

ALFRISTON PARISH COUNCIL

RESPONSE TO ESH DESIGN RESPONSE 13 NOVEMBER 2020

1. This response is subsequent to an APC Traffic Management Committee meeting at which attendance included Maria Caulfield MP and Alex Pringle on behalf of SDNPA.
2. The Committee were heartened to see that ESH/ESCC had taken on board some the comments made in APC's previous response, but would still hope to see ESH/ESCC act in a spirit of facilitation rather than finding reasons to frustrate APC's ambition.
3. In response to ESH's document the committee made the following observations:
4. APC's proposals have never been born out of a need to address any accident record but from a desire to make Alfriston and the Cuckmere Valley a more desirable place to live and visit by addressing the issues brought by traffic movement and in particular a perception of fear engendered by the manner in which traffic moves through the valley and the village.
5. APC's proposals, in our opinion, form a positive and sensitive scheme by which to achieve the aim of addressing the issues faced by creating a sense of place and improving the public realm.
6. It should be noted that, for a number of years, ESCC pursued a traffic signal scheme. APC raised on numerous occasions that the accident record did not warrant such an intrusive intervention but this was rebuffed by ESCC. APC, therefore, finds it unhelpful for ESH to have to recourse to this excuse in relation to any proposal now advanced.
7. APC would welcome a site visit with ESH to discuss and explain the proposals on the ground, and hope this can be facilitated soon.
8. Re weight restriction signage at the A27 and Seaford: APC does not ask for additional signage, it asks for better and clear signage of the type illustrated in APC's original proposal, which are a type already adopted widely across the country and in East Sussex.

9. ESH's stance in relation to the removal of white lines and cats eyes continues to lack coherence when measured against the removal of lines at Whiteway. APC approach this issue from the point of view that the removal of lines begins the process of engendering a sense of place well in advance of the village gateways, and so complements an overall scheme.
10. APC would welcome the introduction of some form of cobbled strip/similar design feature as in ESH's latest document Figure 1.7, to sit alongside the SDNPA boundary markers on the C39 at Drusillas and Seaford, and would not push for cattle grids if these could be incorporated into a design.
11. APC continue to press for village gateways that include a build out/single lane priority but stress the desire and need to make any design sensitive to the setting. That would require the minimum of signs, markings, bollards etc. APC question whether in fact these are necessary given the absence of such features in the image at Figure 1.3, which must have met minimum safety requirements; and also given the absence of such features at Frog Firl where a single lane/priority feature has been in place for a number of years. APC believes that gateways can be designed so that the benefits are realised without visual impact, whilst safety standards are met, as there are many examples across the country. APC would wish to discuss possible siting of gateways at a site visit.
12. APC would like to see all options of 5 metre strip of contrasting road surface at gateways, as well as 604 metres of colour/texture change and 604 metres of setts included in any consultation, but continue to favour a change to road surface across the 604 metre length.
13. Remodelling of intersection/Roundel: APC see this feature as essential to addressing both the speed and attitude of drivers as they approach the bend into North Street from the north, by engendering a sense of place, which in turn should provide for a safer pedestrian crossing point for those exiting the Willows.
14. North Street: It is recognised that the proposal to break up the linear nature of North Street is difficult to articulate on paper, and difficult to achieve without bailouts etc. The reason for

suggesting some design feature is because drivers tend to accelerate down the 'straight'. It may be best that ideas can be mooted at a site visit.

15. Convex Mirror: It is unclear to APC whether the requirements necessary for DfT to consider a convex mirror is that all requirements must be met, or one/some. If the latter, then it should be noted that no other visibility scheme is feasible; and visibility cannot be improved by removing walls and houses. However, despite the concerns that *may* arise from placement (concerns that have not been shown thus far to actually arise), APC continue to press for at least a trial of a convex mirror to investigate the extent to which it would ease/avoid congestion and conflict at the narrow part of the High Street without causing any safety issues. It should be noted that other, far more costly and potentially unsafe schemes have been trialled by ESCC and ESH in the recent past.
16. The rationale behind the proposal for a convex mirror is not based on any accident record, as APC has been well aware for years that no such record is apparent or that it has ever called for drastic intervention. This measure is aimed at easing/improving the flow of traffic at this point which, when congestion does occur, leads to pavement mounting, aggressive driver behaviour and increased fumes from vehicles that become stuck (which affects pedestrians and those living in close proximity to the street).
17. APC continues to push for the removal of parking restrictions in Kings Road and Deans Road, and the introduction of a double yellow line outside the Star for all the reasons previously set out.
18. The proposal to re-evaluate the bollards is to see if there is a more cohesive approach that does not produce increased pavement restriction/mounting of the footway or lead to building strikes. The proposal arises because APC recognises that the siting of individual bollards is the result of an ad hoc approach and there may be room for improvement if a cohesive 'scheme' were looked at.
19. APC would welcome any update on the results of communication between ESH and Highways England re those matters set out in Table 1.1 of the report.