on how the policy is to be implemented and monitored. Clarification is sought on how this policy will be implemented and monitored. It is considered that Bexhill town centre is a particular priority for investment in creating effective and attractive routes – see also comment in relation to 9 below.</p>	<p>Implementation of the plan requires flexibility in the face of uncertainty as to funding streams whether from Government, developer contributions or bidding success. Each year an Implementation Plan will be published which will give details of the schemes to be delivered for the year ahead and indicative plans for the short and medium term.</p>	
1 5	<p>5. RDC supports the introduction of the Quality Bus Partnership in Bexhill. RDC would like the criteria to include commitments to extend the Quality Bus Partnership routes to key service providers like the Conquest Hospital and Bexhill and Hastings college. Amend text to include key service hubs such as the Conquest Hospital and Bexhill and Hastings College.</p>	<p>The document has been amended to include reference to key service hubs such as the Conquest Hospital and Bexhill and Hastings College.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
6 7	<p>6. Increased use of low carbon forms of public transport, walking and cycling improves health and well being and air quality by reducing congestion. Walking and cycling need significant continuing investment to create safer and more convenient routes. The existing cycle network in Rother is fragmented and of varying quality. To facilitate cycling and a shift away from car transport this network needs to be expanded, linked together and the quality improved. New cycle routes could comprise of bespoke facilities such as off-road cycle paths or clearly signed routes along existing 'quiet' roads with crossing points where needed. To achieve the maximum benefit, new cycle routes would need to link communities to existing cycle routes and to employment centres. That is, from rural areas to routes into towns and business parks. Commitment should be made to involve organisations with expertise with cycling such Sustrans and local cycle groups in the process. Amend text.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy of 'Sustainable Growth' supports the objective of increased journeys being made by sustainable means. The criteria for considering new routes and facilities for cyclists is set out in the strategy and prioritises urban utility cycling journeys. The County Council already works with partners such as Sustrans and local cycling groups and will continue to do so. A network of routes has been indentified for Bexhill, in conjunction with Sustrans and local cycle groups, and this is being used to help secure development contributions to enable the delivery of routes between residential areas and key trip attractors.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
11 4	<p>7. Greater emphasis should be placed on the continued promotion of 'Smarter Choices' measures. It is an opportunity to focus on schemes that will lead to cultural change – addressing transport behaviours and encouraging modal shift through localised solutions and investment in education/awareness. LTP3 should embrace a more holistic approach to street design – acknowledging the many functions of streets, the wide range of stakeholders in our streets and the changing ways that people and communities are becoming involved in the design of their towns and streets. Amend text to reflect this.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy of 'Sustainable Growth' does include the use of 'Smarter Choices' interventions including the provision of information, travel planning and the promotion of benefits of sustainable travel choices. The importance of public realm schemes and addressing the 'clutter' which prevents public spaces and streets achieving the highest standards of attractiveness is acknowledge in the document.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>



15	<p>Rother District Council considers an immediate review of existing LATS would be appropriate. LTP3 should commit to a new programme of development of LATS to reflect current economic, physical and social considerations. Good transport planning should be based on sound, current evidence.</p> <p>LTP3 should include a commitment to review existing LATS and as a priority progress with the Bexhill and Hastings LATS in tandem with the BHLR programme.</p>	<p>The Bexhill and Hastings LATS was developed with the BHLR as a crucial part of the future transport infrastructure of the area. In recognition of the deferral of a decision on funding and construction of the road, the LATS is 'on hold'. However, further work is being undertaken on a traffic model looking at the period to 2016 without the BHLR but with current growth scenarios. This will inform the decisions on housing delivery and growth for Rother and Hastings Councils. There is currently no plan to review existing LATS.</p>	
5	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Bexhill/Hastings</p> <p>We acknowledge that the provision of transport infrastructure is required in the Bexhill and Hastings area to accommodate the level of housing supply that has been allocated in the LDF process. The outcome of the CSR however has had implications for the County's aim for an improved connection to the M25 via the A21. As has already been indicated the A21 schemes in East Sussex have been cancelled.</p> <p>We support measures such as a Quality Bus Partnership for Bexhill and are happy to consider journey time reliability measures for bus journeys on the A259 and A21 since this approach could offer a more attractive alternative to the private car.</p>	<p>Noted. The A21 schemes remain an aspiration and therefore will continue to be included in our Local Transport Plan.</p>	
15 9	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Eastbourne/Hailsham/Polegate</p> <p>The level of housing supply allocated in Wealden District's LDF could result in increased stress on the SRN particularly in the Polegate area where the proposed development at Honey Farm is expected to have an impact. Therefore we would encourage measures that reduce network stress in this area. While the scheme to build a parkway station west of Polegate may have benefits in terms of offering an alternative to private car, it may also result on additional traffic on the SRN as vehicles travel to and from the station. Therefore we would wish to be involved in the consultation for this scheme from an early stage.</p>	<p>East Sussex County Council will continue to work closely with the Highways Agency in all proposals affecting the strategic road network. Should the Honey Farm development take place there is a requirement for the developer to deliver a number of improvements to the Strategic Road Network to mitigate the impact of the development.</p>	

15	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Eastbourne/Hailsham/Polegate</p> <p>5 While we support the principle of the Folkington Link Road, we will not be funding the scheme but would co-operate with the County if a funding source were to be found. Additionally, we would be interested to receive further details on the junction improvements the County propose for the A27/A22 Pevensey Roundabout and the A22/Dittons Road Roundabout.</p> <p>We would welcome improvements to bus services in the area that could dampen demand on the road network.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The improvements to the A27/A22 Pevensey Roundabout and the A22/Dittons Rd Roundabout are improvements which will be delivered by the Honey Farm development should it be approved by the inspector. There is a requirement for the Highways Agency to report back to the Department for Transport on the strategic need for the Folkington Link (Regional Funding Advice from the Regional Transport Board to Secretary of State/ DfT Feb 2009)</p>	
5 6 7	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Newhaven</p> <p>Developments detailed in Lewes' LDF are likely to impact the A26 and A27 and we therefore support proposed improvements to public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure which may dampen demand on the SRN.</p> <p>We welcome our continuing work with regards to the expansion of the Newhaven Port.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
15	<p>Planning and provision of infrastructure: Uckfield and Rest of County</p> <p>It may be beneficial to identify travel patterns in the County between the various local authorities to determine where traffic travels to/from to see if transport connections between authorities require more attention. It is these travel patterns within the County which potentially have the greatest impact on the SRN and key local roads and this could be assessed using data from the Office of National Statistics (Census data).</p>	<p>Agreed, though we do monitor traffic flow and numbers of vehicles on all strategic corridors of movement across the county.</p>	
1	<p>The inclusion of Hastings/Bexhill as a spatial priority area is very much welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
15	<p>Section 1 is about promoting the improvement of strategic infrastructure such as the Link Road, the Baldslow Link and various improvements to the A21 - in the light of recent Government announcements, this section will need to be updated; however the Hastings Bexhill link road is of primary importance to strategic infrastructure planning in East Sussex and Hastings Council strongly supports the need to deliver the link road and would like ESCC to confirm in the LTP that this is the most important capital transport scheme in the county.</p>	<p>The importance of the Bexhill Hastings Link Road to the strategic infrastructure of the county is underlined in this LTP and also in the bidding document for the Local Enterprise Partnership with Kent and Greater Essex. We are continuing to work on our final proposals for funding for the BHLR to submit to the Government to inform their decision on its implementation.</p>	

8	Section 2 is about lobbying for rail improvements and whilst it is appreciated that we need to get better rail communications and achieve modal shift from road to rail (which will require substantial investment and is not likely in the short term) - the Plan needs to be clearer about what is happening in the meantime re rail transport strategy - also it is noted that the draft LTP focuses more on roads than railways - some further explanation of the reasons why might be appropriate. The policy needs to make clear that the Wilting Station idea is aspirational - recent appraisal work has indicated that the station provision would be very expensive ( approx £18m) and technically challenging.	There are no plans to update the existing rail development strategy. Our aspirations and plans for rail are set out in LTP3. We have no statutory responsibility for rail but we continue to work with the rail industry to discuss issues of importance to the residents of East Sussex. Wilting Station and many of the rail infrastructure improvements are aspirational, but are included in our strategy because of the benefits they would bring to the people of East Sussex.	
15	Section 3 is about 'investigating' complementary measures for the Bexhill/Hastings Link Road such as bus priority measures and junction improvement schemes. ESCC should be encouraged to provide a stronger statement of support for these measures, based around words like 'designing' and 'implementing'.	The document has been amended to include the word 'deliver' rather than 'investigate'.	Document amended
7	Section 4 - this is about focussing on key walking routes and corridors of movement, but this needs strengthening as there is no information about whether this focus is backed up by any resources for implementing improvements.	Additional text on funding and resources for implementing schemes has been added to the document	Document amended
5	Section 5 relates to continuation of the Hastings Quality Bus Partnership - this commitment should be supported.	Noted.	
5 15	Section 6 is about developing a Quality Bus Partnership for Bexhill, concentrating on improving bus services along the A259 between Hastings and Bexhill. It is clearly stated that this is subject to funding being available; however, the policy could be strengthened if possible sources of funding were clearly identified along with a time frame for implementation.	Discussions are already underway with partners about the best way to take forward a QBP for Bexhill. Once the QBP is under way, identification of the most appropriate measures to improve services in the area will be considered and it is at this point that funding will need to be identified. It may come from a range of sources but in the current economic climate there is no certainty on the level or when it will be available. Individual schemes with funding sources will be identified in the LTP Implementation Plan.	
6 7	Section 7 relates to development and implementation of cycle and walking routes, but again is caveated to be subject to funding being identified. -the policy is welcome as it links in with and gives clear support to policies being developed as part of the Hastings Local Development Framework Core Strategy; however, the policy could be strengthened if possible sources of funding in addition to developer contributions were clearly identified along with a time frame for implementation.	Work is ongoing to establish funding streams and consequent timeframes for implementation of all aspects of the preferred strategy. Individual schemes with funding sources will be identified in the LTP Implementation Plan.	

15	<p>Section 8 is about the effective management of on street parking in Hastings. The Borough Council has made its views clear on the need to retain local management of this function to ensure it supports the needs of the residents and businesses in a town with high levels of deprivation and fragile economy, as well as reducing congestion of the road network and improving the efficiency of public transport.</p>	Noted.	
11	<p>Section 9 is about continued promotion of Smarter Choices measures and initiatives. These are likely to be an essential component of future traffic and transport management - particularly with the uncertainty over the Link Road and the likelihood of future Government funding for transport initiatives being linked closely to demand management and 'softer' solutions. Initial (unpublished) transport modelling work undertaken to establish the impact of strategic development in the LDFs of Hastings and Rother has indicated that even with the Link Road development there will be significant traffic pressures at road junctions throughout Hastings. This means that HBC should request that the LTP3 should make a strong commitment to developing a specific costed and phased Smarter Choices Plan as part of a Local Area Transport Strategy for the Hastings/Bexhill area.</p>	<p>The emerging Local Area Transport Strategy (LATS) for Bexhill and Hastings does identify the need for Smarter Choices measures to complement and make more effective the implementation of other infrastructure and the use of roadspace. Currently this is designed to work with the BHLR and once a final decision is made as to whether that scheme can be taken forward then the direction and emphasis on Smarter Choice measures will become clearer. In the meantime work continues on the specific types of measures listed such as school and workplace travel plans, improving journey information and enabling car sharing. It will also be for Hastings Borough Council to ensure that appropriate planning conditions for travel plans and associated measures are included and applied to housing and employment developments in the town.</p>	
16	<p>In Bexhill specifically we feel little has been done to fulfil LTP2s aims so we are concerned that although LTP3 talks a good talk there needs to be clear directions as to how the aspirations can become reality. The recent Bexhill High School with shared space in Turkey Road and Gunter's Lane together with Canada Way cycle path and the Connect 2 Bexhill-St. Leonards coastal route are fantastic news and examples of what can be achieved. We don't accept that we are being impatient or unreasonable to expect more as there have been some huge sums spent in Bexhill without any cycle provision.</p>	Noted.	

1	<p>3) Bexhill – Hastings Link Road, Glyne Gap roundabout on A259 has one of the highest polluting areas in East Sussex. This is down to congestion at peak times. The construction of the Link Road would help to reduce this. The Link Road is vital to the growth and prosperity of East Sussex also the only way to open up new land for housing. Creating more housing within towns without restricting vehicle access is not sustainable. Demolishing a large house and creating more properties, mainly flats, increases the number of vehicles competing for the same space in towns is not a sustainable option.</p> <p>The Link road needs to be built if the target of 5600 extra homes is to be achieved. The Link Road design has a Greenway alongside which would encourage sustainable forms of travel. The homes and businesses also created will increase traffic but not necessarily carbon emissions if it reduces congestion on other routes and alternative eco friendly vehicles are used.</p>	<p>The Bexhill Hastings Link Road is fully supported by this LTP as well as the complementary measures designed to increase the use of sustainable forms fo transport.</p>	
6	<p>Cycle Paths – We welcome specifically the comment “There is also an opportunity to promote the National Cycle Network (NCN) along the coast and also north-south via the proposed Avenue Verte, a cycle route from London to Paris. This would increase the opportunities for ‘cycle tourism’ and as a sustainable option for utility cycling for residents between local communities.”</p> <p>This is exactly what we have been saying for over 15years and Bexhill is a missing link in the network. Please work together with Rother for a safe route along the seafront, ie the Promenade, to encourage new user groups who currently use motorised transport. Pedestrian priority should be maintained and a speed limit with a code of good practice for cyclists. This works not just in other countries but also in other towns in UK and Sussex.</p>	<p>We are continuing to work with partners including local councils and cycle groups to establish safe cycle routes and to promote cycling an attractive form of travel in the Bexhill area.</p>	
6	<p>Point 5.52 is most welcome, the only way we see to have a safe route is for it to be traffic free, which means using the Promenade which is predominately 16 m wide and could easily accommodate this at little or no cost. The key aims of the LTP could be achieved by developing this and funds should be relocated for this. Once a piece of infrastructure is built it becomes a long term usable ESCC asset with in this case minimal maintenance which can be carried out by volunteer schemes like Sustrans Ranger programme.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

6	<p>In 2011 the Bexhill to Hastings cycle and walk way, running behind the beach, is to be constructed. This is thanks to the successful, Sustrans led, Connect 2 Lottery grant application, supported by HUB and Bexhill cycle groups and to the ESCC funding contribution. This will have a significant impact on cycling to work and school and recreational cycling for all age groups.</p> <p>In addition Hastings Borough Council reacted positively to the HUB petition to the Cabinet in 2010 (calling for a reasonable and annual funding commitment for cycling improvements) and have agreed to be extend the promenade cycle way to the Stade in the Old Town and to work with HUB to develop more provision for safer cycle routes.</p> <p>Finally, the plan of proposed cycle routes in Hastings, which HUB was involved in producing, has now been included in the LTP3 and in the Hastings Local Development Framework.</p> <p>These very positive developments are warmly welcomed by HUB but it is vital that this level of commitment is maintained in the years to come, if Hastings and St .Leonards is to get the cycling infrastructure that is so badly needed.</p>	Noted.	
6	<p>The new cycling facilities relevant to Hastings and St. Leonards – The Bexhill to Hastings NCN link, The NCN Promenade extension, A cycle link through the Town Centre and the Pebsham Country Park Cycle tracks (provided that they link in with cycle routes into the urban area) are, of course welcomed.</p> <p>The support in the LTP3 for other NCN cycle route improvements and inner urban links associated with the Hastings Greenway concept and the extremely important ‘work and educational cycle route links to the Town Centre, are also very much welcomed</p>	Noted.	
16  13	<p>However, HUB is concerned about the lack of a clear budget commitment to fund this cycling improvement work and the heavy bias towards road improvements, parking and other investment aimed at car use. This surely contradicts the aim of seeking a major shift in transport options away form car use and towards cycling and other alternatives.</p> <p>Many people, who support initiatives to reduce car use and promote more environmentally beneficial and healthy alternatives, of which cycling is a undoubtedly one of the best options, would argue that the huge investment in the Hastings to Bexhill Link Road could be better spent on alternative transport investment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Work is ongoing to establish funding streams and consequent timeframes for implementation of all aspects of the preferred strategy. Individual schemes and the source of funding for delivery will be identified in future LTP Implementation Plans.</p>	

6	HUB want to see a definite 5 year programme of cycle route improvements and cycle safety work in Hastings and across East Sussex, with an annual budget commitment and a pro active investment of time in seeking external funding. This will need to be based on a partnership between the local authorities, in collaboration with HUB, Sustrans and other cycling groups. In Hastings Borough, HUB would like to see a strategic group to plan cycling improvements, established from the key agencies and organisations to follow on from the Bexhill to Hastings Link project group.	Work is ongoing to establish funding streams and consequent timeframes for implementation of all aspects of the preferred strategy. Individual schemes and the source of funding for delivery will be identified in future LTP Implementation Plans.	
6	HUB calls for a definite plan of action to implement the Proposed Hastings Cycle Routes Plan over a period of years, with appropriate prioritisation, funding and a development programme.	Work is ongoing to establish funding streams and consequent timeframes for implementation of all aspects of the preferred strategy. Individual schemes and the source of funding for delivery will be identified in future LTP Implementation Plans.	
10	However, HUB is well aware that many people, who would like to cycle (to get to work, an educational establishment, or for shopping or for health and recreational purposes), do not do so because of the inherently difficult and dangerous road system in Hastings. Consequently, major improvements in cycling infrastructure – cycle lanes, off road cycle ways and shared use cycling/walking areas – are vital to make real progress on these initiatives.	Noted.	
5	There is a vast amount of traffic travelling daily between Eastbourne and Hailsham. This could be greatly reduced if the bus service were improved and made more affordable. Bus/cycle lanes should be introduced all the way from the Cophall roundabout to the centre of Eastbourne. This would make bus journey times shorter. Only such a reallocation of road space will encourage people to leave their cars at home and try the bus.	The Eastbourne Quality Bus Partnership will be focusing on improvements for buses across the whole area but this corridor will feature particularly. The Hailsham / Eastbourne corridor is identified as one of the key measures to help deliver sustainable economic growth in the Eastbourne / south Wealden area.	
6	Improvements need to be made to road layouts to encourage more cycling. For example, the Cophall roundabout (junction of A27 and A22) just north of Polegate is a total no-go area for cyclists, due to fast-moving and free-flowing traffic.	Noted.	
17	Newhaven Port and Properties Ltd set out their future development options for the port which will entail limited, moderate or extensive expansion of the port.	Noted.	

17	<p>North Quay</p> <p>North Quay does not lie within the Eastside area of Newhaven but forms part of the masterplanning process. The land at North Quay is subject of a 999 year lease, it is likely that the businesses (mainly aggregate based) in this area will be kept in operation, although some of the berths at North Quay require maintenance works to be undertaken so that they can be brought back into use. The northern area of North Quay is in use as a Waste to Energy Plant operated by Veolia. This was approved under planning application reference LW/462/CM (EIA).</p>	Noted.	
17 8	<p>Railway Quay</p> <p>In terms of Railway Quay, it is our view that this area forms a transition into the Port and should read as a soft edge towards the gradual progression to the working area of the Port. The main opportunity within this area lies with the listed Marine Workshop which could act as a focal point to the entrance of the Port. The use of this area for a low activity public use would be supported by NPP, it was suggested at the latest Stakeholder Workshop that the Marine Workshop could be used for a café/museum/workshops and maritime related business units. The surrounding areas could be used to support the leisure/marine industry currently served by the Marina, this could be in the form of a boat hoist for repairs or dry staking. These uses could all be linked in with a transport interchange which would provide a sustainable way to visit the Port, in addition to the existing railway. The southern boundary of this land could be used as the entrance way into the operational part of the Port.</p>	Noted.	



2 15	<p>The work undertaken by the Government in relation to the draft National Planning Statement for Ports should be taken into account, this document identified a “compelling need for substantial additional port capacity over the next 20-30 years, to be met by development already consented, and development for which applications have yet to be received.” (Paragraph 1.11.12). This document also highlights the desirability of connecting Ports to the rest of the transport network and in particular a trans modal shift from road to shipping and rail (Paragraph 1.10.3). The use of rail-freight has not been discussed at length by the draft LTP, and with the Ports direct connection to the rail network it is considered that this is a significant opportunity for the Port and Newhaven, and this itself could be linked with the waste to energy plant at North Quay with the potential for the sustainable transportation of the bottom ash. Furthermore, the rail link and associated opportunities have not been discussed in relation to Newhaven Port in the draft Freight Strategy. This is a disappointing omission.</p>	<p>The County Council supports the sustainable transportation of freight on rail, and the benefits of enabling freight on rail at certain locations in East Sussex, most notably at Newhaven, are recognised. The document and background paper have been amended to reflect these points.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
17	<p>The second Local Transport Strategy (2006-2011) did note the potential for rail to freight in East Sussex, and the potential of a connection to Newhaven Port. On page 172, the strategy notes “The Port at Newhaven, in particular, has the distinct advantage of having existing rail links, which could potentially be made capable of providing a rail freight link from the quayside.” It seems unfortunate that the current draft LTP does not highlight this potential, taking into account the fact that Newhaven Port is the only Port in the County to have such an advantage. In general, it is considered that the Port has a number of advantages, being the shortest trip from London to Paris, connected by rail, road and sea, as well as the potential for a transport interchange and a freight to rail facility. We therefore consider that the Port offers significant economic and sustainable transport opportunities to the County.</p>	<p>see above</p>	

15	<p>It is noted that at 5.71 – 5.83 the limitations and opportunities at Newhaven are discussed in more detail. It seems unfortunate that the detail contained here seems to have been largely sourced from the ‘vision’ for Newhaven that has been produced by Newhaven Town Council. We have shared our views with Newhaven Town Council on their ‘vision’ for Newhaven on a number of occasions. It is our view that the level of residential development proposed by the Town Council is unsustainable in terms of the generation of traffic within the Town..... It is considered that the provision of residential development in those locations identified within the ‘vision’ prepared by Newhaven Town Council, would make it difficult to sustainably support the large-scale redevelopment of the Port without harming the local transport network. <i>continued below</i></p>	Noted.	
	<p>Whilst we recognise that matters relating to planning and land use are largely dealt with by LDC, highway considerations within Newhaven are clearly important and could dictate the level of development within the Town. We consider that the transport implications of any future Core Strategy or Neighbourhood Plan should be considered carefully with the prime consideration being the need to deliver sustainable economic growth in Newhaven.</p>	Noted.	
1 15	<p>Paragraph 3.4 proposes Newhaven, and specifically its economic revitalisation, as a principal project area. Paragraph 5.75 of the draft LTP recognises the importance that Newhaven Port has to play in the regeneration of Newhaven, and is correct in that NPP’s principle focus is on the continuance and strengthening of the ferry service at Newhaven Port. We agree with the comments at these paragraphs, and consider that the redevelopment of Newhaven Port is vital for the regeneration of Newhaven as a whole. Newhaven is the shortest way to travel from London to Paris, and is the only Port along the South East Coast that is directly connected to the rail network. It is considered that the connection of rail, sea and road at Newhaven presents a perfect opportunity for developing a strong industrial and employment sector in the Town and hence County. As stated above, in order that this is fully realised the transport strategy for Newhaven must be considered carefully with subsequent implications on the type and level of development that is planned and allowed within the Town.</p>	Noted.	

15	<p>Paragraph 5.76 of the draft LTP refers to the access road granted permission and commenced (but not delivered) to the east side of Newhaven. It is referred to throughout the draft LTP as the Port Access Road. It is not considered that this is appropriate given that the 'Access Road' also provides the only access to the Eastside Business Area, required to bring this area of land to the east of Newhaven into use.</p>	<p>Noted. The Access Road to the east of the port remains an aspiration and until such time that the Port decides on their access strategy through their masterplan, it will remain a potential route to gain access to the southern part of the port.</p>	
15	<p>It should be emphasised that the proposed access road does not only provide access to the Port but also to the Eastside Business Area to the north and east of the Port. It is therefore considered unfortunate that the 'Access Road', is referred to as the 'Port Access Road', and not something more general, such as the 'Eastside Access Road'. In going forward, it is considered that this is a more appropriate naming strategy for the road because, as noted above, its name suggests its only purpose is to provide access to the Port which is incorrect.</p>	<p>Noted. See comment above.</p>	
15	<p>Further to the point made above, the Port already has road access from Railway Road off The Drove, as well as rail access and access by sea as already noted above. The current and historical access to the Port has always been from Railway Road and Beach Road. It is unlikely that this arrangement will change in the short term. We consider that access to a redeveloped Port could be adequately provided from Railway Road, with some minor alterations to the current Port entrance area. In some circumstances, it is considered that this access would be preferable over the permitted access road, given that the permitted access road is only likely to be built on the back of significant residential development that would make the movement of large-freight vehicles difficult (where previously it was planned to be built with business units). Furthermore, the cost of implementing the access road is very considerable, particularly at the southern end with the need to bridge over the railway and the creek.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

15	<p>Furthermore, the cost of implementing the access road is very considerable, particularly at the southern end with the need to bridge over the railway and the creek. Certainly, provision of the 'Access Road' would not be viable or justifiable on the back of port related development. The current access provisions are also considered more appropriate, as the use of this road does not pass through residential areas but on one side has Port related development, and on the other has industrial, storage and business units. In any case, the cost of providing the final section of the 'Access Road' from Pargut Roundabout into the Port, which includes a bridge over the rail-track and creek, would be prohibitively expensive and insistence upon it would undermine the overall port redevelopment project. <i>continued below</i></p>	Noted.	
	<p>On this basis, NPP have been moving forward with their Masterplan with the likelihood that the access road would not be achievable, or even preferable, given the points raised above. In this case, any potential application at the Port would likely be submitted utilising the existing but upgraded access and rearranged entrance facilities into the Port. It is recognised that this would require robust justification in terms of the proposals effect on the transport network. We submit that an acceptable means of access for a redeveloped Port could be achieved without the need for development of the Access Road. If the Local Authority and the Highways Authority are not able to support such measures it is unlikely that the Port redevelopment would be viable.</p>	Noted.	
1	<p>It is worth noting, however, that NPP are generally supportive of the provision of a transport interchange in Newhaven.</p>	Noted.	
8	<p>The draft LTP fails to recognise the potential to reinstate a rail service into the Port itself with the possibility of the formation of a rail to freight facility. NPP have been in talks with Network Rail to discuss the possibility of buying the rail track that lies within their land to enable this to be moved with the result that further land within the Port is released for Port use. However, there is future potential for reinstatement of the station and rail track for use with freight, and at initial meetings Network Rail have been supportive of the provision of such. It is, therefore, disappointing that this has not been discussed or supported within the draft LTP, or the draft Freight Strategy.</p>	<p>The County Council recognises the potential for freight to rail at Newhaven and the final document has been amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

1 3	I can agree that all the towns identified should have greater priority than Crowborough but disagree that the content within the strategy does not even attempt to address the local economy needs of Crowborough. In fact, to say that access to supermarkets in north wealden is an issue - Crowborough has 5 supermarkets!!!! I think that the proximity of Tunbridge Wells to our town leads me to believe that Crowborough has a greater synergy with Tun Wells/Kent in which case there is more of a case for its inclusion in Kent than East Sussex; perhaps future boundary changes should take account of that.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas. The reference is to the ability of people to access supermarkets, including those at Crowborough, by public transport, walking and cycling rather than the number of supermarkets in the area.	
13	You have focussed on the road link for Bexhill and Hastings - this will be hugely expensive and money could be better spent on improving safety for cyclists at roundabouts.	We are applying to the Department for Transport for funding for the BHLR which constitutes a 'major scheme' whereas funding for cyclists or safety schemes comes out of our local integrated transport budget or potentially from a successful bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.	
13 15	More emphasis should be given to public transport improvements and getting people out of their cars. Because of their deeper social and structural problems, Hastings and Newhaven should be the priority areas for new investment. Hastings and Bexhill's strategy should be geared to the metro / railway proposal rather than tarmac over the beautiful surrounding countryside - the proposed ring road will only displace the congestion from Bexhill Road to the Ridge anyway. In Newhaven the ring road needs to be reconfigured so that it does not strangle the town centre. It needs to be contained to the north of the town centre thereby allowing the opportunity to re-connect the harbourside.	The preferred strategy of sustainable growth is aimed at supporting all forms of sustainable transport including public transport. Both Hastings and Newhaven are priority areas for investment but it is recognised that there are no easy solutions to the issues in either place. The need to look at the ring road in Newhaven has been identified in the strategy for the town. The metro/railway proposal has been considered previously as part of the SoComms work but ultimately any decision on increased frequency of services and new stations needs to be approved by the train operating companies and Network Rail.	

6	<p>We are concerned with cycling issues in the Lewes area so Newhaven is the area where we have most knowledge. The sections on cycling links for Newhaven (5.82-3 and page 121 box point 6) ignore links to Lewes which are likely to be beneficial to local residents and tourists and would enable sustainable access to the hostel being constructed near Southease station. These links (currently the C7 or the A26) are particularly poor for cyclists who could benefit from on and off-road improvements as funding becomes available. Our vision as provided to the Lewes District Council draft core strategy in summer 2010 is: Newhaven port and Lewes railway station will be gateways for sustainable tourism. Newhaven will be linked to Lewes town by a cycle route connecting the villages along the Ouse, serving both local utility and recreational users and increasingly popular with tourists including those arriving from Dieppe. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>The document has been amended to include reference to cycling links from Lewes and Newhaven into the South Downs.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
	<p>Walkers and cyclists arriving by train in Lewes will find good signed routes to the countryside and the South Downs, as well as the town's excellent range of shops, food and drink and accommodation providers. Seaford will have good cycle connections to the north (towards Beddingham) and east (towards Exceat), complementing the popular existing route to Newhaven</p>	<p><i>See comment above</i></p>	
19	<p>We the other areas have better everything than Hastings already.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
3	<p>My main concern here is that there will be no money left for investment anywhere else in the County, as these Towns have been made the priority for developement.</p>	<p>Much of the funding for transport measures necessitated by development is expected to come from developer contributions or, in the future, from the Community Infrastructure Levy . Schemes for other areas of the county can be considered through the scheme prioritisation framework but will be appraised against all schemes coming forward across the county.</p>	

8 6 13 5	<p>more investment in rail transport, even if only relatively minor- ie increase the number of carriages and have one that carries only cycles. so that a joined up sustainable transport system can be achieved plan around the fact that most people's journeys to work are less than 5 km and help them to avoid car use promote the connect2 west st leonards to Glyne Gap cycle/pedestrian route and enhance the link from Hastings to Bexhill to make it a real alternative to road transport, rather than road improvement spend more on cycle training and its promotion for both adults and children enable bikes to be carried on racks on buses to help with the hilliness of Hastings which deters many. Increase bus services into the evenings for areas in addition to Hollington. Provide designated space for cyclists at all traffic light junctions so that they can get away first</p>	<p>The County Council agrees that more investment should be made in the East Sussex railway. A list of aspirations are included in the strategy. There are limited numbers of carriages on the East Sussex rail network due to limited availability of diesel rolling stock, which leads to overcrowding on the lines, especially at peak times. Our and the Train Operators' priority is towards providing carriage space for passengers ahead of bicycles. Secure, covered cycle parking at stations is continuing to be provided, although it is acknowledged that some cyclists require their bicycle at both ends of their rail journey. We also encourage sustainable transport by means other than the private car, preferably walking and cycling, but otherwise rail and bus, and where these modes are not available, car sharing is promoted.</p>	
13	<p>We do not support the Bexhill-Hastings Link Road which would despoil the beautiful Combe Haven Valley. To support our argument, we would draw attention to the comments in the section on the Uckfield Priority Area with its references to unacceptable traffic congestion in the centre of the town. Uckfield has its fairly recent Bypass to the west of the town centre and yet it is already being said that the town centre is again congested. This would support other positive elements in the LTP3 in relation to the need for modal shift and the encouragement of public transport. In particular, this should include reducing the need to travel, particularly by car, by the integration of transport and land use planning. This is particularly important in rural areas such as those in many parts of East Sussex, where people have to drive more to carry out their daily needs as basic facilities close down. Also see Q9</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
3	<p>We feel there was too much emphasis on urban communities and that the needs of rural communities seems to have been forgotten as they are not featured in the LTP3 document at all. Some communities have answered this challenge by providing voluntary community transport (eg to provide access to local health providers) but without targeted finance to set the scheme up in the first place and/or the continued goodwill of volunteers to keep the schemes going rural communities will become more and more isolated</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas. Community Transport schemes are welcomed and will be supported especially where they can be operated sustainably and provide access to jobs and services.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

15 6	We note from the implementation plan that there are planned road works in many Eastbourne areas. You will realise that Seaside, the seafront and King's Drive could be key to improving the cycling route through Eastbourne. Could road maintenance have to be "signed off" by a team looking at sustainable options? Why are new schemes brought in (eg Enys Road to King's Drive) without a cycle filter lane? Similarly, attention to bridges could include the possibility of improved signage or path or facility for cyclists. It feels as if there is no joined-up thinking.	A cycling strategy for Eastbourne is currently being developed and will encourage liaison with maintenance and other transport planning and operations teams within this and partner organisations to make the most efficient use of opportunities to enhance cycle provision.	
15	BEXHILL/HASTINGS TASK FORCE – BEXHILL HASTINGS LINK ROAD The Strategy should acknowledge the uncertainty about whether this road will be built. The strategy should set out alternative transport initiatives to be implemented if the road is not built.	Noted.	
1	Newhaven Town Council welcomes the aspirations for transport network improvements for Newhaven in LTP3	Noted.	
17	Newhaven Town Council notes that it is now uncertain whether the Port Access Road will be required in the form which currently has planning permission.	Noted.	
1	Newhaven Town council strongly supports the proposal for a transport interchange on land adjacent to the existing town station.	Noted.	
5	Whilst it is understood that the second phase of improvements for buses along the A259 bus corridor is now on hold, the Council welcomes the continuing inclusion of this proposal in LTP3 and hopes it will be implemented in due course.	Noted.	
7 15	Newhaven Town Council welcomes the proposals to improve pedestrian links and safety to reduce community severance. In this connection it was particularly felt that more attention should be given to keeping paths free from overgrowing vegetation.	Noted.	
6	Newhaven Town Council strongly supports proposals to link existing sections of cycle route in the town to create a co-ordinated network. In this connection it was pointed out that Cycle Route 2 has a width restricting barrier at the top of Gibbon Road which prevents cycles with trailers passing through. It was also felt that the provision of cycle parking in the town centre should be highlighted as a priority.	Noted and document amended to include reference to the need for better cycle parking facilities.	Document amended
1 8	Newhaven Town Council is pleased to see that aspirations to reinstate the Lewes/Uckfield line are included in LTP3.	Noted.	

12	Newhaven. (page116) The proposal to improve access and facilities at the Town and Harbour stations is supported as is the required action to improve integration of timetables between ferries, train and public busses at these stations.	Noted.	
5 15	The commitment to collaborative partnership working with Brighton & Hove City Council to deliver public transport improvements on routes between the county and the city is also welcomed. However, clarification is sought about the status of the proposed improvements to the bus route between Newhaven and Telscombe Cliffs (listed in LTP2 as the second phase of the A259 Quality Bus Corridor scheme). The early design of these improvements, together with a programme for their implementation, is essential in order to achieve the necessary developer funding through Section 106 Agreements to pay for them. The early implementation of 'real time' information on the 28/29 bus route to and from Brighton would also be beneficial.	Noted.	
1 16	The identification of Newhaven as one of the priority areas for the planning and provision of transport infrastructure is welcomed in view of the pressing need to achieve the economic regeneration of the town and port. However, whilst acknowledging the difficulties in terms of estimating the likely levels of available funding in the future, it is disappointing to note that almost all of the measures identified in LTP3 to improve transport infrastructure provision in the town appear to be long-term aspirations rather than short-term, deliverable improvements.	The transport modelling work for Lewes District Council will inform the proposals for Newhaven and time frames for delivery will depend on funding streams but are not necessarily long term.	
15	In particular, the County Council needs to re-assure itself that the expectation that the Port will construct the second phase of the Port Access Road, as stated in paragraph 5.76 of the LTP3 strategy, remains realistic. It is District Council's understanding that the Port is now investigating alternative options for achieving improved access and, in this respect, the statement in Appendix A that any proposed port improvements will be dependent on the completion of the Port Access Road to help facilitate the development of the outer port is a cause for concern. It would be helpful if the County Council could clarify the situation by confirming that, whilst the Port Access Road remains the preferred option for enabling improvements at the port, as the local transport authority it is willing to consider other technically feasible alternatives for providing an improved means of access, as identified in the BBP study for example.	The document has been updated and amended to reflect the changed position re the Port Access Road. The Access Road to the east of the port remains an aspiration and until such time that the Port decides on their access strategy through their masterplan, it will remain as a potential route to gain access to the southern part of the port.	Document amended

15	Clarification is also sought about the level of anticipated development in Newhaven that formed the basis for the County Council's analysis of the impact on the transport network in the town and its conclusions about the required package of transport measures and infrastructure to mitigate this development (LTP3 paragraph 3.15 refers). An indication of how this necessary infrastructure is intended to be funded and the assumptions made about the broad locations of future development in the town would also be helpful in terms of informing the Council's emerging LDF Core Strategy.	The County Council is continuing to work with Lewes District Council as the Planning Authority to ensure that the levels of proposed development can be adequately supported by existing and enhanced transport infrastructure. Developer contributions will be required to mitigate the impact of the development on the transport network. Work is beginning on transport modelling for the town which will inform the planning process.	
15	Whilst acknowledging that the town of Lewes is not one of the identified spatial priority areas in the draft LTP3, the land at North Street is a potential strategic development site which may be brought forward through the LDF Core Strategy. It would therefore be useful if the document recognised the possible transport requirements of any future development in this location, particularly in the light of the County Council's commitment to model the impact of local planning authorities' spatial strategies on the existing transport infrastructure and to consider what interventions could ensure sustainable development while mitigating any negative impacts (LTP3 paragraph 3.13 refers).	The document has been amended to reflect the potential development of land at North Street, Lewes and the implications for transport. Modelling work is also due to be undertaken for the town of Lewes and this will enable potential developments to be assessed in terms of their impact on the transport infrastructure and networks.	Document amended
4	Table 7-1 shows the likely significant effects of Eastbourne/Hailsham/Polegate as a priority area for infrastructure investment. Landscape and heritage has been scored as a minor negative effect however, the Folkington link and possibly the parkway station west of Polegate (subject to location) are considered to have a major negative visual impact on the South Downs National Park.	Noted. Currently both of these schemes are aspirational and there is no assurance of delivery in the short to medium term. Should that situation change much more work would be done to assess the environmental impacts of the schemes.	
8	The Council supports the inclusion of a new station west of Polegate but would also support an additional train station (halt) at Stone Cross/North Langney. This will give the local community a park and ride travel alternative for access to the Town Centre and supports sustainable travel opportunities for proposed housing development in south Wealden.	Providing two additional stations at Stone Cross and in the Polegate locality would not be appropriate. This would increase journey times significantly as the train would not be able to pick up speed between stations positioned so close together. It is unlikely that there would be a business case for providing two stations in such close proximity, and it is envisaged a new station in either the Stone Cross / Polegate locality would provide a rail service for passengers arising from the development proposed in south Wealden.	
6	The Council recommends that item 4 in the section 'Planning and Providing Infrastructure in Eastbourne and South Wealden', is expanded to include cycle links to educational, leisure, industrial, recreational, health centres and commercial areas.	A Cycling Strategy is being developed for Eastbourne which can incorporate these aspirations. The document has been amended to reflect this point.	Document amended

15	Eastbourne Borough Council supports a fair parking management scheme, but the Local Transport Plan needs to be flexible on the detail of implementation. The Council has already stated its view that effective management can be achieved by alternative means to charging. Managing the demand for parking needs to fully understand the impact on the community and businesses, before the implementation of any detailed proposals.	The document has been amended to give greater clarity on parking management. The County Council is currently working with Eastbourne Borough Council to aid them in the production of a Parking Strategy.	Document amended
15	Reinstatement of the Willingdon Chord is not supported by the Council. The reinstatement could mean a reduction in rail services to and from Eastbourne. As the town is a key Service provider for the surrounding area an efficient and frequent train service into the town is critical. The reintroduction of the Chord will reduce the convenience of access to Eastbourne thereby working against sustainability policies of reducing car travel. Furthermore, Network Rail's own Sussex Route Utilisation Strategy (2010) undertook an assessment into reinstating the Willingdon Chord and it was not recommended as the demand did not justify the additional service and construction cost.	The County Council supports the reinstatement of the Willingdon Chord, and continues to do so on the proviso that there would be no reduction in the existing rail passenger service to Eastbourne. This was reflected in our response to the Sussex Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS).	
8	The Council would seek the support of ESCC for the inclusion of a reference in the LTP to improving the rail connection between Eastbourne and London. The Council's aspiration is to see greater frequency, faster travel times and more carriages on this important route.	Whilst the Route Utilisation Strategies do not identify specific infrastructure improvements for East Sussex, journey time improvements can be achieved through improved signalling which in turn opens up opportunities for increased frequency of services. We are also seeking an increase in rolling stock on all our lines as demand and patronage continue to increase.	
15	Finally, since the County published the draft LTP, the Council has commissioned a piece of work looking at the supply and demand for parking across the borough as part of the evidence base for the Town Centre Area Action Plan. It is suggested that a reference to this new piece of work could be made in LTP3.	The document has been amended to refer to this work.	Document amended

15 13	<p>The Bexhill to Hastings Link Road (BHLR) is there still. (plus Wilting Farm station and a parkway station at Polegate), but the Enterprise East Sussex LEP whose job it would be to deliver this has now disappeared to be replaced by the E Sx, Kent and Essex LEP. BHLR is the second most polluting local authority road scheme in the country. (Written parliamentary answer, Gillian Merron, MP, 17.5.07). It also appears to be very poor value for a very large sum of money. More serious is the risk and doubt around funding for the BHLR. It is demonstrably a very poor scheme in terms of benefit to cost ration (bcr). Its future is in jeopardy, yet there is no 'plan 'B'. we think this is dangerous.</p>	<p>Noted. The Bexhill Hastings Link Road is the top priority for the County Council in helping to deliver regeneration in the area. Our estimate of the benefit cost ratio is 3.75 to 4 which represents good value for money.</p>	
11	<p>General comment: Workplace Travel Plans are absent in Bexhill and Hastings. This suggests that any review of bus services (along with investigating potential for improved access to stations, or new stations) should demonstrate an awareness of the potential for WTPs to support these and grow the market while reducing dependence on the private car and on ESCC support.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
15	<p>5.40 This section is riddled with assertions and inaccuracies and embarrassing to read. The A259 is not the 'sole east-west transport corridor at this point of the coast'. There is a railway line. And in any case, it is overwhelmingly used as a 'local road' for very short trips. Data exists to clearly show this.</p> <p>The '180 degree' argument crops up every few years. In this case it means that for Hastings and Bexhill, the sea is a big problem. The only solution is of course to move the towns to somewhere just outside Guildford! Similarly, Mount Caburn is a massive constraint on the growth of Lewes, while the Thames creates all sorts of north - south communication problems for London..... This is called geography. It should be remembered (and appears to have been forgotten) that the sea is one of the county's greatest assets. To live on, or to be able to visit the very special place which is the coast, is a cause for celebration. This amounts to 'talking down' Hastings and Bexhill and is both regrettable and unjustifiable.</p>	<p>The document has been amended to refer to the railway between Bexhill and Hastings.</p> <p>The paragraphs referred to describe some of the economic and development constraints in that area and the issues to which improved transport can contribute solutions. Reference is made to the rich and varied architectural, cultural and environmental heritage. This includes its seaside location.</p> <p>While the A259 is used for short journeys due to the proximity of the two towns, it is part of the strategic road network and does carry longer distance traffic as well.</p> <p>The 180 degree argument relates to the ability of the two towns to only focus on markets to the north which puts them at a disadvantage from this perspective but with acknowledged advantages with their location by the coast.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

13	5.41 and 5.42 are evidence that for ESCC, tackling car dependency and building sustainable transport networks for the future is seen as 'too difficult'. The BHLR takes us precisely the wrong direction away from a sustainable future. The same theme continues to 5.49. It is notable that at the time of the multi-modal study referred to, the cost of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road was estimated by the consultants carrying out the study (Halcrow) at £24m. The cost is now £100m.	The preferred strategy is one of sustainable growth. The BHLR is aimed at enabling growth both economic and developmental. If it does go ahead, which is now uncertain, there will be a raft of complementary measures designed both to mitigate the impact of the road and also to enable and encourage sustainable travel such as a greenway and bus priority measures on the A259.	
2	5.43 The complementary measures cited as potential enhancements of the 'positive impacts' of BHLR would all be undermined by the scheme. The 'Greenway' (cycle and horse riders' route alongside the BHLR) will not attract 'utility' cycle trips, or, for that matter, any recreational trips since it is alongside a busy road and on a gradient that would discourage large scale cycle useage. It has also negative impacts on the landscape of Combe Haven valley.	The greenway would enable access by local people and visitors to open green space and the Pebsham Countryside Park. The Connect2 cycle route will help to attract utility cycle trips between the two towns.	
15	5.43 - 5.48 This is a list of schemes associated with BHLR including the Hastings Spur Road (Gilsmans Hill) and the Wilting Farm 'parkway' station proposal. If BHLR goes, this list will almost disappear. This will be of benefit to those who would otherwise see an increase in urban 'rat running', particularly in the Wishing Tree area of St Leonards.	Noted. It is highlighted that these schemes are aspirational and would continue to be subject to investigation.	
5 7	5.49 - 5.56 We would support the Quality Bus Partnership schemes described here and the development of a cycle network. However, evening services are sparse and the poor evening service to the Conquest Hospital is unacceptable as an alternative to the car. Since the draft LTP3 was written, we note that Baldslow Interchange has been cancelled. Attention to needs of pedestrians is also a direction we would support.	Noted.	
11 15	Workplace Travel Plans (there were none at all operating in the two towns this time last year, despite commitments made nearly 10 years ago), and extension of parking controls are also aspirations we can support. (Parking: there is very over 'generous' parking provision in the new developments near and next to the station and bus interchange. To redress this peculiar and in transport terms, unhelpful situation, there should be compensatory reduction in/control of the parking provision elsewhere so as to support sustainable mode development.)	Noted. The parking provided as part of these developments accords with the parking standards for these types of development.	

13	P 107/108 Panel. Needs a recast to exclude focus on BHLR and related schemes. Welcome re-commitment to sustainable transport interventions. Many of these are featured in LTP1 and 2 so there has clearly been a lack of emphasis in the past. LTP3 should address this.	The plan supports both the Bexhill Hastings link road and also puts emphasis on sustainable modes of transport.	
13	p114 Panel. If 1 and 2 were suspended (A27/A271/A22 road schemes and Polegate parkway station investigations) and there was major movement on 3 - 7 (all of which deliver sustainable modes/outcomes), the need for 1 and 2 could be examined in the light of developments that would be far less car dependent. This should be accompanied by 'demand management' of private car trips and should begin ahead of the developments to avoid major and time (and money) wasting political battles such as we have seen in Eastbourne.	Work is already progressing on the Quality Bus Partnership and corridors, a cycling strategy, on street parking management and Smarter Choice initiatives for the Eastbourne area.	
14	5.73 Could emphasise the positive of the proximity of the South Downs National Park. Newhaven is a potential gateway for green tourism and without a great deal of imagination, could have a share in the tourism economy. The Ouse valley has a lot to offer.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended
15	5.85 Uckfield - Traffic flow improvement could make the car a more attractive option, heading us in the wrong direction. An element of demand management in Uckfield would be appropriate.	Noted. We are currently investigating the most appropriate solutions to deal with proposed development in Uckfield as identified in the Wealden LDF.	
15	5.137 We note that the regeneration effects of non-transport interventions are potentially and currently important in geographical areas where major transport interventions are planned. We say this because great claims are made for the future contribution of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road to regeneration objectives, while on the ground, the major positive effects of the higher and further education facilities in the town centre, and the relocation of SAGA to the town centre -along with a successful tourism season for the town - are much more relevant to regeneration than the BHLR and already successful.	The Bexhill Hastings link road is fully supported by this LTP as we believe it will create the right transport conditions for continued economic regeneration, help businesses to operate more efficiently and provide access to new housing and business development.	

15	<p>We greatly appreciate the close and joint working referred to in building our LDF, and have recently completed major pieces of research known as the South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Studies (SWETS), commissioned from ESCC jointly with Eastbourne. However, we are not aware that any of the above proposed transport interventions formed part of or were tested through the SWETS process. Their potential impact on our own and others' core strategies / spatial distribution of growth has not been tested. These have therefore not been included in our IDP, and if this is to be accommodated at some date in the future, the impact on the LDF growth scenarios, particularly regarding the location and spatial implications of this proposal, timescale and delivery mechanisms, need to be known in order to ensure that any realistic opportunities to deliver these improvements in the future are not lost.</p>	<p>We recognise that the IDP does not include elements of infrastructure where funding is unknown or where delivery will not occur within the plan period. The LTP includes reference to schemes that are long term aspirations for the county.</p>	
15  16	<p>Page 51 Transport implications for LTP3 - Road Network: We welcome the reference under this bullet point to future modelling work to be undertaken in the north Wealden area.</p> <p>However, as Uckfield is one of our key growth areas in Wealden, we would request that clear reference is made to the specific modelling exercises proposed for this area, particularly in relation to the quantum of new housing and employment growth in Uckfield and the pressure on town centre traffic as identified on page 53. Explicit mention should also be made of realistic implementation mechanisms for delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>The document has been amended to include reference to the modelling work being undertaken to look at the impact on transport networks of proposed development options. This will inform the investigation of various mitigating options for addressing that impact as well as proposing solutions to current stresses on the road network.</p>	Document amended

17	<p>Since the drafting of the LTP3 Consultation draft, further modelling work has been undertaken as part of the South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Study (SWETS). The following interventions have been agreed to support growth in this area, and have been included in the IDP supporting Wealden's pre-submission Core Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New road / junction improvements between Cophall Roundabout and the Folkington Link or equivalent (desirable improvement)</li> <li>• Signals at Cophall roundabout</li> <li>• Improvements at junctions between the A22 Jubilee Way, the A27 and Dittons Road</li> <li>• Junction improvements at the A2270 and Polegate High Street, and at the A2270 and Wannock Road</li> <li>• Improvements to Hempstead Lane junction to alleviate traffic congestion on the A271 and Hailsham Town Centre. (An alternative, but less effective solution to the A271 capacity constraints involves the re-design of the Boship roundabout).</li> <li>• Relieve town centre congestion and stress at Battle Road and London Road (Hailsham) through re-routing traffic to Summerheath Road, including signalised junctions.</li> <li>• Relieve town centre capacity issues through signal improvements at E</li> <li>• A2270 and A259 Quality Bus Corridors and Eastbourne - Hailsham ex</li> <li>• Uckfield Town Centre Road Scheme <i>continued below</i></li> </ul>	The document has been amended to include reference to the schemes that are agreed as necessary to support growth in the area.	Document amended
15	<p>We would request that that these additional interventions are added to the list at Para 5.62 on page 112, and to the list at point 1 on the table 'Planning and providing infrastructure: Eastbourne and south Wealden' on page 115. Again these should be accompanied by clear references as to by whom, by when, and how these will be delivered. This approach should be also be supported by and reflected in the accompanying action plans for LTP3.</p>	The document has been amended to include reference to the schemes that are agreed as necessary to support growth in the area. Much of the funding for transport measures necessitated by development is expected to come from developer contributions or, in the future, from the Community Infrastructure Levy .	Document amended
15	<p>Our concerns regarding the parkway station - referred to under 1.d. of the table on page 115, are given above. However, further early investigation into the provision of a parkway station is considered essential to assess the viability of this proposal. This will ensure that potential opportunities to help fund any scheme arising from projected growth are not lost.</p>	Noted.	

15	We support the focus given in para 5.84/5.85 on pages 122 and 123, regarding the traffic levels in Uckfield Town Centre and efforts of the partners to find an appropriate solution, to enable the level of growth envisaged in Wealden's the pre-submission Core Strategy. However, we would stress the importance of early resolution of this particular issue, and the need to clearly identify alignment, costs and phasing as a top priority so that current problems are addressed and the future growth of Uckfield in line with the LDF pre-submission Core Strategy is adequately supported by infrastructure improvements.	Work is being undertaken on a traffic model for Uckfield so that various options can be assessed.	
8 15	We support the County Council's aspirations to reinstate the Lewes/Uckfield railway line, and the desire to ensure that any future traffic improvements in Uckfield town centre do not prejudice this aspiration. However, this should not delay the planning, design and implementation of essential road improvement works in Uckfield town centre which have been identified as necessary for some considerable period of time.	Noted.	
6	We are concerned that the focus on Newhaven is for cycle routes that support local utility trips. The strategy, in considering cycle routes of less than 5km, continually underestimates the effectiveness of cycling as a means of transport between towns. Newhaven, along with Seaford, urgently requires improvements for routes toward Brighton, between Newhaven and Seaford and North toward Lewes and the rest of the county.	Noted. However, the county's cycle strategy prioritises urban utility cycling routes and will only consider recreational routes where they are externally funded.	
3	Whilst we do understand the need for the provision of infrastructure to be focused on the four areas of key spatial growth this is very much to the detriment of rural communities like ours that find themselves living on the arteries to such sites. Our community needs support from you with traffic calming measures. Newhaven is earmarked for residential development, the incinerator will soon be operational, there are plans to develop the port & a wind farm. This will put intolerable pressure on the C7 which you acknowledge to be narrow & of poor alignment & passing through small communities.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended

8	<p>Whilst the Bexhill Hastings Link Road is now on hold an alternative needs to be addresssed for the future, taking into account all the previous issues raised and Government spending review and the consequential local authority cuts.</p> <p>My proposal is to reopen and rebuild the old railway line from the London Rd area (Sidley) to Crowhurst with a viaduct being built to minimise disruption to wildlife and areas of scientific interest and natural beauty. The viaduct could have look out viewing areas with a new station at upper Wilting area linking to West St Leonards station. Also reconsider reopening Glyne Gap station. Then limit traffic 7-9 am and 4-6 pm introducing a small congestion charge between these times and improve the number of buses and parking spaces at the stations to enable workers between Hastings, Bexhill and Eastbourne to achieve ease of travelling with less impact on the environment.</p>	<p>In terms of building a new railway line from the London Road area to Crowhurst, including a viaduct, this is not an option the County Council is considering. An existing railway line runs from Hastings to London calling at Crowhurst. There is also a rail link along the East Coastway calling at Bexhill, and a change can be made at Hastings/St Leonards for those wishing to travel on the Hastings - London line. However, it is recognised that journey time and frequencies could be improved and these are sought by the County Council and will be included in the LTP3 strategy. The County Council supports a new station at Wilting. With regard to a station at Glyne Gap, this proposal is supported by the County Council and can be seen in the rail infrastructure improvements list.</p>	Document amended
13	Bexhill - Hastings Link Road will destroy the Combe Valley and should be dropped.	Noted. The Link Road is the top priority for the regeneration of Bexhill and Hastings.	

Any other comments		ESCC response	
Code	Are there any other comments that you would like to make about this Local Transport plan?		
1	In general the plan sets out a healthier, more environmentally friendly and more accessible transport policy. I hope the council and planners can stick to their own policy without falling back on the easier "more cars need more roads" policies of the past.	Noted. Many aspects of the strategy are aimed at making sustainable forms of transport attractive in order to reduce the number of journeys made by car.	
	As it is a lengthy document and a 15 year plan I will address any comments I wish to make in an email as I feel this space may be insufficient.	Noted	
2	I will reinforce, why cut the help you give to the few children that travel to Kent for a Church School. Stop saying the right things and start doing the right things. Understand that one size will not fit all and study what is really needed. Car sharing schemes do not work, better transport systems do work. line up buses and train timetables is a good start. Stop throwing money at areas where there is no return. If the crop doesn't grow in the poor soil, there is nothing to reap. (There is no point in planting it)	The preferred strategy gives a general way forward but does not dictate a one size fits all approach.	
16	These aims will cost money and I thought that the Government were asking for cutbacks - how will this be funded or is the plan just cleverly diguised cutbacks?	Funding issues are described in the strategy and the situation at the time of publication was set out in the Implementation Plan. While some government funding streams have been changed and simplified, other funds have to be bid for. All schemes and potential interventions will be assessed in terms of their value for money as well as their effectiveness at addresssing the issues and challenges in the county.	
13	Greater emphasis on encouraging residents to use public or green transport. There should be incentives given to use public or green transport.	Noted.	
5	I welcome the opportunity to talk to someone about my proposals for the Hastings No. 27 bus service. I have spoken to neighbours and other users of this bus and have been encouraged to start a campaign to have the timing for the last bus of the day changed as well as to increase weekend service.	Comments have been passed to the Passenger Transport team and will be incorporated in the responses to the Hastings and Rother Review of bus services.	

5 6	Public transport links to the University campuses in Eastbourne could be dramatically improved by: 1) Having the Bus route from Brighton go down Beachey Hill Rd and stopping near the Darley Rd and Welkin sites. 2) Having a direct bus from the train station to the University campuses rather than a ridiculously slow one that meanders through Eastbourne (its quicker to walk) 3) Having the Unizone rail scheme extended to include Eastbourne (and Hastings) as well as the Brighton area where it currently exists. There should also be many more cycle lanes in Eastbourne and cycling on seafront should be allowed in dedicate lanes (as in Brighton - where less space and more people!)	Comments re bus services have been passed to our Passenger Transport team to be passed on to bus operators and inform the Quality Bus Partnership for Eastbourne . Extension of the Unizone rail scheme is the decision of the train operating company though ESCC supports the idea and will continue to lobby for it. The focus of the developing cycling strategy for Eastbourne is described in the strategy chapter.	
15	I do not support a cycle path on the seafront between Wish Tower and foot of Downs unless it is fenced off to prevent accidents between pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted. Comments have been passed to the Transport Planning team for their consideration regarding the proposed route.	
1	Ensuring that the transport network continues to work is essential to any economic growth in the county.	Noted	
2 3	Repeat:- Why does the survey not include Lewes or Ditchling, both of which have horrendous traffic problems? What's so special about Eastbourne, Hailsham and Polegate, Bexhill and Hastings, Newhaven and Uckfield. Why is my council tax being spent on these areas and not equally on ALL areas that have traffic problems? I object to this.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas. Our statutory duties and the four priority services areas apply equally across the county. The four areas mentioned are priority areas for investment in transport infrastructure because of the County Council's policy of regenerating Bexhill/Hastings and Newhaven and because of the prospect of large scale development in the Eastbourne / south Wealden and Uckfield areas. These focus investment where the economic, social and development pressures are greatest. The strategy includes criteria for considering schemes for other areas of the county.	Document amended
15	The plan could reference and draw on the AONB management plans for the High Weald and South Downs designated landscape areas, and seek to reflect the landscape priorities in the LTP. For instance routeways are a significant component of AONB character and provide a range of access and network links through the landscape which can help connect people to the landscape and its goods and service and help the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty	Management plans for both areas are referred to in the executive summary and in the local policy context and have been used to inform the plan. Conservation and enhancement of the characteristics of the High Weald and the South Downs is included in the environmental challenges and elaborated on in Background Paper B. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) assessed the LTP3 objectives and strategies to help inform the choice of the preferred strategy. LTP3 includes the objective "Contribute to the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment."	

6	To encourage more to cycle, on road cycle lanes where vehicles will park is not the answer as can be shown in Cooden Drive, Bexhill. It is better than nothing but the only solution is to provide safe traffic free routes using, improving and connecting existing infrastructure eg. Bexhill promenade as a safe recreational and utility route which could be part of NCN2 instead of using the road. There have been several accidents on the A259 involving cyclists and a safer route should be encouraged.	Work is continuing to develop schemes which achieve safe, coherent cycling routes in accordance with our cycling strategy.	
3 11 5	I do think it worthy of revisiting the rural areas of the county and providing some additional support particular with better and more integrated travel plans - E.G There are no bus services through many of villages after 5pm - yet many residents would welcome transportation to attend activities beyond that time - in particular younger people	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas. Access issues, particularly outside peak times, are recognised as a challenge. Where commercial services are not viable the County Council does subsidise some services where they will be value for money, and there are opportunities for community transport schemes to be developed by communities to address issues at a local level.	Document amended
11 13	I would like to have seen Option 2 – Changing Travel Behaviour (greater emphasis on tackling climate change) - given the greatest emphasis.	Noted.	
15 5	Please ask the local community what their needs are and take these on board. It's all very well having a strategy if it works for the community. Good example is : Saturday buses from Framfield to Uckfield - if you work at 9.00 - you're late in by the time you've walked to your place of work and not able to get home if you work after 4.30pm - last bus leaves then. So many cars have to go into the town to pick up people. What is the sense in that. Also we have no quick access to Brighton from Uckfield unless we get the bus in which takes 1.5 hours or you drive. When there not a lot of price difference in some car parking charges, which would you choose? Again - not very green either...!?	We will continue to consult local communities as to the issues they face particularly in accessing services and key centres. We will also continue to work with commercial bus operators and operators of community transport schemes to improve services and local connectivity so that people can travel by more sustainable means than the private car.	
18	Not the plan but this consultation document. Question 3 - all the questions within it run together and are not separated by spaces so it is almost impossible to read/ Also many of the priorities/aims are full of jargon - please use plain English!	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	
5	Earlier and later buses needed for satellite towns to connect with major rail services in Brighton etc to allow workers to reach London in time to start work if forced to get coaches into London. Maybe reducing frequency during the day to set off cost of earlier and later buses.	We will continue to work with bus and train operators to integrate timetables where possible and improve the availability of hours of service.	

3	The most eastern part of the county, where I live and work, is the worst served in East Sussex for road and rail connections - the failure of successive governments, both national and regional, to improve and upgrade these vital arteries has left those of us who live here as "poor relations" when compared to the rest of Sussex and most of Kent too. It is stifling economic growth and adding to the misery which the recession has inflicted on us, and I believe that we will take longer to recover prosperity as a result.	Noted.	
3 5	I don't see anything about the need that exists for bus services to villages and remote areas. I live in Chiddingly and run an attraction there. No one can get to it by public transport at the weekend.	The plan does recognise the need for better accessibility for people in remote areas of the county, particularly to essential services and key centres.	
2	Some specific objectives rather than general waffle would be nice.	The objectives are set out in the plan and the document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	
8	Encourage the CC to be pro-actively pro-rail	The County Council is very supportive of rail and proactive in its lobbying of the rail industry for improvements to lines and services across East Sussex and beyond.	
5	Newick needs buses to run early and late between Uckfield / Haywards Heath for commuters to London / Brighton. This would reduce cars on the road if this happened.	We will continue to work with bus and train operators to integrate timetables where possible and improve the availability of hours of service.	
13 6 7	I think that funding for sustainable transport could be ring-fenced and not compete against roads development and highway maintenance. The document talks about promoting sustainable transport but there is little evidence of actual cycling facilities being provided. Improvement to footpaths promotes leisure walking and is not suitable for utility walking or as an alternative to car usage.	Noted. The document is providing a strategy for the future so has not given details of cycle facilities currently being provided but they do include improved cycle parking at stations, schools and in public places, the first phase of the Ringmer to Lewes cycle route and various other schemes underway in accordance with our cycle strategy.	
15	poor links to the hospital. Very expensive public transport.	The plan does recognise the need for better accessibility for people particularly to essential services and key centres.	
16	Non specific about how this will be achieved. Cost associated - plan and carry over to users. Usable for all community members. Time frames, times of buses	The details of how we will deliver the strategy will be published in an annual LTP Implementation Plan.	
15 4	Snow should not stop transport unless significant. European countries can still operate in it. Climate change considerations need to reflect the recent experiences - snow.	Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies are working to minimise disruption from severe weather events and the Secretary of State for Transport has asked Network Rail to examine the case for replacing the third rail in southern England with alternative systems that are more resilient to severe winter weather. The County Council has ensured that access to bus depots is included in the gritting routes.	
18	Very difficult to access the LTP. Too in depth, time consuming	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended

18	So huge and detailed - would have benefited from the executive summary.	An Executive Summary was provided at the beginning of the draft document. The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
	LTP3 is simply lacking in detail and vision as regards the needs of rural areas in the County. The emphasis on such as Community Transport and Accesssibility Strategy Assessment areas as rural solutions are unconvincing because of lack of detail. The "Rest of the county" should have its own dedicated Transport Strategy designed to meet actual future transport needs. See letter/ email filed separately.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
18	Far too long! Most of the population won't be tempted to read a 180 page document, which let's face it isn't particularly easy to read and understand.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
14 4	It is concerned, however, that little emphasis is placed on the creation of the South Downs National Park, and indeed there are parts of the draft document such as para 4.1 that seem to ignore it. Other parts such as 3.30 do not recognise that the existing South Downs Management Plan will be overtaken in due course by the Management Plan on which the National Park Authority (NPA) have started a consultation process. The advent of the National Park in parts of the County and particularly the inclusion of the whole of the town of Lewes in it mean that ESCC should have regard to s.62 of the Environment Act 1995 and give greater attention to transport matters in that area. At present the plan places emphasis on those towns where ESCC perceives economic development should take place but this needs to be balanced by the need to consider the new obligation which the National Park places on ESCC. Specific proposals should therefore be included to meet this obligation in much the same way as specific proposals are put forward for the towns regarded as priority spatial areas.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended
15 14	There does not appear to be any mention of ESCC bringing back in house on 1st April the rights of way functions currently carried out on their behalf by the South Downs Joint Committee (SDJC). Whilst the draft document refers to the existing Rights of Way Improvement Plan this change may affect the priorities in it. In particular ESCC should ensure that the maintenance standards achieved by SDJC are not allowed to decline. ESCC should also work closely with the NPA on access matters, since the NPA will be the access authority, and to improve the signposting of walking routes out of the town and into the rural part of the National Park	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended

4	Other more general environmental matters that should be addressed in the plan are the need to reduce traffic noise by using appropriate road surfacing on busy roads and reducing light pollution from street lighting columns, particularly those in the countryside.	The issue of traffic noise is highlighted in the Issues/Challenges section and the maintenance approach set out in the strategy chapter.	Document amended
10	The Society agrees that improving safety should be one of the key objectives and that measures to reduce the speed of traffic should help in this regard. However this principle seems at odds with the procrastination that ESCC have shown over extending the current 20mph zones in Lewes.	We refer you to the Transport & Environment Lead Member report and decision on 26 July 2010 regarding a petition calling for a 20mph speed limit in Lewes. The request was not approved on the grounds that there were limited benefits in terms of speed reduction and accident savings and that neither the national or local criteria for such a scheme would be met.	
8 5	The Society supports the potential reopening of the Lewes to Uckfield railway line and retaining the rail link from Lewes to Ashford preferably coupled with more Eurostar trains stopping there. As far as bus transport is concerned the Society considers that the County Council should insist on those providing supported services using low emission buses.	Noted. The County Council does encourage the use of low emission vehicles particularly on its supported services. When tendering for services a certain element of the decision is based on 'quality indicators' which include the provision of low emission vehicles, however, there is a fine balance to be struck between this requirement and the price of the service and, should we insist on low emission vehicles, we would be able to buy in far fewer services. We do require the use of vehicles with a registration no earlier than 2000 complying with a European standard.	
15	The Plan needs to be flexible and not be fixed to either a point in time or a context that may change significantly over the life-time of the document. Ensure that LTP3 is flexible and can respond effectively to changes at national and local levels.	Noted. The document does reflect the policy direction of the recently published Transport White Paper	
15	The coalition Government has placed an emphasis on localism. It is not clear from the draft LTP3 how this can be achieved. Put mechanisms into place to ensure localism is at the heart of the process.	The document has been amended to give greater clarity on our approach to the issue of localism.	Document amended
18	It is not easy to relate the summary paper to the main document. Amend the executive summary accordingly.	The Executive Summary is a precis of the content of the full document and will be updated to reflect changes made to the final document.	Document amended
15	para 2.6 the High Level Objectives It is noted that 5 goals set out in LTP3 are aspirational, but these are too broad. To relate to stakeholders more effectively these goals need to be localised, with the objective to establishing clear and measurable goals relevant specifically to East Sussex. Refine the objectives to reflect the local agenda.	In the examination of local issues which was part of the draft plan and now supports it as a background document, the local agenda is central to the objectives and strategy contained in the document. The five goals also reflect the five national transport goals of the Department for Transport. The transport specific objectives have been identified to relate these goals to the local issues in East Sussex.	

1	<p>para 2.18 - Support the provision of infrastructure around four geographical areas where spatial growth and /or economic growth will take place. Bexhill and Hastings are identified as one of those areas. Support focus on Bexhill and Hastings.</p>	Noted.	
16	<p>General - LTP3 should reflect the general economic climate especially after the CSR. Many of the strategies listed in LTP3 will not be fully implemented. Review existing strategies and present a viable programme that will reflect the economic reality.</p>	<p>The strategy is designed to be sufficiently flexible to respond to a changing economic climate over the life of LTP3. The current economic reality will be the central factor in the LTP Implementation Plan which will be published each year.</p>	
15	<p>para 3.4 - Clarity is sought on the role of Local Enterprise Partnerships and the delivery of the principal project areas. LEP will be driven by private sector enterprise and subsequently it could form an important source of future funding. It is envisaged public sector spending will be very limited in the short and medium term then potential funding streams should be explored fully. Local Enterprise Partnership (LEPs) will drive the sub-regional economic agenda. Inevitably planning and transport will play an integral part in realising that agenda. LTP3 should align itself with LEP issues to ensure East Sussex is at the forefront for opportunity.</p>	<p>We believe that LTP is well aligned with the aspirations for East Sussex as outlined in the bidding document for LEP. We understand the LEP is taking the opportunity to bid for funding from the Regional Growth Fund although details are not yet available.</p>	

15	<p>Cross Boundary Working Para 4.21 to para 4.25  With reference to Paragraph 4.21 to 4.25 of LTP3 Rother District Council supports the LTP3 objective to work across administrative boundaries on wider transport issues. Strategic infrastructure such as rail and trunk roads traverse across the county, people's transport needs do not recognise administrative boundaries. Consideration should be given to working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that, as far as possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. joint proposals are developed for important cross-boundary corridors of travel;</li> <li>b. significant proposals close to administrative boundaries are discussed on a joint basis;</li> <li>c. links are developed to support economic regeneration on a regional and sub-regional level;</li> <li>d. public transport ticketing systems and concessionary fares arrangements are developed to assist cross-boundary travel;</li> <li>e. transport strategy objectives are not undermined by incompatible policies.</li> </ul> <p>LTP3 to include a mechanism to formally advocate effective cross boundary working.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and work is already ongoing with neighbouring authorities on all points.</p>	
15	<p>General  Accept that over the lifetime of LTP3 there will be less resources available to invest in transport schemes and interventions across East Sussex. It is therefore important that clear priorities are set out within the SPA areas.  Some of the schemes identified in the SPA have been cancelled because of the recent cuts announced in the CSR. Clarity is sought on the SPA strategy. It should be made explicit that the guiding principal for SPAs is Sustainable Growth. This is not clear. At the moment, it is an aspirational infrastructure programme.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the document to reflect the decisions made in the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review particularly regarding the strategic improvements needed in some of the spatial priority areas. The preferred strategy of 'Sustainable Growth' is the guiding principle for all areas. Whilst some of the schemes have been cancelled as part of the CSR they remain aspirations and we consider them important in delivering sustainable economic growth in the county. Therefore we will continue to lobby for their future consideration by Government.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

<p>16</p> <p>15</p>	<p>Implementation - Funding will be limited over the lifetime of LTP3. There should not be overreliance on developer contributions through traditional S106 agreements for funding. It is important that ESCC as the Highway Authority seeks innovative delivery mechanisms for highway projects and that it fully explores opportunities to deliver projects jointly with other bodies in a manner which meets joint objectives. Draft LTP3 does not fully explore these opportunities; this is a missed opportunity.</p> <p>Support to investigate the Community Infrastructure Levy as a source of funding. The evidence to support a future levy will be provided by Localism Bill. In order to effectively deliver LTP3 reference must be made to Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs).</p> <p>Commitment is sought to update the LATS programme in the final version of LTP3. Amend text to reflect emerging IDPs.</p>	<p>The document has been amended to refer to the fact that the County Council will work with partners to explore all available opportunities for potential funding including the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
<p>15</p> <p>10</p>	<p>Transport and the Wider Context</p> <p>The County have identified the level of housing which each Borough and District Council was expected to deliver by 2026. One consideration of our review of the LTP3 is to determine whether the preferred strategy will help mitigate the impact of these developments on the SRN.</p> <p>We welcome our continuing work together to reduce the number of road traffic accidents through our involvement on the Casualty Reduction Steering Group.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>15</p> <p>9</p>	<p>Local Picture</p> <p>Four road infrastructure schemes are identified which would help deliver spatial and economic growth to the County. However you identify that these schemes were subject to the outcome of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR). As you are most likely aware, the A21 Tonbridge – Pembury dualling will now remain in planning stage until at least 2015 and the other schemes on the A21 have been cancelled. However, the A23 Handcross to Warninglid scheme will go ahead as planned.</p> <p>The LTP3 will need to reflect the outcome of the CSR and we would encourage the County to identify alternative methods of reducing network stress where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. The document has been amended to reflect the decisions made in the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review. The A21 schemes still remain aspirations and are seen as important to help improve connectivity and journey time reliability into and out of the county. Therefore we will continue to lobby for those improvements and for their future consideration by Government.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

1	We acknowledge that the County identify the need to work together with West Sussex, Brighton & Hove, and Kent as schemes and developments in these regions can impact on East Sussex, including traffic on the SRN. For instance improvements to public transport between Brighton and Newhaven could provide an alternative to using the A27 and A26.	Noted.	
	We note that it is your County's intention to lobby for improvements to the strategic transport links to Europe focus on rail as opposed to road.	Noted.	
16 1	We understand that the early Implementation Plan is presently unable to provide full details on how funding for the LTP3 strategies is likely to be prioritised as it will be a number of months before the County are able to establish how the CSR will impact available budgets. The broad types of Future Integrated Transport and Road Safety Schemes that you propose will be prioritised are appropriate in that they would support preferred strategy option 3 and we would recommend that the County adopts a forward planning approach.	Noted.	
15	Future Implementation Plans should be based on schemes with a realistic prospect of delivery and realistic estimates of the funding that is likely to be available, should outline the prioritisation of transport measures and detail of funding streams for measures proposed. It is advisable to produce a Sustainability Appraisal in order to assess the issues that could affect the plan and identify where mitigation is required to ensure the impact of the plan is acceptable.	The intention is to produce future LTP Implementation Plans which do include details of timescales and funding of schemes. The environmental implications of the LTP strategy have been assessed during the development of the plan through the Strategic Environmental Assessment (Appendix C) and have determined some elements of it. Individual schemes will be assessed for their impact on the environment and if necessary mitigation designed to reduce any detrimental impact.	
15	Clearly funding will dictate the pace at which your strategies can be delivered and your delivery plans will address this. It would be very helpful when you set out the outcomes within your delivery plan if you could indicate where your priorities could be dependent upon the delivery of improvements to the SRN and wider network measures. We look forward to working with you on your LTP3 where there are interactions with the SRN.	Noted.	

17	<p>Bexhill Wheelers and Classic Cycle Group are predominately a social cycle group interested in promoting safe and responsible cycling in Bexhill. We have an interest in seeing that the balance of investment in transport infrastructure changes from road to more sustainable forms. That is Walking, Cycling and in Public Transport. However that does not mean that we want a second rate road network which we have at present in East Sussex. This has primarily been caused through a sustained lack of funding as it is seen as an easy hit. Please find below my personal response to the LTP3 which combines most of the views of our local cycle group.</p> <p>The comments, observations and suggestions below are broadly in line with the in depth reply from Eastbourne Bespoke cycle group and also our members. Although individuals in both groups may disagree with some of the comments there is a consensus as to the general theme of improvements to our transport network.</p>	Noted.	
17	<p>I would also recommend the reading and incorporation into the LTP3 of the excellent "Making a Cycling Town" a Department of Transport publication. This is a compilation of practitioner's experiences from the Cycling Demonstration Towns programme of Cycling England. Within the document it shows what works, why and how to make it happen. Also the book "Two Billion Cars: Driving towards Sustainability by Daniel Sperling and Deborah Gordon which gives an illustration of where the future may go.</p>	Noted.	
16	<p>All the contents of LTP3 are extensions of LTP1 and 2 with more detail. For example in LTP2 it states "promote and improve facilities for walking, cycling and public transport, so these modes are safe and attractive options" also " continue to improve the environment for cyclists" We feel more could and should have been done for walkers and cyclists after these were produced. Is this just another plan without any hope of it becoming a reality?</p>	<p>The LTP is a strategy to guide the County Council's actions and investment in transport related measures over the next 15 years. It's success in delivery will be partly dependent on the levels of funding available but the priorities set out in the plan will be adhered to including the preferred strategy of 'Sustainable Growth' which will support measures to increase people's ability to travel by sustainable modes.</p>	

	<p>The Eastbourne Bespoke's response is both detailed and reflects by and large the same views as our group, with the following exceptions:-</p> <p>1) Parking – Just because a town enforces parking restrictions and has a clear policy which involves pay for parking it does not necessarily follow that it reduces business in towns. On the contrary it can and often does increase business. High spenders would prefer to go to a town where they know they can park and pay for the privilege. Both Hastings and Tunbridge Wells locally are shopping centres where the pay for parking is often full.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>6 8</p>	<p>2) Trains and Cycle provision - The rail networks must work efficiently, they have logistic problems in adding more carriages and passengers must come before cycles. They welcome folding bikes and as such they can be taken on any train free of charge. A reasonable compromise until we update our Victorian rail networks.</p>	<p>The County Council is working with the rail industry to improve cycle parking storage where required at railway stations in East Sussex. All cycle parking provided will be covered and CCTV provided. A railway station audit has recently been undertaken by the County Council to identify which stations would benefit from additional secure and covered cycle parking, which may negate the need for some cyclists to carry their bicycles on the train, and provide reassurance for others that their bicycle will be secure if it is left at the station.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Safety _ This month and year is the start of "Decade of Road Safety" where a United Nations Programme can reduce up to 5 million lives. Most of the deaths in East Sussex are caused by bad driving or road design. In the section regarding road safety there is no specific mention that ESCC has no motorways although i realise that it would fall under the Highways Agency it is still significant as a greater proportion of accidents occur on rural roads than motorways. Given that according to DTI statistics there has been a 56% reduction in car occupant deaths over the last 20years and the total road deaths has only marginally come down what specific plans are there to implement an education programme in how to drive on rural roads. Most fatalities occur on rural roads, DFT statistics Nov 2010, also speed is responsible for between only 8-14% of accidents, meaning that the balance is for other reasons. From that it is not unreasonable to assume that we have a specific driver problem in East Sussex that needs addressing. <i>cont'd below</i></p>	<p>There are a range of factors which contribute to fatal accidents on East Sussex roads, however the condition of the road is only rarely a contributory factor. We acknowledge that driver behaviour is an important contributory factor and targeted driver awareness and education is described as an important tool in our strategy for road safety.</p>	
	<p>Having said that it would appear that per thousand ESCC has a lower accident rate than both Kent and Surrey.</p> <p>There is little in your Plan regarding the important part that Driver Education and Encouragement of good practice can play. Where necessary correct and proper enforcement of the Road Traffic acts and the Highway Code need to be carried out in a last resort.</p>	<p><i>See comment above.</i></p>	

10 6	<p>The total of KSI figures show that UK has improved in some areas and not others. For example the number of total KSI's in England for motorised vehicles has reduced from 18332 in 2007 to 15453 in 2009, the number of KSI's on pedal cycles has increased from 2335 to 2470 in the same period, source DTI, <a href="http://reports.roadcasualtiesonline.org.uk/Reports/DisplayReport/310">http://reports.roadcasualtiesonline.org.uk/Reports/DisplayReport/310</a> . Given that the Institute of Advanced Motorists IAM report Deaths and Injuries on Britain's roads estimates that each death costs 1.79 million every KSI that fact alone should prove the need to invest more in safer off road shared use for walkers and cyclists as well as investment in public transport. Another fact that should be included or at least recognised is that between 2004 and 2009 in England total KSI's for motor vehicles reduced by 26%, for pedestrians by 19% however for cyclists there was an INCREASE of 17%. Again this fact should reflect in the investment made into traffic free infrastructure. The major reason for the reduction in motor safety is only partly due to better roads a major factor is vehicle safety.</p>	<p>Noted. Our safety strategy is based on the local situation and the statistics for casualties in East Sussex rather than national statistics which include the cities and large metropolitan areas.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
6	<p>The increase use of MPV / SUV's especially when transporting children on the school run results in congestion at these peak times and is something that needs to be addressed. These and most modern vehicles are much larger than earlier models resulting as can be seen from the statistics that it is the cyclist that suffers. The above should be considered in your plan and solutions developed to make cycling as relatively safe as vehicle use currently is.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
15	<p>If Bexhill is anything to go by driving standards are not improving, if fact they are probably getting worse, this could be due to people driving longer. I overheard a conversation last week in the doctors waiting room, "Do you realise" said one "my arm is so weak i can hardly hold this coffee cup" "yes i know" said the other My cataracts are so bad i can hardly see to pour the coffee" " i can't turn my head" said the third "because of my arthritis in my neck" "my blood pressure pills make me dizzy" commented the forth, adding "i guess that's the price we pay for getting old" "Well it's not all bad" piped the first "We should be thankful that we can still drive". Although comical in itself it addresses a very serious issue that the plan does not cover. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

	<p>With an ageing population, I've got to work for an extra 6 years as my wife's pension will start 6 years later than planned 10 years ago and the charts show we will all live longer. However will we all be fit enough to drive motor vehicles ?? The rise of motobility scooters will i think continue as we all live longer but not necessarily with complete mobility. More provision should be made to consider these new modes of transport.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>Parking and Road craft - In Bexhill we do not have a traffic warden and the parking of vehicles is a free for all. Every day you see vehicles: double parking, parking against the flow of traffic sometimes with their headlights on, parking on double yellow lines, zebra crossing chevrons, parking on bends, over dropped kerbs, near junctions, parking in loading or disabled bays. On main roads the use of driving and fog lights as well as headlights is on the increase all of which makes more dangerous for all user groups. Some of the above have undoubtedly been the cause of accidents which could have been avoided if good road craft were used. The correct infrastructure and consideration at planning stage could channel vehicles so it is not necessary for any of the above bad and dangerous practices. For example how many times have you seen someone park their vehicle outside a take away dangerously or causing an obstruction. There are many examples of take aways in Bexhill directly outside a Zebra Crossing. This should not be allowed to happen. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>Noted. The parking strategy highlights that we will continue to discuss with Rother District Council the role of civil parking enforcement in developing solutions to congestion, improving safety and achieving a better turnover of short term parking spaces which can have benefits for local businesses as parking space is not being filled up with longer term, all day parking. However any future solutions will be developed and delivered to address local issues.</p>	
	<p>Planners see it as a police duty to enforce the traffic laws and dissolve themselves of the resulting chaos. How are ESCC going to see that good road craft and the Highway code are followed ?? From a personal point i would like to see the roll out of civil parking enforcement to cover Bexhill. This would not prove popular, however this is probably the only way to achieve many of the aims of LTP3. Also ESCC is to be congratulated on the Pay to Park scheme for its own staff that is a standard by which others should follow.</p>	<p><i>See comment above.</i></p>	

15	<p>Use what we have - At these times where the talk is on austerity and budget cuts there has never been more reason to make better use of existing infrastructure. There are many footways that are used by cyclists at present which with little or no money could be opened up and encouragement given to their use. This would help achieve the aims of LTP3 quite easily and frankly this should have been done many years ago again refer to LTP2 and LTP1. In fact some of the ESCC own plans show a footpath as shared use but have a "No Cycling" sign.</p>	<p>Part of the strategy is to make best use and maximise the capacity of the infrastructure already in place.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
4 15	<p>Environment - Alternative fuel sources The LTP3 talks about climate change and reduce carbon output. However does not seem to look beyond 2026. In 1999 Rother said they would work together to achieve a network of cycle routes in Bexhill. The routes exist only on paper 12years on and nothing looks likely in the next 5 years although we remain as ever hopeful. If you plan only 2026 by that time technology and events would have overtaken you. You can't predict the future but you can plan for it. The only way forward is to accept and encourage that in Towns a sustainable traffic model is required, housing areas, schools, shops and hospitals a reduced speed shared space environment and between all roads that enable fast connectivity. Vehicles will be different in 20 years time, more fuel efficient, hybrid, electric and maybe hydrogen fuel cell this will mean an infrastructure to cope with this growing trend. Bio fuel is another alternative is it not possible for ESCC to establish schemes that encourage their development and use. It could be a good investment with our money.</p>	<p>Noted. The preferred strategy of 'Sustainable Growth ' does include the use of technology including the infrastructure that could support electric and other alternately fueled vehicles. The delivery of the network of cycle routes has been identified in the Infrastructure Plan for Bexhill and Hastings to deliver the LTP3 strategy of sustainable growth. The strategy has been amended to include reference to delivering infrastructure to encourage greater use of electric vehicles.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

15	<p>Economy - One reason transport is so important is that we have to travel more for a task that used to be carried out locally in the past. Bexhill Hospital has no minor injuries unit so we have to travel to Conquest in Hastings along a congested road. The similar applies to maternity units that close &amp; centralisation of Cancer facilities in Maidstone. The NHS is fantastic but requires us to travel for appointments. Decisions require an overall view of their consequences which is sadly sometimes lacking. Lack of local work opportunities means getting up around 4am for a 9-5 job in London then arriving home around 8pm. I know a few who do this, needs must and they do. So please try to work with the NHS to see if similar services can be opened up where people live and try to only employ local workers. Many a time you see someone carrying out a task and they have travelled miles when there could easily have been someone locally quite capable.</p>	<p>The LTP does commit us to work with other organisations and partners including the Primary Care Trusts (and GP consortia) and Public Health authorities to influence the way their services are delivered and the location of those services.</p>	
16	<p>Planning – The plan says you will “influence the way in which partners design and deliver their services so they are provided where people can access them sustainably, and minimise the need for the County Council or partners to provide specific transport interventions” With the Next Wave project specifically in Bexhill where there was an ideal opportunity to deliver a safe off road greenway along the promenade as part of the NCN2. Your partners feel that Transport is your responsibility and as such should provide funding to support safe routes. This is a clear case where for the last 100 years all the talk has produced nothing so far on the ground. With change of attitudes towards sustainable transport and the fact that the shift from vehicle use to alternatives has started it is ESCC’s duty to fulfil the aims of LTP.</p>	<p>Noted. Transport is a means to an end and not an end in itself and therefore it is the responsibility of the County Council along with its partners to deliver solutions which reduce the need to travel or provide and fund transport solutions. Whilst the County Council is the transport authority, and will take the lead on addressing many of the transport issues in the county, we also need to work with our partners to identify what is the most appropriate intervention is to tackle the issue we are trying to solve.</p> <p><i>See below</i></p>	
		<p>Whilst this may be through providing new transport infrastructure or new transport services, we also need to consider whether it is more cost effective and better value for money to look instead at how our partners design their services which means that people do not need to make additional car borne journeys. A good local example is the recent opening of the Medical Centre in Eastbourne Rail Station which means people can receive medical advice at the start or end of their journey to or from work, or whilst they are in Eastbourne for shopping/leisure. In the case of Next Wave project, the decision on whether an off-road route was provided along the promenade in Bexhill was dependent on the outcome of Rother’s byelaw review which was recently completed.</p>	

15	<p>Road Maintenance – 2010 has been a great year for seeing the temperature drop below freezing. Any school experiment will show that water expands when it turns to ice. Our roads are designed to be a sealed surface with sufficient depth to take the traffic expected. The construction usually takes place with good supervision and handed over with the desired structure. So what goes wrong? Services: Gas, Water, Electricity, Storm / Sewage Water, Cable and Telephony all need additions, alterations and maintenance. The co-ordination of District, Parish, Borough, Town, County Councils as well as Highways Agency together with the above services requires a level of competence that can try anyone's patience. However this is inevitably where most of the problems exist. Currently, in your past and in your future plan there is not sufficient emphasis placed on this important subject. What happens is a very good road is excavated, backfilled too hastily with incorrect material and inadequate compaction then finished with too thin a top coat.</p>	<p>As part of our network management duties we work with the utility companies to ensure that disruption from roadworks is kept to a minimum and that reinstatements are made to a high standard. This is highlighted in the maintenance section of the strategy.</p>	
	<p>The inevitable result is after traffic runs over the repair it heaves and a hole occurs which fills up with water turning to ice in winter. This cycle continues until an adequate repair is carried out, it is a time consuming and wasteful exercise which should be easy to stop. Although ESCC is not directly to blame it is responsible and currently costs us ratepayers a great deal of money which should be passed on to the Utility companies not ESCC ratepayers.</p> <p>The other cause of wear and tear of the road surface is the gutter being eroded by organic growth. Every road should have a strong weed killer used before any top coat is laid and regularly treated so weeds cannot destroy a surface. The same applies to the footways.</p>	<p><i>See comment above.</i></p>	
11	<p>School Travel Plans – It is easy to write a plan, however achieving it is the challenge. The STP's are a great idea however it seems that each school has followed the government template and substituted their own details. That is similar to the LTP'S. The problem lies in how to make that plan achievable. For example the government target was for a 5% increase in pupils cycling, the schools and ESCC have done very good work in providing extra covered cycle racks and training. It is outside that needs the focus. There needs to be schemes to move children in a safe way from where they live to where they learn by footways being opened up for safe shared use. This is achievable at a very low cost and will help with your LTP3's goals.</p>	<p>While guidance has been provided, School Travel Plans have been developed to address the issues that exist for individual schools and the Local Transport Plan for the particular issues and challenges of this county. It is acknowledged that improvements to encourage greater cycling need to focus on infrastructure and safe routes as well as facilities on school sites.</p>	

6	<p>Avenue Verte – London to Paris and back. Wonderful; travel used to be for pleasure as well as necessity. Now that is brought back to life with this scheme <a href="http://www.francobritishcycleplan.org/intro_en.html">http://www.francobritishcycleplan.org/intro_en.html</a> the Franco-British Cycle Plan with European Union Funding, is this not an opportunity to complete the missing link of Bexhill and create a safe traffic free section, please!</p>	<p>Work is continuing with our partner authorities to find the best approach to establishing the Avenue Verte as a viable safe route.</p>	
6	<p>Encouraging Cycling – 5.106 the ESCC Cycling Strategy seems to support existing cyclists, however is it not equally or even more important to encourage new user groups, young, old or groups who are no longer able to drive through eg: loss driving licence because of health issues. To do this safe traffic free routes need to be implemented, which is very low cost compared to alternatives. 5.109 very true many travel the same route by the same method and education to the alternatives is required to habit change. Bexhill has no manned TIC which could inform and encourage alternatives to cars.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
6	<p>Cycle Parking – Again much is to be encouraged in the LTP3 and the initiative on extra covered CCTV monitored cycle racks at every station has proved a great success. Cllr. Mathew Lock has observed as soon as they are erected they are full. So please could this excellent example continue to be extended to encourage increase usage at not just railway stations but also other destinations. Again specific cycle routes in and around stations would reduce vehicle traffic.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
6 15	<p>Rights of Way Improvement Plan – If ever there is an opportunity missed this is it. Numerous Rights of Way have a “No Cycling” sign on them which could easily be removed and replaced with a sign “Cyclists Slow – Give Way to Pedestrians” This attitude would encourage good responsible use of infrastructure and reduce vehicle traffic in time. In many instances Rights of Way are adjacent to railway lines and plant growth extends into the path making it dangerous for all users but especially children in push chairs. Could the county do more to make those responsible for overhanging foliage to clear before accidents happen ?</p>	<p>Paths are inspected in accordance with our Transport Asset Mangement Plan and vegetation maintenance is undertaken appropriately. Where we are made aware of overgrown vegetation, we do cut back if on the highway or write to the landowner and request they cut back.</p>	

15	Intelligent Transport Systems – Traffic signals have a “revert to all red” at night which seems a little silly. Should not main roads be kept on green so as to allow vehicles the unnecessary stopping and starting which besides being frustrating uses more fuel? Also can’t believe that the roll out of “Real Time Information” should be considered this technology is available and should be installed to encourage more to use public transport.	Traffic lights reverting to 'all red' is used at particular signal controlled junctions to slow traffic down on the approach to the junction and consequently improve safety. We have used this measure at two junctions, one in Heathfield and one in Hastings at the request of the respective local authorities. The roll out of Real Time Passenger information (RTPI) is funding dependent and will need to consider the changes in technology from radio to mobile phone systems.	
6	List of National Indicators – whilst it is important to have in the list the KSI's for road crashes and children these are on the decline, however KSI's for cyclists is on the increase. Hence this would indicate that not enough is being done for cyclists oppose other groups. That National Indicator should have been highlighted.	There is no national indicator specifically for the number of cyclists killed or seriously injured (KSI) but they are included in the broad KSI indicator.	
18	I note that LTP3 draft constitutes 212 pages excluding appendices. The former SEERA Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) that was issued in June 2002 was 97 pages while the SoComms Newsletter May 2002 was 18 pages and the core document of the former S.E Regional (SER) Plan dated January 2005 was 267 pages. To me LTP3 seems like a n East Sussex Plan in the style of the former SER Plan.	The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	
16	Difficulty identifying the proportion of the ESCC transport budget that has to be spent in order to comply with statutory requirements for maintenance of roads, bridges, culverts pedestrian crossings etc. Question as to whether all other work requires funds from other sources.	At the time of the consultation on the draft LTP3, funding levels were unknown. The LTP Implementation Plan will set out the schemes we will deliver and the amount of funding that we will invest in maintenance and integrated transport / road safety schemes.	
9	Priority should be given to removing blockages and improving flow of road and rail traffic before investment in infrastructure for spatial development.	Blockages in the network will be removed by encouraging more journeys to be undertaken by public transport, walking and cycling which will deliver sustainable growth.	
2	Assessing value for money as outlined in 6.25 is weighted against the taxpayers that suffer congestion.	Value for money will be assessed by the scheme's overall benefits, including easing congestion, against the cost of the scheme.	
9	Improve the flow of traffic along the A27 to ease congestion along alternative routes e.g. A259, B2192/B2124	We have and will continue to lobby for improvements to the A27 to improve journey time reliability.	
9	Upgrade section of A26 south of A27 if Newhaven port is to be regenerated.	This comment will be passed to the Highways Agency which is responsible for the A26.	

15	Suggested modification to A26 at Earwig Corner to have filter lane to new section of road north of allotments rejoining B2192. Westbound traffic and cycle track to join A26 as at present. This would ease congestion, provide for sustainable transport, reduce emission and fuel usage. A26 south of Earwig Corner should be made three lane by rerouting footway and BT cables. Lanes to be controled as those at the road bridge over the Tamar between Plymouth and Saltash.	Improvements to Earwig Corner have been considered in the past but no practical and cost effective solution which provides significant benefits has been identified to date. We will consider options to deal with this localised bottleneck on the network.	
12	Joining up public bus services with rail transport should be a priority in Lewes. This doesn't feature in Appendix A paras 10-13	Currently there is limited potential to enable bus /rail interchange outside Lewes rail station due to the weight restriction on the rail bridge. We continue to work with Network Rail to resolve this.	
5	Talking bus stops in rural areas.	This is not currently considered a priority.	
15	Network Rail should maintain the bridge at Lewes Station to a standard to support large buses.	The County Council is discussing with Network Rail how to upgrade the bridge to support buses.	
8	ESCC should lobby for installation of new electric shoe design for third rail to ensure greater reliability in severe weather. (rather than HS2)	A wider review of third rail usage is being undertaken by DfT in response to the recent severe weather.	
8	Network Rail should consider a new link between line north of Salfords and the line between Redhill and South Nutfield allowing greater access to Gatwick from people to the east without having to go via London.	This area is outside East Sussex and should be promoted by the relevant local transport authority	
8	Brighton to Ashford line should be double track and both Willingdon Chord and Ore tunnel rebuilt.	The County Council promotes and has been lobbying for dual tracking of the line between Ashford and Hastings, as well as reinstatement of the Willingdon Chord. Network Rail would have to rebuild the tunnel should it need doing so as part of these schemes.	
8	Electrification and double tracking of the Uckfield to Hurst Green route to East Grinstead should be high priority.	The County Council promotes and has been lobbying for the electrification of the railway line between Uckfield and Hurst Green. This has been highlighted in the strategy.	

2 16	<p>Obviously we should have quicker, cheaper &amp; better facilities for rail, cars, cyclists and pedestrians, but there is not much ESCC can or has done about this to the extent that I find all of these, whether I am in a car or train, on a bike or on foot, are some of the worse facilities I have experienced anywhere in the UK or western Europe for that matter. We don't seem to be able to persuade train companies to get us to where we want to go, at reasonable costs in reasonable times. In fact the service is getting worse, longer, unsustainably expensive and they are talking about withdrawing routes, ie Canon Street. And all to pay for high speed lines that don't go where we want and therefore no one wants to use.</p> <p>On the roads it can take longer to get across East Sussex than any other county due to the lack of decent roads, dual carriageways and again making roads like the Flimwell by-pass at our borders worse. In Hastings there has been no end of waste on road humps, pavement widening, traffic lights and yellow line painting. All costing a fortune to makes things worse.</p> <p>On cycling there are no safe cross county cycle paths and facilities for</p>	<p>There are many challenges in the county and they are described in Background Paper B which accompanies the final strategy. We do not agree that all interventions "make things worse" and will continue to work towards improving transport infrastructure and services in the county in accordance with the objectives set out in the plan and which the people of East Sussex feel are important.</p>	
15	<p>So what should you be doing, well I'd start by ending the war on the motorist and particularly car parking by adding the following to the transport strategy:</p> <p>" Implement the parking enforcement provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and consider the introduction of additional enforcement powers under the Act only if it is to the social, economic and environmental benefit to the town, its people, visitors and businesses. Where it is proved to be the opposite reduce parking restrictions and enforcement powers to the benefit of the town.</p> <p>Remove all unnecessary and punitive CPZs, and all associated restrictions across the town and in parallel reduce the responsible departments 25% year-on-year with closure targeted for 2014."</p> <p>See how you get on with that then perhaps we can address the rest.</p>	<p>Where we have introduced civil parking enforcement in the county, there have been benefits in terms of reduced congestion, improved safety and greater turnover of short term parking spaces in town centres which has had positive effects on the local economy.</p> <p>In January 2011, the Department for Transport issued a revised Policy Planning Guidance Note on transport which gives councils a little more flexibility to set parking policies they believe are right for their own areas. The document has been amended to reflect that change.</p>	Document amended
1 4	<p>Sussex-air is supportive of the East Sussex Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) consultation draft as it is a comprehensive and thorough document which considers the multi-layered aspects of transport strategy. However as transport emissions are the main contributor to air pollution in Sussex, the ESCC LTP3 does not appear to be able to reach far enough to alleviate or improve air quality issues.</p>	Noted.	



3 15	Paragraph 1.1 of the Introduction (page 19) states that the Local Transport Plan will set the strategy and policies for improving travel choices and how transport assets and provision will enable people to access jobs and services. However, the Plan appears to be ostensibly concerned with transport issues in an urban environment as there are very few references to health and recreation in the countryside, or to the use of rights of way which could also be viewed as a travel choice. Walking and cycling are viewed mainly in the context of travel to and from the workplace and not as a means of recreational enjoyment or for gaining access to the countryside. There is also very little reference to horse riding. It would therefore obviously be helpful if the Executive Summary were to define the word 'transport' as including the use of public rights of way.	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas. References to the rights of way network are made in the strategy and are regarded as part of the transport network for the county.	Document amended
15	Walking, cycling, riding and recreational driving using motorcycles or off-road vehicles all benefit a person's health and well-being. The Plan should therefore include greater reference to the recreational use of rights of way by all categories of user as appropriate as the use of rights of way as a leisure pursuit should be encouraged as it contributes to the local rural economy. With the current financial restraint on departmental spending, sufficient funds should be directed towards rights of way to at least achieve the targets spelled out in the Plan.	Noted. The document has been amended to include the fact that use of the rights of way network for recreational purposes does benefit the local rural economy.	Document amended
6 10	Although the Plan refers to the 'Avenue Verte' National Cycle Route 2 between London and Paris which passes through Newhaven with a link to the ferry terminal, there needs to be other links to the area. This is an example of how the Local Transport Plan should be more fully integrated into the Rights of Way Improvement Plan. Cyclists' view of safety should be taken into account when cycle routes are being planned both in rural as well as in urban areas.	The plan identifies the need to improve cycle links in the Newhaven/Seaford area in the Newhaven section of the document. All proposed schemes are audited for impact and effect on cyclists to ensure safety is not compromised and facilities enhanced where possible. The preferred strategy includes the details of how cycling issues are addressed in the county.	
15	Improved access to the countryside is largely ignored. The Plan makes no reference to the provision of suitable parking areas for visitors' cars, horseboxes or bike trailers. The usual two metre height restriction to most car parks prevents most trailer-towing cars from gaining access and that often results in vehicles and trailers being parked in field gateways.	The document has been amended to include reference to access to the countryside and open spaces. With regard to parking areas, the issue could be raised with the East Sussex Local Access Forum, who advise ESCC on access related issues.	Document amended
15 10	No mention is made of providing links between the ends of rights of way to improve the safety of walkers and to allow slow-moving and unpredictable horses having to share road space with fast-moving vehicular traffic, or to the provision of safer road crossings for cyclists and equestrians.	Noted.	Document amended

15 11	Consideration should be made of encouraging local authorities to provide suitably located car parks to enable single occupancy cars to be parked so that small groups of workers could continue their journeys to a common place of work sharing one vehicle. Such arrangements already exist elsewhere in Europe. With the likely growth of electrically powered vehicles, electric two-wheeled vehicles are likely to become commonplace during the term of the Plan and charging points would be required for these as for electric city cars.	The idea is noted. The preferred strategy includes the use of technology to support greater use of sustainable forms of transport and charging points for electric vehicles.	
14	Reference should be made to the transfer to ESCC next April of the rights of way functions in the South Downs National Park that are currently being carried out on its behalf by the SDJC as this may affect priorities in the Rights of Way Improvement Plan. To ensure that the standards achieved by the SDJC are maintained, ESCC should work closely with the new NPA.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park. We are currently in discussions with the South Downs National Park with a view to agreeing an accord for the management of Rights of Way in the park, as well as other operational details.	Document amended
15	Local authorities should be encouraged to provide suitable areas of rough ground for off-road vehicle practice which could help to reduce the inappropriate use of rights of way.	Noted, but not an issue for the Local Transport Plan.	
15	Speaking as a long-term wheelchair user, I'm very mindful of the limited countryside access locally for wheelchairs and the larger mobility scooters, especially the 'all terrain vehicles', such as the Trampler. This is mainly due to the all too often use of either gateways that are too narrow or the ubiquitous stiles. These barriers do not meet the needs of Disabled Ramblers (mobility disabled people who rely on wheelchairs, scooters etc); without these barriers substantial lengths of path and trail could become open to many more people for use.	One aim of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan is to take into account the needs of disabled people when carrying out work on the rights of way network and to work with disabled users to identify routes which could potentially be used by those with mobility problems or visual impairments. Where landowner cooperation can be secured we do seek to install the most accessible structure i.e. gate rather than stile but this is not always possible. Our recently completed online Rights of Way map also shows the location of stiles and gates on the Rights of Way network, which can help to plan stile-free walks where possible.	
15	Probably not in the remit of what is required for this consultation; but I do feel this an important point - unfortunately, if there are toilets available, there may be a disabled accessible toilet included, which although may meet the DDA [Disability Discrimination Act], but frequently these are found to be too small even for a small basic electric wheelchair!	The point is noted but is not within the remit of the Local Transport Plan to address.	

8	This submission concentrates on railway issues. Whilst ESCC is oft-quoted as saying it is 'a roads authority', or that it 'has no remit for rail' – which is itself a matter of concern for those people who see transport infrastructure planning as something that must take account of the many modes that are available and the types of outcome that these provide – there is a great need for ESCC to play a more active political role in promoting and championing rail services within, into, and out of the County.	East Sussex has a statutory function for roads but not rail. However, the County Council actively promotes and encourages sustainable travel, including rail. We have regular meetings with the rail industry and work in partnership with other stakeholders to progress and promote rail services and infrastructure para 5.123 refers. The County Council will continue to work with stakeholders and liaise with commuter groups to ensure that lobbying undertaken by the County Council in terms of rail, reflects the needs and aspirations of those that use it.	
8	The URLPC takes the opinion that the Plan as drafted contains only cursory mentions of rail transport which, even then, fails to target and meet the challenges of rail capacity problems and passenger transfer issues that are restraining effective expansion within the local economy. The URLPC believes that ESCC will have a desire to assist with efforts to ensure the growth of a successful and vibrant local economy – whilst wishing to be a leader in meeting the demands for a 'greener' way of life; the railway has a vital and obvious part to play in achieving this.	The document has been amended to strengthen the strategy and emphasise that rail travel should and could play a greater role in providing sustainable travel opportunities and facilitating economic growth.	Document amended
8	(Exec Summary) Page 5, "Local Enterprise Partnership" – the URLPC is dismayed to learn that ESCC has entered into partnership with Kent and with Essex, and not taken up the more obvious links with Brighton City and West Sussex. URLPC has been unable to establish any valid reason and/or benefit from links with Essex in relation to this exercise. However, the partnership with Kent should be exploited to explore and encourage greater rail connectivity between Kent and East Sussex, via the reinstatement of the Tunbridge Wells to Eridge line, and its connection to the East Sussex coast via the rail hub at Lewes, via reinstatement of the line to the South of Uckfield.	The County Council is working with its partners in the Local Enterprise Partnership and will consider transport improvements as they relate to the local economy. The plan has been amended to make reference to the wider benefits of reinstating the Lewes-Uckfield railway line.	Document amended
15	(Exec Summary) Page 5, Transport Infrastructure, bullet point 1 – this statement should include reference to the (poor) standard of rail infrastructure as this has as much influence on progress of economic growth as the road infrastructure	Bullet point 6 of the same section in the draft document set out the challenge regarding rail infrastructure. This is referred to in the final document.	
15	(Exec Summary) Page 5, Transport Infrastructure, bullet point 4 – to be fair, this point should also include the figure for rail traffic levels between the same two years.	The document has been amended to include changes in passenger levels on rail and on buses.	Document amended
15	(Exec Summary) Page 6, Transport Infrastructure, bullet point – the URLPC seeks the inclusion of mention for a rail link between East Sussex and Mid/North Kent (i.e. by reopening the rail route between Eridge and Tunbridge Wells)	The document has been amended to include mention of a rail link between Eridge and Tunbridge Wells to join up with the Lewes-Uckfield line.	Document amended

15	(Exec Sumnmary) Page 6, Environment, bullet point 2 – the URLPC seeks the opening words of this point to be revised to read “Road transport is the fastest .....”	The document has been amended to include the word 'road'.	Document amended
8	The URLPC has also looked at the references to rail in the main document. Attention to rail freight issues is welcomed and laudable. However, the movement of freight will be much easier after reinstatement of the rail link between Uckfield and Lewes which would allow simple access to, and egress from, the port facilities at Newhaven, for instance	The document has been amended to include reference to the additional freight benefits of having rail on the line should the Lewes-Uckfield line be reinstated, although it is acknowledged that the rail industry would have to make infrastructure improvements along the line, such as bridge strengthening/replacement in certain locations.	Document amended
8	The URLPC is dismayed and disappointed to find that in the Section “Major Railway Schemes” (pages 12 and 13) ESCC has failed to include electrification and dual tracking of the Uckfield to Hurst Green (and eventually Uckfield to Lewes) section of the rail network. Also, reinstatement of the Eridge to Tunbridge Wells link has not been mentioned, although this would be a major boost to the movement of people between the highly-populated areas of Mid/North Kent and East Sussex and the South Coast. The URLPC urges ESCC to include these factors in the final Plan.	Electrification of the line between Uckfield and Hurst Green has been included in the strategy. The document has been amended to include the additional benefits of dual tracking of the line and also to include the reinstatement of the Eridge-Tunbridge Wells line to connect with a reinstated Lewes-Uckfield line.	Document amended
1 6 16	HUB welcomes the generally positive points in LTP3, about the need for action to improve cycling routes and cycling safety, and the cycle route improvements that are underway in Hastings. The comment that “ there is a pressing need to improve infrastructure .. to enable a modal shift .. to cycling” is absolutely correct. However, unless adequate financial resources are committed and/or secured from external sources on a year on year basis and a stronger programme for cycling improvement work is drawn up and implemented, the cycling part of LTP3 is likely to turn out to be little more than a hollow statement of intent.	Noted, but uncertainty over levels of funding from all sources (central government, developer contributions or grants which have a competitive bidding process) means that, at this point, it is impossible to commit to a sustained programme of improvements for more than 3 years at a time. All cycle schemes will be assessed along with other potential interventions against their ability to contribute toward achievement of the LTP objectives and also in terms of their value for money.	
8	The Lewes-Uckfield rail line should be reinstated. This will enable people to travel by train rather than by car.	LTP3 states the County Council's continuing support for the reinstatement and electrification of the Lewes Uckfield line in its strategy for the Uckfield area and also in its strategy for rail. However the 2008 study undertaken by Network Rail identified that whilst it is technically feasible to reinstate the line, there is currently a poor business case and a low cost benefit ratio.	
13	Highly expensive plans such as the Bexhill-Hastings link road should be abandoned. They cost a fortune and only lead to increases in traffic long-term, as can be clearly seen and demonstrated by the construction of the Polegate bypass.	We believe that the Bexhill Hastings Link Road is the best solution to the problems of access, connectivity and air quality issues in that area. It will also facilitate a package of measures which would encourage more sustainable travel on the A259 between the two towns.	

9	Make the A27 to Eastbourne from Lewes dual carriage asap	Although we have lobbied for improvements to the A27 for a number of years to improve journey time reliability, there are currently no proposals to dual that section of the road.	
16	It would be good if the plan could be carried through this time but, in the past, short-termism and political squabbling/change of regime have defeated the efforts after only minimal improvements have been achieved. The Beddingham - Southerham improvements were compromised by the reduction from full dual carriageway to single carriageway sections - utterly ridiculous and, ultimately, a bar to further development. The coastal highway (continuous motorway from Plymouth to Dover) is still a distant dream and unlikely to be realised in my lifetime.	Noted.	
6	we need greater access routes and support for those using bicycles and choosing to walk rather than use cars.	The preferred strategy supports this objective.	
3	There needs to be more emphasis on rural areas	Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.	Document amended
	I know I have concentrated on aspects of the local economy which possibly adds nothing influential to the overall LTP strategy. Thanks for your reminder to complete the survey; I was reluctant to respond until then.	Noted.	
6 15	The Parish Council are currently revisiting the possibility of a cycleway/footpath between Rotherfield and Jarvis Brook. This was supported as desirable in the Parish Plan and we are shortly to publicise the proposal in the village to seek support from residents. It has been suggested by Sustrans that as a first step it would be beneficial to show the scheme as an aspiration on the Local Transport Plan and I have contacted Jon Wheeler regarding this.	Noted.	
16	Where is the money going to come from?	There is uncertainty over levels of funding from all sources (central government, developer contributions, optional funding from partners and grants which have a competitive bidding process) however, the LTP Implementation Plan which will be produced annually will adjust to the level of funding available and efforts will be made to bid for funds and with partners explore other ways of achieving the LTP objectives.	Document amended

<p>1 6</p>	<p>We agree generally with the objectives of the plan, all of which can be delivered through encouraging cycling and improving provision for cyclists. The economic growth objective, where cycling is at first sight less relevant, can be facilitated through increasing sustainable tourism involving cycling: Sustrans has long established that cyclists spend more with local businesses in the immediate area than car-based tourists do, for example on food and drink, thus they are important to the tourism economy, and 'green' tourism options like cycling and walking opportunities are thought to be increasingly attractive to the kinds of visitors spending time in the area. East Sussex has an extensive network of quiet lanes used by cyclists and equestrians, while the southern area on and around the South Downs has some of the best off-road cycling in England. However the connections between these areas and the towns are poor, with cyclists needing to negotiate heavy traffic and difficult junctions.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park. We appreciate that greater connectivity of cycle routes would be desirable and that there is no absolute divide between utility and recreational cycling.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
	<p>There is no signage from the towns (where most of the population lives) or the railway stations to direct cyclists and walkers to the edge of towns or to the South Downs. The cycle connections between Lewes and Newhaven/Seaford are particularly poor. We would like to encourage transport planners to view the connectivity of the cycling network as strategically as they do other forms of transport. There is not an absolute divide between 'utility' and 'recreational' cycling - people may become regular utility riders through having enjoyed recreational cycling. Conversely they may be put off increasing their cycling if the provision stops at the edge of town. Visitors to the area, particularly those arriving 'sustainably' at the gateways of Newhaven port or at the main town railway stations like Eastbourne and Lewes are likely to find it extremely difficult to locate a pleasant route out of town on their bikes. The key issue is linking the rural routes to the centres of population. Often this can simply be done through better signage, though infrastructure improvements may be needed in some p</p>	<p><i>See comment above.</i></p>	

4	<p>ESCC needs to lead and provide support to promoting the county to becoming a "Low Emission County", by reducing own fleet emissions, promoting reduction to vehicle journeys through improved/sustaining rural public access to public transport, support initiatives to implement EV network across East Sussex, introduce planning incentives to increase EV charge points and encourage other low emission options in developments (Fleet operators etc) and consider alternative fuel options for high emitting vehicles (HGV, Buses, RCV (refuse collection vehicles)). ESCC needs to assist local authorities in the county to deliver improvements in air quality and carbon emission reduction through the LTP3. EAst Sussex has 2 AQMA's, however several other populated locations are near to breaching (Newhaven, wider Lewes Town and Hastings/Bexhill). Air quality/emission assessments need to be sought through planning to ensure breaces of air quality standards from multiple individual (small/medium &amp; large) applications do not contribute to the creation of new AQMA's. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>The principal of reducing the impact of travel on the environment is embedded in the Environment Strategy for East Sussex produced by the East Sussex Environment Strategy Group.</p> <p>The preferred strategy includes the use of technology to support greater use of sustainable forms of transport and charging points for electric vehicles.</p>	
	<p>Therefore a Low Emission Strategy for the County needs to be considered to ensure emissions are reduced across the region. Emissions from the transport sector have a major impact on ozone concentrations in the county, which affect human health, biodiversity and the natural landscape. Acting on air quality can influnce and improve the quality of life for 1:12 people, who have asthma and people with COPD plus protect the biodiversity and lanscape of the SDNP and High Weald. (<a href="http://planetearth.nerc.ac.uk/news/story.aspx?id=900">http://planetearth.nerc.ac.uk/news/story.aspx?id=900</a>). Comments from Sussex Air Quality Partnership (Sussex-air)</p>	<p><i>See comment above.</i></p>	
5	<p>Public transport to The Waterfront in Eastbourne needs to be improved to assist the local economy and help maintain and increase local jobs in that area.</p>	<p>Noted. We are currently looking at a scheme to create a bus gate between north and south Soverign Harbour which will address this issue of access to the Waterfront.</p>	

<p>1 3 13</p>	<p>CCPES joint response to the LTP3 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) for East Sussex. This is a joint response from the organisations that form the Climate Change Partnership for East Sussex and does not represent the views of individual partners. Responses from individual partners may also be received. Transport is the UK's second biggest CO2 emitting sector, with energy production the greatest. We are therefore please that this has been recognised in the LTP3 with climate change one of the high level objectives for the Plan, as well as sustainable transport. The LTP3, through the actions it proposes, provides the best focus within the County to address and reduce the emissions from this sector. The Climate Change Act 2008 sets a legally binding target of at least an 80 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, to be achieved through action in the UK and abroad. It also includes a reduction in emissions of at least 34 percent by 2020. This needs to be sighted and responded to within the Plan. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
	<p>We suggest that even in the absence of the Local Area Agreement the East Sussex target should be adapted by this Plan to mirror national targets. The three percent reduction in CO2 per year (annual 6,623 tonne reduction as mentioned in the document) should be lead and championed by this document. In order to achieve this target there should be greater emphasis within the Plan on sustainable transport solutions, developing community transport solutions and addressing rural sustainable transport challenges, as part of the transport infrastructure programme . These are mentioned within the document and are to be worked up in partnership with East Sussex Strategic Partnership. This Plan is key to ensuring that these are developed in partnership and implemented on the ground, so clear outcomes and solutions are delivered. The forthcoming East Sussex Strategic Partnership climate change action plan (draft to be completed by March 2011) should be able to assist with this task. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	

	<p>These outcomes and solutions should build on the LTP3 focus on reducing journey times and congestion which will also deliver CO2 reductions and improved air quality. Through the promotion of sustainable transport and alternative options to the car this should not have a negative impact on the economy and rural areas of the county. We support the inclusion in the Plan of ensuring that the current and future transport infrastructure is resilient to climate change. Flooding is mentioned within the LTP3, but there will be wider pressures to the transport network than just this. We would like to see the wider implications risk assessed and mapped into the future implementation sections of the plan. If you would like to discuss this further please contact Chris Wick at <a href="mailto:chris.wick@environment-agency.gov.uk">chris.wick@environment-agency.gov.uk</a> chair of the Climate Change Partnership for East Sussex.</p>	Noted	
15	Use the Area Management Board and more local to the people impacted methods of consulting on this.	We have included a section on localism and how people and local groups can participate more effectively in transport planning.	Document amended
16	The transport plans of the past have had similar aspirations, but there has been years of underfunding in all forms of transport, even during times of relative prosperity. With the ESCC's declared aim of keeping the council tax as low as possible, and central government's emphasis on spending cuts, I am afraid that no more than the Council's statutory duties will be fulfilled, and maybe not even those.	This is a longer term strategy than previous LTP strategies. There is uncertainty over levels of funding from all sources (central government, developer contributions, external funding from partners and grants which have a competitive bidding process) however, the LTP Implementation Plan which will be produced annually will adjust to the level of funding available and effort will be made to bid for funds and with partners explore other ways of achieving the LTP objectives.	
14 12	please show a commitment to all modes of sustainable transport both in your objectives and their implementation in your revised transport plan. Also ensure that the plan demonstrates the integration of cycling, rail, bus and walking, so that a truly joined up transport system is achieved	Noted.	
1 11	The Survey is structured in such a way as to make it virtually impossible for anyone to disagree with most of the Objectives; we must make some general comments to give a better balance to our response. OPTION - We agree with Option 3, but believe that it could be strengthened by adding parts of Option 2 in relation to "Changing Travel Behaviour". We do not believe that this would add any significant initial cost and would lead to lower overall costs in the long-term. A change in travel behaviour should be an essential element of any transport plan.	The preferred strategy of 'Sustainable growth' does include a focus on influencing travel behaviour albeit not as great as that in option 2.	

<p>15 3</p>	<p>A surprising omission from the LTP Consultation Draft is data on traffic growth. Whilst these can only be forecasts, it is difficult to see how any plan can be put forward without traffic data forming a basis. These should be on an “as we have been increasing” basis compared to the targeted figures based on measures included in the Plan to introduce modal shift. These should clearly include not just road vehicles, but also public transport, cycling and walking to demonstrate what could be achieved. If not, there is a risk that the Plan is based on nice words without meaningful, measurable targets and without the public seeing a true Vision of what could be achieved. The plans for the Priority Areas have some detail, but there is nothing really in respect of the rest of the county. There are many general statements, but what about the specifics? How can train and bus services be improved – location and frequency being the key points – to get people out of their cars, with an effective system from door-to-door which they actually want to use? Firm plans need to be given for the b</p>	<p>Modelling work to assess the impact of housing growth in the priority areas has identified the expected levels of traffic growth and the effectiveness of different transport interventions in mitigating the impacts. The most appropriate and effective interventions have been incorporated into the transport infrastructure requirements set out in the strategy for Bexhill and Hastings, Eastbourne and south Wealden, Newhaven and Uckfield.</p> <p>Data is collected on the various modes of transport and we will continue to monitor levels of traffic, cycling trips and bus punctuality etc. to inform decision making on a continuous basis and to assess achievement as the plan period progresses.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the document to give greater clarity to our approach to the rural areas and the towns and villages outside the priority areas.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>There are many areas which are very distant from a railway line yet alone a railway station. This therefore leads to the use of cars to get to the station. From both the commercial and tourism point-of-view the West-East Coast railway line would appear to be an undeveloped facility which largely exists. There is considerable scope for linking Southampton, Portsmouth, Chichester, Littlehampton and Worthing through Brighton to Lewes, Ashford and the Chunnel and thereby to mainland Europe, without putting further pressure on the lines to London. There are issues with lack of through lines at Brighton; the need for reinstatement of the Willingdon Chord; and the electrification and dual-tracking of the Hastings to Ashford line, but the basic infrastructure is in place. It is that sort of initiative which should be in the Plan to support the modal shift required. If it is not even a long-term possibility, it should be stated as ruled out within the Plan and reasons given. They may not be under the direct control of the County Council, but should they not be firm needs expressed by the Pl</p>	<p>The background document has been amended to include reference to rail improvements which would improve connectivity along the east coastway and to the continent.</p> <p>Reinstating the Willingdon Chord and electrification and dual tracking of the Ashford-Hastings line are long term aspirations of the County Council and have been and will continue to be lobbied for at all appropriate opportunities with Network Rail.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>



<p>5 15</p>	<p>As part of the Comprehensive Spending Review, the Government announced a reduction of 20% in Bus Service Operators Grant and a reduction of 28% in local government resource grants. A number of local authorities have already moved to save money from their local transport budgets by announcing their intention to make reductions in their tendered bus services. Naturally we hope this will not be necessary everywhere, although I note that 75% of all bus services in East Sussex are supported by the council. As the statutory representatives of bus passengers in England (outside London), Passenger Focus is keen to promote the maximum transparency and public consultation over any difficult decisions that may have to be taken regarding the supported bus network.</p>	<p>Noted. These comments have been passed to our Passenger Transport team for their consideration.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>If local people are to have a genuine input into their local bus services, it is important that they are presented with a full description of any proposals and a convincing rationale for them. We would recommend that this should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• full details of all services for which you propose to withdraw funding, and which services will remain if operators withdraw the service</li> <li>• figures for the number of passenger journeys affected and the amount of public money expected to be saved, disaggregated by route, day of the week and time of day</li> <li>• a detailed assessment of the benefits of the current bus services provided and of the impact of the proposed service cuts on bus passengers, on the delivery of your Local Transport Plan objectives, in particular in relation to traffic congestion and parking</li> <li>• a formal study of alternative options explored and the reasons for not putting them forward</li> <li>• a review of the contribution flexible transport solutions could make to mitigating the effects of the proposed reductions in mainstream local bus services</li> </ul>	<p>We are currently consulting on a review of supported bus services in the Hastings and Rother area, including some services in Wealden and Lewes. These are the majority of the bus service contracts we support and they are due to expire in July 2011. The review will assess the current bus services and consider whether savings can be made by providing similar levels of service more efficiently. We are seeking views from any individual, group or organisation that has an interest in the review and we will endeavour to be responsive to the consultation feedback wherever possible.</p> <p>At this stage we do not know whether there would be significant changes to services or how we would engage with the public about any further changes to bus services. However, in all cases we will try to minimise the impact of any changes on the service users.</p>	

15	<p>We believe that the current difficult financial circumstances present an opportunity to build a more effective dialogue with local people about the rationale for the network of bus services available in your area and how this may need to change, explaining the benefits and impacts of proposals, listening to the public's views and modifying proposals to respond to their comments.</p> <p>We would welcome the chance to work with you to make the most of this opportunity. To this end, I would like to know whether or not you are planning to make any significant reductions to the bus services you currently support and how you are intending to consult local people. If I can be of any help in this process, I would be delighted to assist.</p>	See above	
17	<p>We also carried out research in May to better understand passengers' views on how frequently bus services should change, and the best way of letting them know about new routes and timetables. The headline results were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 66% of passengers did not find it acceptable to make changes to bus services more than twice a year</li> <li>• 62% of passengers wanted at least 4 weeks notice of major service changes</li> <li>• 76% of passengers wanted to be informed about major changes by notice at the bus stop</li> </ul>	Noted.	
17	<p>Finally, all research carried out by ourselves and bus operators points to service punctuality and reliability being the most important priority for bus passengers. We are therefore keen to support any existing bus partnerships between yourselves and bus operators, and would encourage their expansion into areas where they do not currently exist. I believe that there is a Quality Bus Partnership for Hastings.</p>	Work has already begun on the establishment of Quality Bus Partnerships in Eastbourne and in Bexhill. We will continue to monitor the punctuality of services across the county and work with the operators to make improvements on a continuous basis.	
1	<p>we agree with the overall high-level strategy and desire to tackle climate change, but caution against using taxation as a means of delivering sustained change in behaviours.</p>	Noted.	
8	<p>There is a real need in the long term for significant investment in the county's rail network to reduce the high levels of traffic congestion with its associated pollution and to enable economic growth that the county urgently requires.</p>	The County Council does not receive funding to invest in the rail network, which is why we lobby and work with the rail industry for improvements. We will continue to do so, as we recognise the value not only for the environment, but also for the economy and social reasons.	

6 7 18	The LTP3 document contains a huge amount of very interesting and highly relevant data, maps and ideas. Unfortunately, nothing will change unless the implementation plan makes cycling and walking its key focus. There are many reasons to encourage cycling (health, social, economic, congestion, pollution, tourism, etc). Unless the issue of lack of safety for cyclists is tackled, the numbers cycling will not increase. The LTP3 is unwieldy for local residents and businesses to get to grips with, which may limit the engagement of the public with its laudable aims. The implementation plan of the LTP3 focuses on cars.	As highlighted in the draft document, the Implementation Plan included in the draft LTP3 was not complete for the reasons given in paragraphs 6.2 to 6.5. However, we were able to include a list of the major highway surfacing works which were already planned and funded through borrowing against future savings in reactive maintenance costs. The document has been amended to make it clearer and more concise.	Document amended
16	3. Implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We find it highly surprising that so little of the document is taken up with implementation of how LTP3 will actually work. Apologies for our cynicism, but nothing will change if nothing happens to back up the very detailed worthy document.</li> <li>• 20 pages of the 187 are taken up with implementation</li> <li>• Of the implementation pages, most are about planned road works</li> <li>• There is no emphasis on needing to combine road maintenance with road improvement.</li> </ul>	See comment above.	
13	On the LTP3 chapter on implementation, there is little on improving networks of cycle routes, nor on cycle parking facilities, advanced stop lines at traffic lights, reduced speed areas, and other aspects that would help cyclists. Instead it focuses on cars:	The strategy chapter has been amended to include greater clarity on facilities for cyclists.	Document amended
13	A chapter of the document is taken up with an options appraisal. One option of increasing transport is sensibly rejected. The other two options are “change travel behaviour” and “increase sustainability”. Option 3 is merely option 2 with extra funding for infrastructure. The ESCC need to realise that people do not cycle because they are scared. The infrastructure is vital to changing the behaviour. There is no explanation given about why biodiversity and water are influenced negatively in Option 2 and option 3. Cycle lanes beside railways etc should improve bio-diversity, and do so far more than proposed road increases.	Noted. We appreciate that infrastructure is vital to encourage and support behaviour change and this is included in the preferred strategy. This is explained in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) at Appendix C to the document.	

15	<p><b>LOCALISM AND DECENTRALISATION:</b>  The detailed implications of the Localism Bill may not yet be known but the time is right to consider which parts of the transport strategy could be delivered at the local town, parish or neighbourhood level. The strategy should encourage communities to take on the responsibility for their local transport network including local roads, pedestrian, cycling, and public transport facilities. The strategy should prepare for the delegation of these responsibilities together with appropriate budgets to competent local bodies.</p>	<p>We have included a section on localism and how people and local groups can participate more effectively in transport planning.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
15	<p><b>DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS</b>  The role that developer contributions (Section 106 etc) can make to local transport infrastructure should be mentioned and the way decisions on the allocation of these funds are to be made – in particular in respect of local consultation. (see also reference to this in the draft Localism Bill)</p>	<p>Developer contributions were listed as a source of funding in the draft plan.  The plan has been amended to include a section on localism and how local people can participate more effectively in the transport planning process.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
15	<p><b>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS</b>  The Strategy should recognise that there is the possibility that Neighbourhood plans will be prepared as a result of the Localism Bill and that these may well set out transport priorities. No mention of the existing Parish Action Plans appears to be in the Strategy. These are also an important tool for establishing transport priorities.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan has been amended to include a section on localism including Neighbourhood Plans and how local people can participate more effectively in the transport planning process.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
15	<p><b>LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIPS</b>  The chapter on this appears to be out of date. The strategy should recognise the Greater Essex, Kent and East Sussex LEP.</p>	<p>The decision on the Local Enterprise Partnership was made after the LTP3 consultation draft was published. The document has been amended to reflect changes since the draft plan was published.</p>	
15	<p>Transport usage. (page 5) Where transport and traffic are being considered in a general sense, especially in the early chapters of the draft, it should be made clear that the comment is (probably) referring to road traffic rather than overall transport activity. In particular where, for example in the executive summary page 5, it refers to presumably road traffic levels increasing by 3% between 2003 and 2009 it would be helpful to also show the increase in rail and (possibly) public bus usage over that period- rail up 10% per annum on some lines- thus underlining the value of the objective to encourage greater use of these transport services since the population is inclined to use them if appropriate services are available.</p>	<p>Noted. The document has been amended to include more data about other modes.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

1	Partnership working. (page 34) The SCRP endorses the references to partnership working particularly through the SCRP, is encouraged by the ESCC emphasis on continuing this positive relationship, and will work to assist ESCC (and the other SCRP partners) in the achievement of the objectives that fall within the compass of the SCRP's activities.	Noted.	
1 15 16	The long-term strategy for transport set out in the draft LTP3 would appear to be soundly based in terms of meeting the issues and challenges facing the county and achieving the identified high level objectives. It is disappointing, however, that the document fails to make a clear distinction between the County Council's "short term plans for improvement" and its "longer term scheme aspirations" or to give any clear indication of the relative investment associated with the measures listed. This makes it very difficult to assess the immediate implications of LTP3 or how effective it will prove in terms of meeting the more specific objectives listed, such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions, local air pollution and noise from transport	Agreed that there remain challenges to address in terms of allocating resources and assessing achievement against the objectives. The plan has been amended to include greater clarity on funding levels and on how we propose to monitor progress towards objectives. The LTP Implementation Plan will outline the shorter term improvements that will be undertaken.	Document amended
15	The absence of the A272 West of Maresfield Corridor Scheme from LTP3 is a concern in view of the likely traffic impact on this stretch of road arising from the 3,000 new homes currently planned at Haywards Heath and the 1,742 new homes planned at Uckfield over the period to 2030. The effects of increasing traffic levels along this stretch of road are likely to be borne predominantly by the communities of Newick and North Chailey within Lewes District and the Council would therefore like an assurance from the County Council that this traffic impact can be satisfactorily mitigated. The traffic impact of future housing development at Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill on Ditchling is also of concern.	Work is being undertaken on a variety of traffic models in Lewes and Uckfield designed to assess the impact of proposed housing development on the transport networks. We are also working with Mid Sussex to assess the implications of development in their area on the East Sussex network. The models will help us develop the most appropriate mitigating measures.	Document amended
14	It is disappointing that LTP3 has not identified the establishment of the South Downs National Park as an opportunity to achieve a shift from the car to more sustainable modes of transport within the county. Encouraging visitors to the National Park to use public transport, for example, could improve the viability of rural bus services which would bring both social and environmental benefits to the area. The County Council is therefore urged to work in partnership with the National Park Authority and other bodies to achieve improvements to the attractiveness of both public transport and walking and cycling opportunities within the National Park.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	Document amended

13	It is considered that there should be a clear thread, based on the sustainable transport hierarchy, running through LTP3. This means that policies and investment will first reduce the need to travel, then promote pedestrian activity, then cycling, then public transport, then private car trips. The Council feels that the draft LTP3 tends to over focus at the bottom end of the hierarchy on highways matters, and doesn't link together different parts of the hierarchy, for example pedestrian and cycle links to railway stations.	The preferred strategy focuses on sustainable modes of transport and the integrated infrastructure necessary to enable increased use of those modes which contribute most to the LTP objectives and are good value for money but without adhering strictly to a hierarchy in terms of relative investment. Maintaining and improving the highway network benefits all road users including cyclists, car sharers and bus passengers.	
12			
8	Whilst accepting that local authorities do not control investment in rail transport, there should be clearer links to the investment priorities set out in the Sussex Rail Utilisation Study and how these could help to promote modal shift from car to rail.	The County Council responded to the Sussex RUS and many of our aspirations for rail service and infrastructure improvements were, unfortunately, not reflected in the final strategy. LTP3 clearly highlights the type of rail improvements the County Council would like to see which would encourage and enable more people to transfer from the private car to using the railway. The plan also makes it clear that it prefers people to use sustainable modes of transport (including rail) as opposed to the private car. Therefore, it is not suggested that any changes need to be made to the draft strategy'.	
15	There should be more about improving access for people with disabilities and any special arrangements they need to help get around. This includes suitable routes for wheelchairs, and better access to buses, trains and taxis.	Agreed and changes have been made to the document to reflect that the needs of people with mobility difficulties are given consideration in the strategy in accordance with the recommendations resulting from the Equalities Impact Assessment.	Document amended
15	There should be clearer links between LTP3 and the work done in Local Area Transport Studies (LATS), such as the recently completed LATS for Ditchling. The Council's understanding was that the LATS provided the building blocks for LTP3 development.	Proposals emerging from LATS will be considered in light of the overall strategy and the scheme prioritisation framework which will assess all schemes in terms of their contribution to the LTP objectives and their value for money.	
15	The Plan does not obviously embrace the idea of working with the business community to seek to deliver a low carbon economy based (in part) on a sustainable transport although we do recognise that this may be addressed in part within the freight transport strategy.	The County Council is working with businesses and other parties through the Local Enterprise Partnership to improve the economy of the county in ways that are sustainable and carbon light.	
16	In the absence of a balanced implementation plan, including a full range of funded projects, there remains uncertainty that the Plan will achieve its objectives	As highlighted in the draft document, the Implementation Plan was not complete. The 2011/12 Implementation Plan will outline the projects that will be funded and how they contribute to the LTP3 objectives. Further Implementation Plans will be developed over the 15 year period based on the fluctuating levels of funding.	

16	<p>The problems associated with the preparation of something as complex as an LTP, in a relatively short timescale, at a time of considerable change, are recognised.</p> <p>Natural England looks forward to seeing and commenting on the Implementation Plan (once funding issues have been fully resolved) and detailed transport proposals that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• respond to the quality of the natural environment and the opportunities for its enhancement;</li> <li>• deliver climate change mitigation and adaptation</li> <li>• improve sustainable access to the natural environment</li> <li>• integrate Rights of Way Improvement Plans</li> <li>• provide Green Infrastructure</li> </ul>	Noted.	
1	<p>The Council supports the Plan on the basis that it advocates sustainable methods of transport, makes improvements to the existing road and bus network, and recommends improvements to cycling and walking networks across Eastbourne, including the Eastbourne Cycle Strategy.</p>	Noted.	
1	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on LTP3. It contains many references to sound principles that are evidently seen as core to the strategies, and we support these. It also contains contradictions, and historic assertions which don't stand up to scrutiny.</p>	Noted.	
15	<p>NOTES ON LTP 3 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> <p>The Local Picture - Transport Infrastructure: This section is not entirely helpful in describing the current situation. The nature of the strategic road infrastructure cannot be planned on the basis of a 'what our neighbours have, we therefore need' approach. (bullet 1) It would be very helpful to know what percentage of bus trips, as opposed to services, are supported by ESCC (bullet 5)</p>	<p>The information on relative lengths of roads in neighbouring authorities is important context in terms of the county's economic potential and is a relevant factor in many other issues such as safety. The LTP is not saying we need this but describing the context and challenges within which we must work.</p> <p>Currently the data we receive from operators is not analysed in this way but it is thought that only a relatively small proportion of the total number of trips taken are subsidised. Although this is very important in terms of rural connectivity and access to services and added social value, as a benchmarking tool trip subsidies can be misleading.</p>	Document amended

8	<p>NOTES ON LTP 3 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY The rail comments (bullet 6) are a bit muddled. Yes, there are shortcomings in infrastructure, but there are also rolling stock inadequacies. The sense given in the sentence on Uckfield – London, and Hastings – London, is that there are movements between the two lines but this is unlikely. I don't think you intend that meaning. The comments on Thameslink bring a sense of hopelessness and negativity into the paragraph. Is that justified? Sounds like an argument for a regional government perspective!</p>	<p>It is true that some of the problems experienced by passengers on East Sussex rail routes could be overcome by provision of additional rolling stock. This is most notable on the Uckfield line and the Ashford-Hastings line. The document has been amended to clarify this section.</p>	Document amended
15	<p>NOTES ON LTP 3 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Economic: Page 8, bullet 2 is interesting. But why is it a wholly negative situation? Too much reliance on Saga sized enterprises means that if one crashes, the local economy takes a big hit. While if a small business goes under, the impact is smaller. A resilient economy is a balance between, and mixture of, the two. Resilience in the retail and manufacturing sectors of the local economy of Hastings, and the significance of tourism, was noted by ESCC's own expert witnesses in last year's public inquiry into the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road (BHLR). Hastings is far from being in dire straits. And Saga has arrived - good news - because of the developments near the station and bus interchange and the good public transport opportunities. Saga cite this, along with the MP.</p>	Noted.	

15	<p>NOTES ON LTP 3 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> <p>Economic: Bullet 4 has a curious inclusion. Some of your own T and E planners would agree that the presence of too much free or cheap parking in town centres will undermine any efforts to reduce dependence on the private car, thus hampering development and enhancement of alternatives, and even threatening their existence. It would also reduce the value of the ESCC support for bus services while increasing the need for such support. Without demand management of the private car in our urban centres, they are becoming dominated by traffic and unwelcoming to ‘railed off’ shoppers. Businesses may be concerned too about public transport but they are vociferous whenever there is any mention of parking restrictions in any form. Businesses always vote for big infrastructure on the basis that ‘it can’t do any harm, and someone else is paying’. The SACTRA report deals with this myth.</p> <p>Businesses also often fail to understand what shoppers want and also how shoppers travel. There is usually an erroneous assumption that shoppers overwhelmingly arrive at the shops by car.</p>	Noted	
15  13	<p>NOTES ON LTP 3 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> <p>Safety, Security and Health:</p> <p>Measures to change the hierarchy in our car dependent society to a great extent depend on challenging the ‘car culture’ in which we are all immersed. Reversing the hierarchy, especially in residential areas, country lanes and villages has to be a priority. Evidently, speed is a major factor, but this is only a symptom of our obsession with fast and powerful cars and motorcycles. This must be challenged.</p> <p>Too often, roads are seen as playgrounds on which dangerous games are played and pedestrians and cyclists intimidated. We hope LTP3 will give these issues serious attention. We would also like to see enlightened urban design to support the aim of challenging this culture.</p>	Noted.	
15	<p>3.20 Bullet 9 ‘Supporting Infrastructure and Transport through Delivery of Housing’. Perhaps ‘sustainable’ should be emphasised. (LIP - Local Investment Plan, and LIA - Local Investment Agreement developed by the local authorities.)</p>	This is a direct quote from the priorities in the Local Investment Plan.	

10	3.24 Childrens' needs. Changes in urban design and adaptation of existing streets, typically accompanied by 20mph zones in residential areas, create conditions where childrens' freedom to play, and to walk and cycle unaccompanied, help their physical and mental health, and social development. This enables social cohesion through the contact between children and between sets of parents. There is consequent relief for stressed parents who can let them out with confidence, thus removing the need for incessant chaperoning.	Noted.	
10	Safe conditions that are fundamental to walking and cycling are also important to the elderly and would support. Older people would love to cycle.	Noted.	
13	4.4 Transport Infrastructure - Key Challenges. This supports the Trunk Road Box and the BHLR. We don't support this approach, believing that the first step in the strategy should be to focus on quick wins for tens of thousands of people in East Sussex that could be delivered more cost effectively by starting with the less fashionable use of the word 'strategic', where it means not big schemes, but the big gains in adopting a strategy of implementing many small, cheap schemes focussed on 'travel to work areas'. Strategic means 'deriving from a strategy'. It doesn't mean big and expensive, and in the case of 'small cheap and numerous' we believe it is more likely to be closer to delivering your high level objectives.	Noted.	
13	Following on from the above, the 'poor infrastructure' which you identify as a problem might be seen differently if many of the short journeys made by car were transferred to sustainable modes. Problems of congestion caused by inappropriate use of infrastructure for these trips is frequently wrongly interpreted as meaning that we need more and bigger infrastructure. That's certainly the case in Hastings, and elsewhere.	Noted.	
14 15	p59 High Weald AONB - the bullet points that apply to the South Downs National Park should be extended to include the High Weald AONB. There should be a strong link between delivery of community objectives and AONB objectives, inc tourism/recreation. Buses can and do carry out both functions	Agreed that the issues are common to both areas but we also described some specific issues related to the High Weald AONB	

15	p70 Welcome identification of 'TTWAs' as significantly important to economy, though it is in fact the organisation and development of sustainable transport that meets the needs of those areas that should be flagged up, not the areas themselves. For many, 'connectivity' has come to mean a major scheme; for others it means 'those measures which make it easiest for all to make a journey from the front door to the place of work, shops, leisure, education or healthcare, and back'.	TTWA = Travel to work areas The first transport objective in LTP is to "improve strategic and local connectivity of communities...". This could refer to a major road scheme, reinstated or improved rail infrastructure, improved bus services or linking up a cycle and walking routes within a neighbourhood.	
15	4.30 p72 Could include reference to AONBs as benefits could flow from their inclusion.	Agreed.	
15	5.58 As always, the phrase 'lack of good strategic connections' leads many to suppose that big infrastructure is the key to prosperity and a way to address any number of ills. This is simplistic. Strategic simply means 'of strategies' and could begin, for instance, with an understanding of our travel needs from the front door to whatever destination and back. Prime objectives would then be identified and the best ways to achieve them examined. We must not begin with a 'scheme led approach'.	We are following an objective led rather than scheme led approach.	
14	5.64 We would like to see assurances that ESCC will engage with the issues referred to (visitor access to the SDNP) and collaborate with SDNP to deliver measure to achieve the highest uptake of sustainable modes. A revived 'Tourism Without Traffic' initiative could help, building on the partial success of the earlier initiative (see 4,4). There should be a similar and simultaneous approach to access needs as they relate to the High Weald AONB. This could help to improve the public transport offer between Hastings, Battle and villages north on or near to the A21 both bus and rail. The bus service has diminished significantly in recent years. All the while voices are raised in support of upgrading the A21, there is silence on public transport interventions. Please be imaginative in LTP3.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.  Noted. The A21 is a key link from Hastings and Bexhill to Kent, the M25 and beyond and the identified improvements to the route will help deliver journey time improvements for local businesses.	Document amended
5	Improving accessibility for rural population.(see also 5.64 above). There is no relationship between the county supported 318 bus service that serves Etchingham - Burwash - Heathfield - Uckfield and the train services between Uckfield - Croydon - London Bridge. We recommend that the potential be explored at both the Uckfield and Etchingham ends of the route. In the light of the good level of service on the Uckfield line, and the new Higher and Further education facilities at Hastings and Ore, there may be a student need.	Noted. Comments have been passed on to our Passenger Transport team.	

14	Access to South Downs National Park and the High Weald AONB should be examined as a whole to investigate the degree to which sustainable modes can perform the required role, and what demand management strategies would be needed to ensure take-up of sustainable options. Since the 'audience' for both will be most likely to have an urban origin, there are potentially significant opportunities to improve rural - urban links through provision of sustainable travel options. Studies could be carried out quite quickly by University College Hastings along with Sussex University to examine this potential, including synergies with all modes/niches, and trip purposes associated with transport in the county and across its borders.	Noted. Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park.	
15	On rail timetables, we rue the passing of the single booklet giving timetables for multiple lines over a wide area and the introduction of 'leaflets' which exclude potentially useful services and journey opportunities. This frustrates attempts to incorporate rail into the chosen mode for multiple journey purposes over East Sussex and to/from London.	Noted . Rail timetables are the responsibility of the train operating companies. For specific journeys there is the ability to create multiple link timetables on line.	
	6.19 We broadly support indicative bullets here but in relation to table 7 (5.144) we suggest that successful bids to the Local Sustainable Travel Fund could help to expand the 'sustainable transport' offer.	Noted. We will be developing and submitting bids to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for sustainable transport solutions.	
15	6.25 1. 'Policy Compatibility' (second bullet - 'Priority areas for planning and development'). We would suggest that the schemes in LTP3 are designed as components of a 'sustainable transport' package that are independent of the BHLR scheme, and are designed to perform on the basis that the BHLR will not be built.	Noted.	
15	Page 35, para 3.2 This section should be amended to reflect the current configuration of the Kent, Wider Essex and East Sussex Local Enterprise Partnership.	Noted	Document amended



15	<p>Page 58 - Environment Landscape and Biodiversity: It would be useful to refer to the Habitats Assessment for the Ashdown Forest that has already been undertaken in conjunction with the County Council, as part of Wealden's evidence base for the Core Strategy. This assessment makes a number of recommendations for mitigation and control measures in relation to reducing visitor numbers and monitoring the effects of fuel emissions and air quality on this unique habitat. <i>See below for more</i></p>	<p>Agreed. The plan has been amended to include reference to the HRA for the Ashdown Forest.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>
15  4	<p>This is particularly important in relation to transport / traffic modelling. Reference is made to the Ashdown Forest on page 71, in relation to cross boundary working with West Sussex/Brighton and Hove and the need to ensure that development is not detrimental to the 'communities' of Forest Row and the Ashdown Forest. However, it is not specific about the potentially detrimental impact of new housing growth on habitats and biodiversity or the potential impact of traffic generated from this growth upon the forest itself. We would like to see this aspect strengthened under the environment section on page 58. This aspect could also be further strengthened in relation to the benefits of environmental designations section on pages 78/79, where the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area and Pevensy Levels RAMSAR site, should also be given specific mention because of their unique global and European environmental designations.</p>	<p>Noted. The document has been amended to address this point.</p>	
15	<p>The implementation plan presented appears to bear little relation to LTP3 as drafted, or its strategic aims and objectives. The implementation plan outlines essential maintenance and improvement works in the 4 key areas namely :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway maintenance/resurfacing</li> <li>• Bridge and structure maintenance and strengthening</li> <li>• Rights of way work, and</li> <li>• Integrated transport and road safety measures</li> </ul> <p>Although these areas are important to the overall transport network across the County and contribute to the key objectives highlighted in Section 2, it is hard to see how the other more significant planned initiatives and strategies incorporated within the LTP3 will be programmed and delivered over the LTP3 period.</p>	<p>The draft LTP included an explanation as to why the implementation Plan was incomplete. The final LTP 2011/12 Implementation Plan will give greater clarity as to the link between it and the objectives of the plan. Given fluctuating investment levels in future years a clear delivery programme for many initiative and aspirations is not possible.</p>	<p>Document amended</p>

16	<p>A forward plan of projected major works and studies is required to assess how the local transport situation will improve and to provide an action plan to accompany local LDFs and IDP and / or CIL schedules. Each initiative and key action point of the strategy presented in the various boxes in Section 5, needs to be accompanied by an indication of a broad timescale for progression until 2026,. Again there should be firm indications of provider, and sources of funding for realistic delivery. This would allow alignment with the LDF, LEP and other strategies coming forward, so that the overall objectives stated in Section 2 can be met.</p>	<p>The Implementation Plan for 2012/13 - 14/15 will outline the infrastructure that will be delivered with the funding that is anticipated to be available . However, it is not practical to identify a programme beyond that without the certainty on funding, whether from LTP grant, external funding, grant bids or developer contributions / Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>	
15	<p>Page 181 - The summary box indicates the purpose of the indicators and targets as a means of determining how well LTP3 is achieving its vision and objectives. These cover a number of aspects included within LTP3, but not all. It is recognised that this list may well be refined following consultation. However, an action plan / forward planning programme as suggested above, covering all aspects of the strategy and linking to the vision and objectives, would serve to provide firm targets against which the strategy can be assessed. This would also be of use to local authorities in producing their LDFs and subsequently to LSP and/or LEP partnerships.</p>	<p>We will be reviewing targets and indicators in light of the coalition Government's desire to reduce the burden on local authorities in relation to collecting and reporting performance data.</p>	
15	<p>Appendix A - Local picture and challenges The need to develop noise action plans for a number of roads within Wealden District is highlighted on page 200, but a programme of work for these has yet to be developed. We would be grateful if you could inform us of the programme once devised or at least any agreed timetable for development of these schemes.</p>	<p>Noted. We will inform and work with Wealden in taking forward the issue of noise reduction work.</p>	Document amended
14	<p>Also, while there is reference in the LTP to the existing South Downs Management Plan, this should be updated to reflect the fact that the National Park Authority is commencing work on a new Management Plan and is currently consulting on arrangements for engagement in that process.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	Document amended

15	While the means of delivery may be less important than the outcomes, it would be relevant to point out that the County Council will be taking back in-house the day to day responsibility for maintaining rights of way. Users and other stakeholders have become used to the higher standards achieved by the South Downs Joint Committee and there should be a commitment in the LTP to maintaining and enhancing those improved standards in collaboration with the Park Authority and the other highway authorities across the Park. ESCC will also need to work closely with the NPA in its role as Access Authority and in improving the signing of walking routes out of Lewes and into the countryside. Widespread and clear explanations of users permitted on each kind of route would also be very welcome.	Changes have been made to the document to give further clarity on our approach to issues related to the South Downs National Park and to the places which will act as gateways for sustainable access to the park. We are currently in discussions with the South Downs National Park with a view to agreeing an accord for the management of Rights of Way in the park, as well as other operational details.	Document amended
16	Whilst large and expensive road schemes, such as the Bexhill-Hastings link road, are retained and the implementation plan specifies many road resurfacing works, Integrated Transport measures are relegated to an 'as funding allows' category. If ESCC seriously wishes to achieve the improvements in cycling that the strategy claims then a greater proportion of the transport budget needs to be put towards that aim.	There will be a budget for integrated transport schemes but the level of funding had not been determined at the point of producing the draft plan. The final LTP 2011/12 Implementation Plan does include the measures programmed for next year.	
1	The introduction of an interactive online Rights of Way Map is we feel an excellent idea...we just hope we'll be able to access it!	Noted.	
15	We note that Rodmell appears on Year 2 of the rolling rights of way survey...we could see no mention of Northease, will they be surveyed with Rodmell?	Yes, answer forwarded already by RoW team.	
15	Local VCS believes that there is a real potential for 'DIY transport' projects to contribute to meeting the LTP3 objectives. Therefore would welcome more support for and involvement of the small groups who can organise a range of transport initiatives in the local communities across East Sussex. The groups felt that such small community schemes can specifically help improving the travel choices and improving the accessibility and inclusion (two of the LTP3 objectives). Projects like voluntary run car schemes and car clubs could also contribute towards achieving the objective of reducing congestion and tackling the climate change. VCS organisations have also highlighted the need for a continued partnership working to achieve the LTP3 Objectives.	Agreed.	Document amended

15	<p>The work of the University of Brighton We value project <a href="http://www.wevalue.org/">http://www.wevalue.org/</a> in promoting “values -based” Education for Sustainable Development may also be relevant to the strategic approach to the development of this plan.</p> <p>Their newly developed, tried and tested toolkit of indicators seeks to reveal invisible qualitative local values which when expressed as quantifiable indicators of sustainable development can be seen to be more fully in tune with the aspirations of local people allowing for much more sensitive sustainable development.</p>	Noted.	
10	<p>It is unclear how LTP3 will encourage more walking and cycling. 20mph zones are one way of encouraging active travel and their absence is a major omission.</p>	<p>The preferred strategy is designed to support sustainable growth and the use of sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling. There is currently no policy to introduce default 20mph speed limits but the new Road Safety Strategy will give greater clarity about the use of 20mph zones.</p>	
1 13 15	<p>Generally supportive of the vision and objectives particularly quality of life and safety issues. Against road improvements as they encourage commuting. Oppose the westwards expansion of Polegate as once the A22 is crossed there is no natural barrier. Does not agree with development at Honey Farm as it is isolated and will increase car use and lead to more commuting. Footbridges are not the answer. Development should take place in sustainable locations e.g. Hailsham.</p>	<p>Noted. As the local transport authority, the County Council works with planning authorities to establish sustainable locations for development and to develop improvements to infrastructure in order to enable travel by sustainable modes to and from those locations.</p>	