



Have Your Say  
A2300 Improvements Scheme  
West Sussex County Council  
Chichester  
PO19 1RQ

By email: [a2300@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:a2300@westsussex.gov.uk)

19 October, 2018

Dear Madam / Sir,

**Objection to sub-standard and dangerous provision for people walking and cycling adjacent to and across the proposed dualled A2300**

I am writing on behalf of Brighton & Hove Friends of the Earth, whose members often cycle and walk in Mid-Sussex, to object to the proposed dualling of the A2300 with its sub-standard provision for people wanting to walk and cycle. Apart from our concern at the emphasis always being on building bigger roads to try and cope with traffic (which nearly always fails in the longer term) rather than investing properly in sustainable transport measures to reduce traffic levels, the proposals for non-car users are simply not fit for purpose in the following ways:

1. The scheme does not conform to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which says that pedestrian and cycle movements should be given priority (para 110) - here they are just an afterthought as they clearly have been added after the road layout has been decided, rather than the road layout designed around the needs of people on foot or on a bike.
2. The shared path is too narrow (at 2.5m wide) - it should be at least 3 metres wide to meet the latest standards in IAN 195/16 as it will basically be a cycle path on which people can walk. Given that the road will no doubt be built to meet the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), we see no reason why provision for people who want to cycle shouldn't either.

3. The path has too many high speed junctions, made worse by the 70 mph speed limit, where no help is given to people wanting to cross. This will not make it easy or safe for people to cross these side roads, breaking up their movement along the route and making it unattractive to use. Despite the 70 mph speed limit some cyclists may stay on the road because they may feel it is easier for them at these junctions, as they are currently designed, as on the road they will have priority over the side road. .
4. There are too many sharp bends at some of the crossing points which will mean cyclists will have to cross the road more slowly, increasing their exposure when crossing the road and reducing safety. It will also be harder for some cyclists to turn and face the traffic. The path should be modified in these locations to proper design standards to improve visibility and to make it easier to cross.
5. There are no slips (easy access points) onto the path near the A23, at Stairbridge Lane or Cuckfield Road. So anyone coming from these directions will find it difficult or impossible to get onto the path. From the west side of the A23 there is no access onto the path, unless you are already off the road, which could cause cyclists to go on the A2300 putting themselves at risk. Elsewhere the lack of slips will cause cyclists to swerve into the traffic to get onto and off the shared path or for them to have to slow right down, or to pull out slowly, in fast moving traffic, neither of which is particularly safe or pleasant. Access slips need to be provided to allow cyclists easy and fast access onto the paths from the road and to minimise the number ending up on the A2300. Good signage will also be required but unless it is backed up by good design, people will still go wrong.
6. Several quieter roads that are good for cycling would be severed by these proposals with no help given to pedestrians or cyclists to cross the A2300, such as from Stairbridge Lane to Pookbourne Lane, at Bishopstone Lane and at Cuckfield Road. This will impact mostly on recreational cycling (but not exclusively) but its importance should not be underestimated, particularly as this could force cyclists onto busier roads or deter some from cycling altogether.
7. As more development follows in this area, then the demand for utility and recreational cycling will rise. Yet any development to the south of the A2300 will not be easily accessible for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly on Cuckfield Road or via the new developer financed roundabout at the eastern end of this scheme. Neither are fit for purpose and the scheme designers have only considered the cycle flow as a linear east-west movement when in reality it will be in all directions. These roundabouts need a fundamental redesign to make it much easier and safer for cyclists to circumnavigate them to access all directions.
8. The path under the retained overbridge is right next to the 70mph carriageway. This is dangerous. The central reservation should be reduced and or the road moved across to provide the required separation between road and path. Standards require an absolute minimum of a 3 metre separation between the road and path for a 70mph road. Otherwise people walking and cycling could be severely buffeted by passing traffic and even sucked into a vehicles slipstream. If this cannot be provided by redesigning the road layout, then the speed limit should be reduced until the appropriate separation can be achieved.

In addition to the above concerns, the path needs to be built to a high standard with a smooth sealed surface (such as tarmac) to make the route attractive and easy to cycle and any lamp columns, signs and other obstructions should be at least 0.5 metres clear of the actual path.

Overall, it is deeply disappointing to see such poor and ill-thought out provision being proposed. Yes there is much detail to be done still, but it doesn't bode well when the proposals so clearly fail to meet minimum standards on many aspects of the current design or to accommodate straightforward movements in and around this corridor. It is not acceptable for the road to be built to DMRB standards but not the walking and cycling elements. This shows a clear prejudice against active travel, apart from being contrary to the NPPF. It perhaps explains why there are such low levels of cycling in the county when many areas, with the right infrastructure provision, would be conducive to supporting very high levels of activity.

It is important that active travel is given a much higher priority, not just to conform to the new NPPF but also to increase the levels of exercise within the community and to improve public health and to reduce pressure on the NHS. More people walking and cycling is also good for reducing congestion and pollution and for business. A fitter population has less absenteeism and a happier population is also generally more productive.

I would urge a fundamental rethink of these proposals so that active travel can be properly accommodated within the designs and to maximise the benefits for the local population. We would be willing to input into the design process should that be helpful, as I am sure would others.

I trust this is clear, but if you would like any further clarification please do not hesitate to get in touch

Yours sincerely,

(Mr) Chris Todd

Planning & Transport Campaigner  
Brighton & Hove Friends of the Earth

cc Councillor Roger Elkins, West Sussex County Council  
Councillor Joy Dennis, West Sussex County Council  
Councillor Kirsty Lord, West Sussex County Council  
Councillor Garry Wall, Mid-Sussex District Council  
Councillor Jonathan Ash-Edwards, Mid-Sussex District Council  
Councillor Norman Webster, Mid-Sussex District Council  
Councillor Sue Hatton, Mid-Sussex District Council  
Roger Geffen, Cycling UK