

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

Against 161 For 66

It would ruin a wonderful safe passage for pedestrians and children. Must be retained as is.
walking and cycling route, dangerous to reopen to

Good as it is. Far safer than it used to be
lack of visibility, large pedestrian traffic, increased traffic onto Lindfield High Street - I can't see how this is a good idea
important safe access to the village for school children, the elderly and cyclists
this is a fantastic safe walk for many to the village if it were opened it would be a no go pedestrian route due to the
narrowness of this road

This is the only safe road that children can walk down in the village without the fear of cars. This road should be kept
closed off

I don't believe this is a safe proposal. It would be a step backwards if the barrier was removed.
Many school children morning and afternoon going to Oathall, 2 nursery schools with toddlers. Very narrow in places,
many joggers and dog walkers. A potential rat run from By Sunte, Sunte Ave etc. Little or no footpath - needs improving
currently provides safe pedestrian + cycle route

The closure must be maintained. The reasons (30/40 years ago) for closure was because of the extreme danger to
pedestrians. Today's traffic will make it even more dangerous
far too dangerous to re-open
strongly against

Strongly (against). Not safe for pedestrians
DO NOT REOPEN. MY DAUGHTER WAS KNOCKED DOWN ON HER WAY TO SCHOOL AS IT WAS USED AS A RATRUN &
TRAFFIC WAS TOO FAST & DANGEROUS

It works well at the moment. No change is necessary
needs to stay closed

No advantage. Risk of increased accidents

Serves no useful purpose. Increases risk to pedestrians. Max 1 way. Costs far too much for benefit. Reduces parking
Everyone is used to Denmans Lane being closed to through traffic. It is a very useful and heavily used pedestrian & cycle
route and should be kept as such

This road is used by a large number of pedestrians who would be put in danger
Do not agree with opening Denmans Lane, the road cannot take traffic in any volume
noting to be gained as this will apply pressure in Hickmans Lane

it is so nice to walk down there & not worry about too many cars coming down
currently the only traffic free access to the village for pedestrians and must be retained as it is

In the 11 yr period the road has been blocked off there have been no accidents. With 2 nursery schools & many
pedestrians walking through, to make the road a thoroughfare would be dangerous. There is no space to create a
pavement!

It is a safe way to walk into town, re-opening the road would endanger pedestrians walking through there. There are also
two nurseries on Denmans Lane end that would make it unsafe for parents to walk their children on the road
The road is incompatible with modern traffic flow & would put all pedestrians/cyclists at risk. This is the only safe way to
walk to the high street from Hickmans Lane

Would create a 'rat run'. Simply add a pavement on one side of the road
Hugely detrimental effect for residents as well as pedestrians & cyclists. Not necessary & will create a rat run
cannot see any major benefit

I fully support the assessment set out in Section 13 of the "Report". It is difficult to see how traffic flow would be
improved. The cost would be prohibitive.

If opened could cause build-up of traffic trying to get out into the High Street as there are two car parks in Denmans Lane
Ditchling build out / move barrier but - as unlikely to be agreed - am against any change

I would suggest that the barricade should remain; but should emergency access be needed then it could be opened for e.g.
ambulances or police or fire

We should be reducing the facilities for motorised traffic. Not adding to them
What would be the benefits from re-opening the Road? The circumstances have not changed since it was originally closed
Very against. Reinstate sign at Hickmans Lane end saying priority to pedestrians and cyclists. This disappeared last
summer. Enforce 10mph speed limit. This is a peaceful village road used by residents walking to shops, schools, dog
walking Don't allow this amenity to be lost for the community

Yes, against!! No footpath from allotment road westwards. Mobility scooters and children are already at risk. Visitors and
I have had a few close calls already and with nursery school opposite it will be very dangerous. Reversing from our shared
driveway is extremely tricky, more traffic equal more unsafe

This will create a rat-run and whether one way with footpath or two-way with no path, will be a danger to residents of
Denmans Lane and Close & school children using the road
This should be left as it is. The road is too narrow for cars

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

Against 161 For 66

But, if the traffic lights option is chosen then open Denmans Lane West-bound only would compensate for difficulties *see below

If two way, two cars passing each other would leave no room for pedestrians. Making it one way would be of little benefit to residents who would still be unable to leave / enter from either end, and it could become a rat-run which would benefit no one

To open this lane to traffic I don't feel will improve the flow of traffic in the High Street

It will become a rat run to avoid Lindfield/Lewes Rd traffic light jams Nursery in both ends of lane danger to children

Road not suitable with today's traffic

The gate was originally put up because traffic drove too fast along the winding lane and there were at least two nearly fatal pedestrian accidents. Now there is a very busy nursery school at the bottom of Denmans Lane and I fear a small child could easily be involved in an accident

If re-open, please only if becomes one-way

Strongly Against. Getting quite dangerous now as a footpath. Cars still go too fast. Bad idea to reopen. Two nursery schools, car park entrance, junction with Compton Road, already quite hazardous

Very much against on grounds of safety for pedestrians and cyclists

VERY AGAINST. Opening up to any through traffic would be a retrograde step and most likely result in increased traffic in Sunte Avenue

Definitely I see absolutely no reason to re-open the road

Would cause accidents especially at Compton Road junction

Dangerous for pedestrians, used daily by families using both nursery schools in Denmans Lane as well as older children walking to Oathall School etc Will be used as a short cut mainly 8-9am when most busy with families. Unsuitable for extra traffic. Total, total waste of money. Repair pot holes instead!

Totally against:-

Safety - pre-school establishments at both ends, pleasant + safe cycling and walking route

Might adversely affect traffic flows at Lewes Road Junction + Sunte Ave/Gander Hill by attracting more movements from East to Balcombe Road

Prohibitively expensive to meet required standards

Reopening contradicts Cycling Initiative and "Safer Routes to School" Initiative

Significant pedestrian traffic on road, especially between 8.30am-5pm

Two pre-schools are located on the road. Both require safe drop off areas

Reopening is dangerous for small children walking/on scooters/in prams; cyclists; disabled people; dog walkers. Previously, when the road was open, it served as a rat run.

Silly idea!

Denmans Lane was closed for SAFETY REASONS Re-opening contradicts the "Safer School Routes / Cycling initiative. Lane is location of two pre-schools. It is used by children cycling/walking; mothers with pushchairs; elderly walkers. Traffic already abuses speed limits in open section. This would worsen.

Fully agree with Consultant's views including that "reopening the closure as a through route would undermine safety for walking and cycling without any significant benefit" and wholly support the views of the Crompton Road Residents Association (copy attached). Additionally reopening could damage the few remaining wildlife friendly original farm hedges Agree with the views expressed against reopening by the traffic consultants and the Crompton Road Residents Association. I suffer from Parkinsons which makes it difficult to move quickly and does sometimes require the use of a walking aid or a wheelchair, so increased traffic would be particularly dangerous for me.

An increase in traffic flow in Denmans Lane in either direction will have an adverse effect on the safety of pedestrians and Residents whose properties border the Road where proposed changes are. There are two nurseries where there is no pavement so increased traffic flow would be dangerous.

Walking regularly the length of Denmans Lane has become increasingly more dangerous, due to high speed traffic, prior to barrier being installed. Particularly so during the darker, winter months. Reopening the road will definitely place pedestrians in danger once again. It would be a bad decision

Two pre-schools in Denmans Lane. Not cost effective to open up road. An open road will invite a rat run and provide a dangerous environment for walkers and cyclists

High Priority. Two pre-schools provides safe access in Lindfield High Street by foot, pedestrians, cyclists, families, commuters & disabled. Traffic will increase on the Lewes Road / High Street junction as will become a fast rat run. Blind junctions / driveways, statistically more accidents on Denmans Road before it was closed. Increase noise & air pollution & very expensive to carry out the work to re-open

Totally counterproductive & unsafe to re-open! Leave alone.....!

The present situation has worked very well for many years providing a safe and pleasant link road for the village. Leave it be.

This lane was originally closed because it was dangerous. Many pedestrians use it, and it was a rat run for cars and official vehicles

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

Against 161 For 66

The PCC's wise decision to drop this pleases me. If implemented the road would have become noisy, dangerous and unpleasant for the residents, pedestrians (especially children), and cyclists. It would also increase traffic at the dangerous Crossways intersection where Portsmouth Lane, Sunte Avenue, Summerhill Lane and Gander Hill meet.

I cannot see any justification for spending money on this road

On the grounds of safety, against. Opening up to traffic would encourage its use as a "Rat Run". Being a narrow lane with no footpath would potentially make it unsafe for both pedestrians and cyclists.

To make Denmans Lane a through road would be detrimental for pedestrians and cyclists

This proposal is very unwise. The pedestrian use of mother, baby & pram has greatly increased, due to the 2 pre-schools. The union point of Compton Road and Denmans Lane is already dangerous as cars turn into the wrong side of the road to enter Denmans Ln. Not enough space for a footpath.

On the grounds of safety, against. Opening up to traffic would encourage its use as a "Rat Run". Being a narrow lane with no footpath would potentially make it unsafe for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Significant pedestrian and cycle traffic shares space with non through traffic without any accidents since 2005. Opening to through traffic would substantially increase danger and speeds

My question is why reopen, what will I get from Denmans Lane reopening, if one way which way will it be - in any event it will increase traffic along the lower part of Denmans Lane leading to congestion accessing the car parks.

Contrary to government's safer school initiative as currently significant safe pedestrian access through the village to the primary school and two pre schools. Opening will create dangerous environment for children accessing preschools on Denmans Lane. Originally closed as was a rat run with accidents & a death. Will bring traffic from outside the village through the centre of the village with traffic queuing at either end t junction (Hickmans Lane & High St ends) with associated increase in pollution in the centre of the village; even if one way; which is ludicrous. Expensive and will create more problems than it solves.

With two pre schools on it, the narrowness of the road, the already dangerous blind junction with heavily-parked Compton Road, the unsuitability of such road for through traffic along its length and "T" Junctions at each end, its blind corners its social amenity value at the historic heart of the village, (peace, walking, safety of adults/children from traffic, Denmans Lane Dash), all favour Denmans Lane remaining as it is. Further, the open the road would not provide a solution to traffic volume and safety; merely introduce the volume of traffic to a central part of the village, and thereby increase danger of harm from accident and pollution.

Provides a good pedestrian and cyclist corridor

Reopening contradicts Cycling Initiative and "Safer Routes to School" Initiative • Significant pedestrian traffic on road, especially between 8:30am – 5pm • Two pre-schools are located on the road. Both require safe drop off areas. • Reopening is dangerous for small children walking/on scooters/in prams; cyclists; disabled people and dog walkers.

Previously, when the road was open, it served as a rat-run. • Opening road will increase traffic on Lewes Road/High Street Junction • Opening road will increase traffic on Compton Road, a busy residential road. • Statistically, there were more accidents on Denman's Road before road was closed. • Will increase noise pollution and air pollution in surrounding neighbourhood. • Is not a cost effective option. Closing the road/installing fence and wall was expensive.

Dangerous to reopen. Road isn't wide enough and there isn't pavement provision all the way through.

Narrow road without complete pavement. Two nursery schools & attendant traffic Will Reinstate "rat run" the reason why(apparently) the road was closed years ago - significantly more traffic throughout the whole village since then so why now!!!!

Will reinstate the 'rat run' for which it was closed! Too many children using this road. Too narrow too dangerous.

There is enough traffic in Denmark s Lane at the moment and too many cars /vans parking on the pavement so mothers and pushchairs have to walk in the road. Opening the road will only lead to an increase of through traffic.

Would once again become a "rat run", with consequent increase in traffic volume endangering pedestrians and cyclists. Importantly there are two pre-schools either side of the barrier used by parents with little ones and prams/pushchairs.

It used to be a rat run before it was closed to through traffic.

We are vehemently opposed to the re-opening of Denmans Lane for all the reasons already given by the Members. The Lane is narrow, with a sharp bend, no room for pavements and, in addition, the camber of the road makes it dangerous for any traffic other than for access.

Re-opening would contradict the government's Cycling Initiative and "Safer Routes to School" Initiative. There is significant pedestrian traffic and re-opening would put pedestrians, small children as there are 2 nursery's, prams, cyclists, disabled people at much greater risk as there are insufficient pathways. The road is already congested at the High Street end with cars parked on the double yellow lines. Re-opening would cause increased traffic on the High Street/Lewes Road and Compton Road, noise and air pollution. With cars much bigger and the narrow sections and restricted viewpoints at Compton Road junction and on the bend, re-opening will undoubtedly cause accidents. If re-opened the road would serve as a rat-run, probably in the main from NON-Lindfield residents!

Denies many on the Western edge of the village a traffic-free, child-friendly walk through to the High St. Could reinstate vehicular cut-through to Portsmouth Lane / Sainsburys / station from Lewes Road. Both would increase car traffic in vicinity. Deeply regressive and regrettable proposal.

No need for rat run when plenty of routes already available

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

Against 161 For 66

Re-opening would re-instate the previous "rat-run" to Sunte Avenue and would contradict the Cycling and Safer Routes to School Initiatives. There are two pre-schools in Denmans Lane with significant pedestrian traffic including parents with small children and buggies etc. which militate against re-opening. Consider also clearer "yield" road markings at Compton Road junction.

Reopening Denmans Lane is a very unsafe proposal for pedestrians and cyclists. The two-way traffic in the High Street portion of Denmans Lane is already a busy route. With no pavement, this would lead to accidents with small children, prams, and walkers, particularly as there are two schools in Denmans Lane, one each side of the barrier. Opening the barrier will also increase the traffic at two already busy junctions: Denmans Lane / High Street and High Street / Lewes Road. As a matter of record, there were more accidents in Denmans Lane before the barrier was erected.

Reopening Denmans Lane is a very unsafe proposal for pedestrians and cyclists. The two-way traffic in the High Street portion of Denmans Lane is already a busy route. With no pavement, this would lead to accidents with small children, prams, and walkers, particularly as there are two schools in Denmans Lane, one each side of the barrier. Opening the barrier will also increase the traffic at two already busy junctions: Denmans Lane / High Street and High Street / Lewes Road. As a matter of record, there were more accidents in Denmans Lane before the barrier was erected.

I am a student at Oathall Community College and I walk up and down Denmans Lane on my way to school. Every day, cars go down the road at great speeds and I have almost been squashed on multiple occasions. This is with the gate in place. If you remove the gate there WILL be a fatality. My mother and her family put the gate in place for her safety so it would be a shame to put all their efforts to waste.

Will significantly increase traffic in an area already too busy, will make the road unsafe for children, walkers, cyclists etc. and increase noise and air pollution

With 2 nurseries and as one of the main pedestrian routes into the village this proposal is clearly going to have a negative impact on road safety in Lindfield. Even as it stands many cars go too fast along the high-street side on Denmans Lane, and with no continuous footpath I have seen many pedestrians, including young children almost hit by these cars. Speed humps may slow average speeds, but with an increase in volume there would still be an increased risk of accidents. Plus there would be more air pollution on a route frequented by young children. A one way route would likely increase speeds significantly, and would cause increased access times for emergency services.

With 2 nurseries and as one of the main pedestrian routes into the village this proposal is clearly going to have a negative impact on road safety in Lindfield. Even as it stands many cars go too fast along the high-street side on Denmans Lane, and with no continuous footpath I have seen many pedestrians, including young children almost hit by these cars. Speed humps may slow average speeds, but with an increase in volume there would still be an increased risk of accidents. Plus there would be more air pollution on a route frequented by young children. A one way route would likely increase speeds significantly, and would cause increased access times for emergency services.

This is one of the nicest safest pedestrian areas in Lindfield. People walk through all day and evening, children with parents on the school run, children with their scooters, bicycles, elderly people cutting through to make walking a manageable distance from The Welkin and Brookway with a large population of elderly as it cuts out the hill. The village improved hugely when it was closed. This would be a terrible step backwards in terms of overall quality of life for the village. The turning space onto the road from the steep driveways is dangerous without traffic adding to it. NIGHTMARE. We bought the house BECAUSE the road was closed.

This is a costly proposal that is not going to particularly benefit anyone, and just create a rat run, on an unsuitable road. This is a terrible idea. I have two young children, one of whom is at nursery on Denman's lane. In the mornings and evening there are lots of very little children walking along Denman's Lane, which has NO PAVEMENTS in many sections, and it would be an accident waiting to happen if rush hour traffic were to be allowed through there. We live on Compton Road, and the traffic is already bad enough on this road - us and almost all of our neighbours have had our wing mirrors and sides of our cars damaged by vans and cars speeding along it. This would only get worse if Denman's Lane was opened up.

* Re-opening Denman's Lane contradicts the government's Cycling Initiative and "Safer Routes to School" Initiative * Re-opening the road puts small children walking/on scooters/in prams; cyclists; disabled people and dog walkers at greater risk. Previously, when the road was open, it served as a rat-run * There is significant pedestrian traffic on road, especially between 8:30am and 5.00pm * Two pre-schools are located on the road. Both require safe drop off and collect spaces, and increase the footfall of children on the road * Opening the road will increase traffic on Lewes Road/High Street Junction * Opening the road will increase traffic on Compton Road, a busy residential road. * Statistically, there were more accidents on Denman's Road before it was closed. * Noise pollution and air pollution will increase in surrounding neighbourhood. * It is not a cost effective option. Closing the road/installing fence and wall was expensive.

My toddler rather enjoys walking up to the co-op, with less danger from traffic. The junction at the Witch pub has an almost blind bend towards the traffic lights, with the cottages nearer to the traffic lights having no off-street parking so often clogged up. Don't see this working.

Current high usage by pedestrians and cyclists plus two nursery schools. A narrow road with no room for footpaths. Re-opening will undoubtedly result in accidents.

Denmans Close being a no-through road is used for pedestrians, families and bicycles as a route into the village especially those with young children. Turning this into a through road for cars is a backwards step. Without designated cycle paths and footpaths this change presents a risk to people.

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

Against 161 For 66

Cost too high to achieve and with two nurseries on the road it would cause significant concern unless proper footpaths were put in place.

Our daughter attends The Acorns nursery school and we feel that opening up the road to additional traffic would make it unsafe for children, especially on outings and around drop-off / pick-up times.

One way traffic (east to west) could draw traffic away from the High Street but impact Compton for traffic heading north. One way (west to east) would cause queuing of cars prior to the junction onto the High Street where there are entrances to the two car parks and where cars park on the double yellow lines.

This would create more congestion at the Denman's Lane/High Street junction. Blocking access to the two car parks that are heavily used.

This re-opening would complicate the proposal to improve the high street / Lewes Road junction and see the re-introduction of a rat run. The present closure allows a peaceful walking/cycling route without motorists needing to go too far round.

My Wife and I have been residents of Denmans Lane since the mid 1970's thus have witnessed the before and after the erection of the barrier. Before the barrier, the Lane was a busy "rat run" for most of the day with the consequential risks of collisions and pedestrian injury. After the erection, the risks of the aforesaid have been reduced dramatically.

Furthermore, with the 2 schools either end of the barrier, it seems inconceivable that anyone would want to increase the risks of personal injury

Far too costly for little reward.

If two way, two cars passing each other would leave no room for pedestrians. Making it one-way would be of little benefit to residents who would still be unable to leave/enter from either end, and it could become a rat-run which would benefit no one.

Any changes will increase risk in area currently used by pedestrians/cyclists and significantly increase traffic. Close proximity of houses (including my own) and nurseries and the detrimental impact to us. As report states I see no case to reopen.

Needs to stay as a pedestrian walk way into the village.

As a cyclist, this is the only place in Lindfield that currently feels safe

My house faces Denmans Lane. When road was 'open' too much traffic including lorries taking it as a shortcut. Very busy with Acorn nursery and also new block of flats with many more cars. Would destroy a lovely lane yet again. Footpath would make road even more narrow. NO NO ...

It was closed as a safety measure. Today with far more traffic ,opening it again would be madness

I am strongly opposed to the removal of the barrier. Living in The Glebe I already find visibility poor turning into Denmans Lane and extra traffic on Denmans Lane would create a dangerous situation for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, Denmans Lane is very narrow with no footpath so the increased traffic would make it extremely dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. There are two Nurseries in Denmans Lane and at two key times in the day the road is busy with parents dropping their children by car or on foot – the removal of the barrier would create a greater volume of traffic on Denmans Lane significantly increasing the risk of injury to very young children. Any thought of removing the barrier is an ill-considered notion fraught with grave dangers to young children, adult pedestrians, cyclists and motorists alike. This is a very, very bad idea that should go no further.

I have lived in The Glebe close to the barrier for thirteen years during which time I have found it difficult on many occasions to turn right onto Denman's Lane as visibility is poor especially in winter and in bad weather. There are two nurseries on Denman Lane. I pass one every day and little children dart around at drop off and pick up times. People who live in the Glebe and beside the nursery know to slow down to a snail's pace but if the barrier were to be removed drivers using the lane as a 'rat run' wouldn't know to do this and I am sure that before long there would be a fatality! I am an ex ward-sister and have worked in Great Ormond Street Hospital and in an A&E department. I have experienced first-hand what injuries a little child can suffer during a collision. Safety must come first every time.

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

For 66 Against 161

may help relieve Lewes Road/High Street junction
a most undemocratic decision cutting off Denmans Lane - it should be used as a one way route resulting in increased traffic to Hickmans Lane
should never have been closed in the first place
good idea
should not have closed in the first place
one way on Denmans Lane East-West with footpath. One way on Compton Road South-North
Good idea - would relieve other roads
make it one way
one way as too narrow for two way. Maybe with cycle way / joint pedestrian lane
Essential long overdue
One way into the High Street. If this was done Hickmans Lane could also become one way OFF the High Street also allowing for a footpath there. Much more pedestrian and cycle friendly for all! Buses come down Denmans Lane. North on the High Street and left on Hickmans Lane in a loop
This form is not accepting my vote in favour of opening Denmans Lane. (Rank 1) Having lived in Denmans Lane before it was closed, I feel qualified to have an opinion. That is it would take pressure off the route past the pond as part of a one way system. A pavement would need to be made and parking would need to be prevented.
Should re-open Denmans Lane one way, with single footpath to reduce High Street traffic and Hickmans Lane / High Street problem, Hickmans Lane to be part one way only
In favour - 1. One way away from High Street. This may help Hickmans Lane / High Street which is a major problem NOT prioritised in this survey
Re-open with one-way going West (i.e. away from Village centre), with footpath on one side
worked well as a one way before - no consultation on close. Only 2 letters suggesting it. Too short to be a meaningful leisure route. Big detour to get from The Glebe / Witch to the other side of village. Ease junction Hickmans Lane / High Street which is bad
One way with footpath
May need to be re-opened if traffic lights are installed in High Street
Reopen
In favour of it being reopened to improve traffic flows across the village
One way from East to West (see Hickmans Lane below) Two way from car park to High Street
Re-open as it was previously
Re-open, one way, away from the High Street. New footpath, possibly speed humps
This will make a huge improvement in traffic flow, whichever proposal is adopted
Not before time! Either proposal would be desirable but the one-way solution might meet with less opposition. Personally I prefer the two-way scheme
Not appropriate
Would improve traffic flow + could fix problem with Lewes Road / High Street junction
Two way with speed bumps
If one way, preferably from Hickman's Lane to High Street
One way with new footpath
In favour One way with new footpath (to ease Hickmans Lane traffic)
I'm in favour completely. Re-open as through road, either one way or two way but only for cars and small carriers only
Ideally one way - much safer - with restricted parking
If re-open, please only if becomes one-way
But only as a one-way
This would reduce pressure on adjoining roads
Re-open as through road with new footpath, ONE WAY provided direction from High Street to Hickmans Lane
Either reopen or change gates to gates which can be open by emergency services to provide access if Black Hill is closed
Compton Road congestion will be much relieved by re-opening of Hickmans Lane
It is ridiculous and disgraceful that this road is closed when no other roads in Lindfield are closed. Of course it must improve traffic flow and relieve Hickmans Lane
In favour of opening it with new footpath
I would like to see this opened to one way traffic. Allowing people out of Lindfield this would help with the traffic going out of the narrow opening of Hickmans Lane + have speed humps to solve any speeding
this would make an additional entry / exit to the centre of the village
May reduce traffic flow through Hickmans Lane /High St junction , which is potentially hazardous for pedestrians.
Open as a one way with new footpath, to take pressure of Hickmans lane exit to High Street, which would remove the danger to pedestrians & cyclist and remove the problem from reversing a car back into the High street to allow the bus or large vehicles to exit. One has to ask way Hickmans lane /High st exit has not been covered ?

Denmans Lane

Re-open as through road, potentially one-way with new footpath or two way with no footpath and road speed humps, to spread / improve traffic flow

For 66 Against 161

I've never really understood why this road was 'closed' off. I know that two local councillors reside along the lane and were active in getting it closed, but I can't see why the traffic was restricted. Currently, the traffic in the lane, towards Hickman's Lane, beside Acorns Nursery clogs up the road when children are being dropped off/picked up. It's difficult to get through - opening up Denman's Lane would help alleviate this congestion.

One way, from High Street to Hickmans Lane. Also Compton Road to be one way from Denmans Lane to Hickmans Lane, but with width restriction.

Hickmans Lane, Sunte Avenue, Finches Park Road

Road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

Against 69 For 133

sign flashing 30 mph

map is out of date. Houses have now been built on Witch garden. Proposed narrowing at East end is narrowest point in the road. If it is built it will make access to my drive and my neighbours drive (No xx & xx) very difficult. No need to build narrow points as parked traffic already keep speed down. Suggest signage on the road marks the bus stop as at the West end

expensive

bad position - usually several cars parked by Witch pub

Reduces traffic flow and creates driver conflict. This road is already too narrow for 2 cars to pass safely at normal speeds - see verges for evidence

Doesn't tackle speed issue. Perhaps put double yellow lines in

This does not tackle the speed of traffic on the bend on Hickmans Lane. Narrowing the roads in Sunte will cause huge congestion & encourage cars to 'take risks' - parking restrictions on the corner by the Witch are needed Sunte - traffic slow and troublesome due to parking on both sides of road. If traffic calming installed, would make very slow and cause queueing traffic. Hickmans Lane E & F - problem is cars parking to access The Witch Pub - speed is the issue towards the Welkin area. Either install roundabout - which will slow traffic naturally or install double yellow lines and speed bumps at Sunte/Hickmans junction

Sunte Avenue 20mph speed limit? Parked cars provide some traffic calming

Hickmans Lane: localised narrowing and pedestrian crossing points will be a hazard to cycling (see attached note) Sunte Avenue: road narrowing ineffective because of parked vehicles. Parking in the blind bend near The Witch should be prohibited.

Far too many constrictions, will slow traffic down too much, will result in increased air pollution from vehicles constantly having to speed up and slow down

Ditchling build outs only - if it is to be "WSCC style narrowing" then forget

This road is already very narrow near to the Witch Inn and this causes great difficulty. It will simply create an obstacle course and there will be long traffic queues - i.e. Ditchling Village

Not necessary - we have not been provided with details of accidents/problems involving pedestrians / cyclists / vehicles where deaths / major injuries have resulted. I do not see the need for so-called "traffic calming" / pedestrian crossing measures

This is totally unnecessary. It is possible to cross the road at present. Narrowing the existing road will cause traffic to back up and pollution. A crossing for school children may be an option.

Road narrowing causes build-up of traffic & air pollution. Button activated crossings are awful. Belisha beacons are good But ban parking outside The Witch & the new houses as difficult to see round curve in road after entering Hickmans Lane.

Not required - why waste money?

Not in favour of road narrowing, which causes tail backs and associated pollution

West Common end Hickmans Lane & Sunte Avenue are important through roads and are already congested by parked cars
Unnecessary

4 additional houses plus car spaces not shown. This means pedestrian crossing point at Eastern end is not possible. Also bus stop eastwards near no 58/60 not shown. Crossing point exists at corner exists

Perhaps a crossing point at junction of Hickmans Lane & Finches Park Road

won't make better

I am against any road narrowing as it is used a lot by people going to the park/nursery + matches on the green. School children do not need narrow roads + footpaths but again speed humps would be useful

Excessive - do not consider necessary

* The form does not ask for comments on proposed treatment for narrow part of Hickmans Lane at High Street Junction:- I would support the proposal in detail G of drawing UKD-161-07

I use these junctions regularly both on foot and in the car. They are seldom a problem and a little patience is usually all that is required.

I live in By Sunte and use Hickmans Lane a lot. The problem is where Hickmans Lane joins the High Street. This is very congested and needs attention.

Currently there is good visibility to enable pedestrians to cross. Could the suggested changes increase traffic congestion?

I am puzzled as to where all these pedestrians are coming from. Other than at school access times and dog walkers, most people seem to travel by car. I see no reason to spend valuable finance on providing dedicated crossing points at this location. Better space where none exists at bus stops at the end of the footpath to Finches.

Will make the current traffic flow worse, increase stationary traffic, increasing pollution, making crossing far more dangerous.

Sufficient parking and crossing is not that difficult

Without the increased traffic flow caused by opening Denmans Lane there should be no need for this.

I'm not against a crossing at some point in the road, but Hickman lane is already very narrow in places. I was forced into the side and damaged my wheels recently when a bus went too near the centre. The road needs clear central road markings.

Don't think it's necessary

Hickmans Lane, Sunte Avenue, Finches Park Road

Road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

Against 69 For 133

I don't think the traffic can pick up that much speed in these areas because of the number of parked cars. Sunte avenue is difficult enough because of the parked cars stopping traffic flow from one direction or another. Quite easy/safe to cross. I don't believe we need as many crossing points as are being proposed. The evidence collected does not show that changes are needed.

Against road narrowing as will do little to reduce overall speed, Pedestrian crossing would be helpful
This is one of the main alternative routes for traffic to avoid the High Street. Sunte Avenue is a wide road, wider than neighbouring Summerhill Lane, which has been left off the list.

Hickmans Lane, Sunte Avenue, Finches Park Road

Road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

For 133 Against 69

signage to warn motorists about narrow pathway for pedestrians

BUT! Very worried if there are no parking restrictions at each side of crossing points pedestrians will think they can be safe yet the speed and volume of traffic will not make this so. Especially at west end it will be too wide and would benefit from an island also. many cars speed along this very straight road (avoiding lights, roundabouts at west common) a low speed limit or camera

definitely need those crossings

Excessive speeding cars - difficult access from Comptons Rd / Shenstone/Hickmans Close/Welkin/Finches Gardens/Finches Road/Brookway

in favour of two crossing points

restrict speed in village to 20mph

Yes, a very good idea

The traffic travels very fast and crossing is difficult for pedestrians. Any measures to slow things down would be welcome double yellow line - need to focus on Portsmouth Lane / Sunte Avenue roundabout - car parking at Witch make West traffic blind - station car parking on Sunte Avenue needs to be addressed

minor improvement at a financial cost

This would be useful if sensitively done. It is used as a rat run with Pickers Green a popular green for dog walkers and footballers

in favour of this

Cars come so fast from By Sunte one way or Hickmans Lane the other way. By the island is a nightmare as it is narrow & I live in Finches Park Road. Also having the bus stop at the end of the Twitten from Finches Park Road and Hickmans Lane is no good

HIGH PRIORITY Favour strongly a 20mph speed limit on Hickmans Lane & Sunte Avenue. Road humps to assist with this too.

I realise that some people are against 20mph road signs but this is a small price to pay. Children's safety is FAR more important

Sunte Avenue is used as a rat run with speeds in excess of 30mph, so anything to help pedestrians is welcome. The West end proposal is still a wide road and needs a traffic island as well. At the east end parking (some illegal anyway) makes access to Sunte Avenue totally blind because of the curve and is an accident waiting to happen. This needs to be addressed to help pedestrians and car drivers

Agree in Hickmans Lane - think money better spent elsewhere than Sunte Avenue

Hickmans Lane and Sunte Avenue certainly need some way of slowing traffic

See above for Denmans Lane

The road bends around trees and houses etc. The position of these crossings - as on the plan - and how they are built out need further investigation. The road is often not much wider than the suggested narrow crossing points and aggressive traffic will ignore them.

Hickmans Lane - needs crossing where the gate and steps are opposite Hickmans Close. Lighting very poor on that path beside the road. Lighting good opposite Welkin entrance. Major accident as in daylight (bright)

A better way of supporting pedestrian safety might be to introduce 'reactive' speed limit signs. These are more effective as a reminder in areas that have good visibility. Obstacles and restrictions only cause resentment.

In favour

A pavement by the Witch would be nice. A pedestrian crossing point at the Welkin would be good. The car park opposite is busy every day & weekends. Traffic calming here would be very useful

Too many

In favour

Denmans Lane one way, Compton Road one way South to North, Hickmans Lane from junction of Compton Road one way West to East. Restricted parking in Compton Road to East Side only (Residents ONLY Parking - PERMIT HOLDERS)

Especially detail "G" (Barn End)

Yes, I think this would be advantageous

Only viable if there are signs or surface marking to show that the pedestrians have priority

OK

should reduce speed of traffic

will ease junction with High Street

*I also feel that you should consider each end of Sunte Avenue - with solid yellow no parking lines on E&W [unreadable] running through junction to bus stops. - highly dangerous areas

*I feel very strongly re the marked issue - both junctions at Sunte are very unsafe agree one or two would be a good idea, but not as many as suggested

The existing pedestrian 'path' to the south on the section adjoining the High Street needs to be more clearly defined and include cats eyes' to the outer edge

Hickmans Lane is becoming a fast cut through to avoid the Village High Street. There are curves in the road making it dangerous to turn right from Sunte Avenue, Brookway and Finches Rd. Vision is poor and traffic goes far too fast - often difficult to cross on foot too! All verges ruined by large vehicle parking - reduced to chunks of mud completely spoils any "green" appearance in Sunte Avenue

This would not be a problem if it were not for all the parked cars in Sunte Avenue

In favour of road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points with a radar trap to deter determined rat runners. Road width at

Hickmans Lane, Sunte Avenue, Finches Park Road

Road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

For 133 Against 69

No 42 is 4.5m. Pedestrians crossing from The Welkin have nearly been hit by east going traffic. The twitter at the bus stop is a hazard to young people

Proposed road narrowing either end will encourage speeding between narrow areas. Imposing a 20mph speed zone plus controlled parking, alternating between north and south side would more effectively reduce speeding, and would also improve visibility for pedestrians and cars exiting driveways which is currently extremely hazardous.

Initiative should consider the cars that park on the corner of Hickmans Lane/Compton Road. Currently, these cause a hazard/blind spot for drivers turning into Hickmans Lane from Compton Road and force cars to swing out onto fast, oncoming traffic

Initiative should consider potential queuing of traffic down Compton Road

Most effective means of traffic calming would be the introduction of 20mph speed limit throughout the village. Speed restrictions required along Hickmans Lane. Include vehicle activated speed signs. Pedestrian crossing point.

This should help reduce traffic speed

Slowing down of traffic essential. Hazard now caused by car parking on corner of Hickmans Lane/Compton Road - in Hickmans Lane

Very necessary! Hickmans Lane is a frequently used rat run and vehicles very often exceed the speed limit a good idea to slow traffic on this rat run and provide safe crossing points

Limit traffic speed to **20mph** through the use of raised tables / speed ramps (as per Westland Road / America Ln) would also be beneficial

Slowing traffic is important but we must minimise additional road clutter and signage.

Pedestrians must be considered in the context of Hickmans lane. As presently presented, pedestrians are not considered at all; they must receive equal priority, at least, as road traffic to ensure safety and preserve social amenity. At present, Hickmans lane is the sole domain of traffic which pedestrians are obliged to navigate without the aid of supporting road architecture. This suggestion would not interfere with present traffic volume, but greatly add to the social amenity of the village. Many people, for many reasons, cross and use Hickmans lane at different points, and their safety and sense of equal right to cross and use Hickmans lane as already afforded to traffic would be safer and more equitable if this suggestion were adopted.

Seems to be too many narrowing and crossing points. Consider a couple less?

Any steps to try to help Pedestrian and to reduce average traffic speeds is good.1188

- Traffic calming and the slowing down of traffic is required
- Initiative should consider the cars that park on the corner of Hickmans Lane/Compton Road. Currently, these cause a hazard/blind spot for drivers turning into Hickmans Lane from Compton Road and force cars to swing out onto fast, oncoming traffic.
- Initiative should consider potential queuing of traffic down Compton Road.
- Most effective means of calming traffic would be the introduction of 20mph speed limit throughout village.

will help to slow down drivers along Hickmans lane and facilitate pedestrian" crossing

Hickman lane is a race track and it and the village generally would benefit from a 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT. Turning left out of Compton Road is often difficult because of vehicles parked too near the corner. A review of parking near blind spot junctions is needed - for example, Tollgate/Compton Road junction.1199

Traffic in Sunte Avenue and area is at dangerous levels and becoming worse. We cannot reverse out of our drive (in Sunte Ave) safely at peak times. Traffic slowing or calming measures would be welcome. Personal preference is for 20 mph signs despite issues of signage appearance.

Hickmans Lane shows the highest average speeds in the village - traffic calming measures are required both here and elsewhere in the village - favour a 20mph speed limit throughout. Review of on-road parking arrangements required to eliminate hazards/blind spots for turning traffic (in to/out of Compton Road and other side roads). Similar consideration needed for Compton Road/Toll Gate.

Need to slow down traffic, so maybe reduce speed in village

Adding crossing points is a great idea. Not sure the narrowing of the road is necessary. The crossing points are a high priority

Parking is a real problem at both junctions of Sunte Ave. Commuters park at the junction with Summerhill Lane and it is dangerous so need double yellow lines around each junction.

As a resident with very young children and open garden frontage directly onto Hickmans Lane we support any motion that would incur the need for vehicles to slow down. Despite it being a bus route, we do feel speed bumps are perhaps the most appropriate option or second to that the narrowing as suggested where vehicles are required to stop and give way.

Vision for drivers coming out of Finches Park Rd is restricted because of hedge on Hickmans Lane to right side. No.5

Finches park junction only. This could slow traffic down as cars travel too fast round Hickmans Lane.

It is good to improve pedestrian flow but I have not, on walking in the village, found these to be problematic roads to cross. I am in favour of these provided funds are not going to hinder more needed works.

You could consider bringing the Finches Park Rd/Hickmans Lane junction out to calm traffic flow and increase visibility

In favour of the upgrade per detail G, (the Barn end).

This would make it safer for pedestrians. The road narrowing would need to ensure that vehicles did not have to mount the kerb/pavement to pass by.

The main issue on Hickmans is speed of traffic especially coming down the hill from the High Street end. As a cyclist, it's hard to turn right into Finches Park Road because the bend is so long it makes it difficult to look behind. The safest thing to do here is to stop and then cycle across when it's clear.

Hickmans Lane, Sunte Avenue, Finches Park Road

Road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

For 133 Against 69

Additionally make the end of Hickmans Lane one way from the Compton Road junction towards the High Street thus removing a serious pinch point and making it far safer for pedestrians. (See item 1, as this would create a circular flow. I note that one of the pedestrian crossing points at the end of Sunte Avenue/Hickmans Lane has already been completed! Yes, but put calming/slowing points at the High Street end of Hickmans Lane before traffic has the opportunity to speed up- which it does now

High Beech Lane and Portsmouth Lane

Vehicle activated speed sign, road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

Against 45 For 150

Junction to By Sunte very bad, traffic too fast and over white line. Adding crossing near here and narrowing road will cause accidents. But speed activated sign higher up High Beech Lane a good idea

Traffic needs to be slowed a bit earlier in the road - it is the speed that cars come down the hill from the golf course & also from the mini roundabout the other way

Against road narrowing - very pro vehicle activated speed sign
waste of money

I have never seen any pedestrians here. Why do we need a crossing point?

Not required - why waste money?

Not in favour of road narrowing, which causes tail backs and associated pollution

Again important through road to Ardingly especially if High Street and Dukes Road are restricted

Definitely no to road narrowing

I don't feel that any change needs to be made to this area

Speed sign may be useful & possibly a single crossing point but should really be promoted as the preferred through route
N-S

The speed sign is a good idea but not the road narrowing. Crossing points are good

I live nearby and use this road most days, on foot and by car, and know it well. No evidence of problems here. No footway but never any pedestrians. The money should go towards making the perilous Crossways intersection (where Portsmouth Lane, Sunte Avenue, Summerhill Lane and Gander Hill meet) safer. Letter to follow on that.

I would support vehicle activated speed signs but am not sure other measures are needed

In favour VASS Against road narrowing and Pedestrian crossing points

The existing traffic crossing island north of Sunte crossroads serves its purpose. Installing a new crossing point near By Sunte would, when crossing from West to East, would have poor visibility because of the blind bend further north round
High Beech Lane

I am in favour of reducing the vehicle speed through High Beech Lane approaching the junction with By Sunte but I believe that something more drastic than any kind of sign would be required to slow traffic at this point. The idea of providing a road narrowing on the exit from a double bend leading to traffic turning the corner to approach a blocked road is to me unthinkable. Again, where are these crowds of pedestrians? Is it worth spending on these issues? Money would be better spent on improving the footway which in some places is substandard.

I would prefer to see railway station / Ardingly cut-through traffic given easy passage to take load off Sunte Ave and Hickman's Lane route (I acknowledge some self-interest here). But speed sign is sensible, fair and reasonable.

In favour of Vehicle speed sign BUT road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points not required.

Unless applied to Summerhill Lane also

Unneeded expense. Just a vehicle activated speed sensor sign may be beneficial.

High Beech Lane and Portsmouth Lane

Vehicle activated speed sign, road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

For 150 Against 45

This should be a top priority. This is a horrible road to cross with young children
any improvement to slow the traffic both up and down High Beech Lane/Portsmouth Lane will be most welcome
Makes drivers aware of their speed (especially the lorries from the stone crushers!)

not a cheap option but sensible

Vehicle activated sign in favour:-7 please improve unofficial footpath on the bank opposite the Golf Course

With the new development coming the traffic needs to be slowed down as lane is narrow and dark.

Speed sign only

needs to slow traffic down towards Sunte Avenue, currently too fast making roundabout dangerous

speed sign yes narrowing no see general comment

This would be useful. However I doubt that it will work as the problems along High Beech Lane have been constant for 38 years!

Like speed sign idea

People come down High Beech Lane so fast & with houses planned in that road, on the Golf Course, there will be a serious accident

Very dangerous turning out of Brook Lane - right - as lorries come round corner so fast

speed sign

Yes to narrowing and crossings. No to speed sign as it is ugly

Against road narrowing. Use the type that shows the actual speed. Very clearly marked pedestrian crossing essential. The road is already narrow and it would be dangerous to do any more to this road until the new houses (planning permission given) are built. The developer will have to spend money on this road at his exit points.

Not sure that road narrowing would provide anything positive.

Agree vehicle activated sign, but not more road narrowing or pedestrian crossing places

In favour of vehicle activated sign. Against road narrowing & crossing points. Vehicle activated speed signs have proved effective elsewhere. Suggest one is placed in the Lewes Road approaching Lindfield too!

Reduce parking in Sunte Avenue adjacent to roundabout (at Crossways) to improve visibility

Speed across the village should be reduced to 20mph

Corrugated red tarmac with 30mph signs on road in each direction at 1. Sandridge Lane 2. North of entrance to HH Golf Course 3. Between Roundwood Lane and Brook Lane 4. Between BY Sunte and Birchen Lane. Vehicle activated sign also in Portsmouth Lane for north bound traffic. Richard Speller AHM WSCC has earmarked fund for this

Vehicle activated signs are brilliant idea generally, & I can't understand why they're not used in other places in Lindfield eg:

Lewes Road, Gravely Lane/Northlands Wood

In 2013 I submitted a petition signed by 109 local residents pleading for the introduction of traffic calming measures. A second sign is required for north bound traffic

Essential. Must be complemented by a similar sign installed on the grass verge on the northern side of the junction between By Sunte and Portsmouth Lane. Northbound traffic approaching the bend opposite By Sunte must be alerted

30mph speed limit sign need not be so far north

to slow down traffic, may be used more if buildouts are completed in High Street

Speed sign is a good idea

Something is necessary but as road is downhill Difficult to keep speed down to 30 AND keep eyes on road / traffic
Will these measures help developers of much disputed development site in greenfields to the E. of High Beech Lane? I hope not!!

Would this slow down traffic at junction w: By Sunte? Any chance of a safer way for pedestrians Portsmouth Lane at Gander Hill/Sunte Ave crossroads

Speed indicating devices supported by radar trap and 20mph limit would assist in reducing dangerous speeding and threat to cyclists and pedestrians

VAS - support

Crossing points - less convinced. Diagram of crossing near Sunte Avenue crossroads does not show existing crossing places which seem adequate. Unsure crossing near Crossways would be safe - visibility for traffic turning left from Gander Hill

when drivers' attention will have been on traffic to their right at roundabout

Traffic calming measures are welcomed

Again this should help reduce traffic speed

Traffic calming measures required

The speed sign is a good idea but not the road narrowing. Crossing points are good

Would suggest the use of activated speed signs in both directions (speeding occurs both up the hill as well as down). Limit traffic speed to **20mph** through the use of raised tables / speed ramps (as per Westland Road / America Ln) would also be beneficial

In favour VASS Against road narrowing and Pedestrian crossing points

In favour VASS Against road narrowing and Pedestrian crossing points

The existing traffic crossing island north of Sunte crossroads serves its purpose. Installing a new crossing point near By

High Beech Lane and Portsmouth Lane

Vehicle activated speed sign, road narrowing and pedestrian crossing points

For 150 Against 45

Sunte would, when crossing from West to East, would have poor visibility because of the blind bend further north round High Beech Lane

Would suggest the use of activated speed signs in both directions (speeding occurs both up the hill as well as down). Limit traffic speed to **20mph** through the use of raised tables / speed ramps (as per Westland Road / America Ln) would also be beneficial

same as answer for the comment for 2 above

Would suggest that the vehicle activated speed sign is put north of the entrance to Haywards Heath Golf Club

Probably the speed activated signs is sufficient

Speeds are often over 30 miles an hour along this stretch. Crossing the road is difficult.

Traffic is either speeding up leaving Lindfield or generally does not slow to 30 when entering Lindfield past the Golf Club.

Therefore Vehicle activated speed signs should be introduced in both directions.

Welcomed

Flashing speed limit signs always very helpful.

Another speed track which could be curbed with an ENFORCED 20 MPH limit

Traffic calming measures and pedestrian crossing points would be welcome.

Very good idea. Everyone goes too fast down this road.

Yes cars are often doing 40+ coming into Lindfield. Can be quite difficult to cross the road, particularly if crossing the road from using the footpath at the brow of the hill, off the side of the golf course.

I hope that there is consideration of traffic coming into town from Ardingly too. Some kind of gate might be in order as is present in other road from Ardingly. Also speed checks and 40mph limit before 30mph limit going down the hill.

In favour of VAS but not the road narrowing. Do not believe it is necessary

Speed of traffic approaching Haywards Heath is much too fast.

Vehicle activated sign should be placed prior to By Sunte turning, heading north. Raised table for pedestrians should be at Sunte Avenue roundabout only. Not necessary further up High Beech Lane.

activated sign useful to remind people as the 30 limit starts quite far out of the village

Why can we not have this on Lewes Road? Everybody ignores the speed limit; we need an actual speed camera!

Would make it safer for pedestrians. Comments re extent of road narrowing (above) apply here too.

Please can these restrictions be continued along Summerhill Lane, which these two lanes feed into? The eastern side of Summerhill Lane lies in Lindfield Parish Council's voting boundary, whilst the whole lane is within Lindfield Village's postal district. The Lane is an area of Townscape Character, so any signage would need to be in keeping with guidelines to protect this.

Although the report says no recorded incidents, I think it's only a matter of time before something serious happens. I believe the recent Reside report stated that the average speed of traffic coming downhill was over 40mph and uphill in the high 30's. Anything to reduce traffic speed would be helpful as well as a safer crossing for cycles and pedestrians.

High Street

Remove existing centreline, provide additional parking bays, additional pedestrian crossing points including buildouts and road narrowing

Against 82 For 127

Already too busy with stopping delivery vehicles
stop parking on both sides of high street
already too congested by delivery vehicles stopping

Stop parking both sides

Disagree with additional parking bays. I would prefer parking to be restricted to one hour only and have regular parking officers patrol
quite expensive

Against removal of existing centreline and provision of additional parking bays. Crossing points for pedestrians might work
see general comment - accident data is misleading as it attributes no blame and contains no detail

Allowing more parking may slow traffic, but very little. Parked cars make problems for pedestrians and cyclists, does not help them

It would be cheaper and more affective to put in double yellow lines in front of the red lion to stop cars from parking in front of it, this is where the road clogs up

prevent cars form parking (near) outside the Red Lion Pub - this causes chaos

The problem is parking by the Red Lion pub. Stop this and then speed humps. There is plenty of parking so install double yellows and enforce it!

Ridiculous unless there is a bypass too! Would cause ridiculous congestion crossing outside 70 High Street would prevent all deliveries to wine shop!! Could be feasible put it the other side of Alma Rd outside 72/4

20mph speed limit? Already problems with road being blocked because of inconsiderate parking

Will cause even more air pollution from cars taking longer to get through an area already slow in transit

Centre line is essential

This will cause a huge blockage in the High Street. As it is vans and cars seem to litter the High Street going to the Bakers, Pub etc. As a main road busses and lorries cannot get through without the width restriction. By removing the centre line you're assuming that all drivers are lane aware - not the case.

The High Street is already extremely narrow especially outside the red Lion. It turns the street into an obstacle course and there will be long queues - i.e. Ditchling Village

not necessary

This will cause more traffic to build up in the High Street& pollution for residents and pedestrians. Better to ban lorries and enforce no parking restrictions which are ignored at present. (A similar scheme in Hurstpierpoint has been very detrimental to traffic flow according to residents there

NO NO NO We have nothing wrong with the High Street the problem is ILLEGAL parking such as outside the Red Lion. We have a lovely High Street . - No narrowing please. Highly dangerous a pedestrian crossing at the top end. Don't need outside the Co-op either.

Double yellow lines on east side of road so absolutely no parking there - especially white van man going to bakers. Ban HGVs. Buildouts have not stopped traffic going through Ditchling

Parking on only one side of the High Street would help the traffic flow. A crossing (perhaps outside Abbots) would be very helpful, but I'm not sure about the road narrowing

Pedestrian crossing yes but don't impede traffic flow more

There is no need for road narrowing as it is often gridlocked around the Red Lion area

Why create another Crawley

Need less parking, yellow lines + traffic lights

This will not ease the congestion in the High Street, just cause more.

This will make things worse, it is already over congested

There is ample parking for a small village

No need for any more crossing points

I don't think there is a problem for pedestrians it is only for drivers on High Street. I don't understand how removing the centreline and adding parking bays can possibly improve traffic flow? Isn't this the problem? Get rid of parking on one side
Perhaps an additional crossing point = where?

No to road narrowing

This road is already narrow + we don't want to lose the verges. I don't feel additional parking bays needed here
not convinced of effectiveness for cost involved

I'm very concerned that any further narrowing of the High St will only increase the risk of more jams occurring - this will only get worse if any lights are put in at Lewes Rd. More/safer crossing points would be good though!

Any more road narrowing will bring the High Street to a standstill. We could do with a crossing of some sort though

I think this would make the High Street even more congested if the centreline is removed and additional parking bays provided. I would however support additional pedestrian crossing. I think that is too much traffic for other measures to work

The suggested measures would surely lead to much congestion of traffic so increasing air pollution. Traffic would be subject to delays

High Street

Remove existing centreline, provide additional parking bays, additional pedestrian crossing points including buildouts and road narrowing

Against 82 For 127

Just an additional pedestrian crossing needed

These are not additional parking spaces but replacement? We see the effect of localised narrowing now from incorrectly parked vehicles so it will just be chaos, perhaps that is the intention. I wonder why the through roads are not just closed down but as with any proposal - where would the traffic go. How do you force/encourage/coerce pedestrians to use these expensively provided crossings? There has to be a vision of how traffic is going to be catered for in the long term - I am afraid the only way is a new road, a by-pass. Opposite to stopping traffic using the back roads it should be encouraged to reduce the load on the High Street junctions.

I know there is concern about the speed of traffic through the village but I think we should a) rethink the 20 mph limit.

Putting 20 MPH signs on the road as they have in Uckfield will have limited impact on the appearance of the village (compared to traffic lights) b) restrict parking to one side of the road

Where is the need to create more parking in the high street and thus spoil the look of the village. This would seem to be sensible .A crossing from the butchers to coop would be a good ide

As above, this would serve to funnel more Ardingly and Hosted Keynes to Haywards Heath traffic down Hickman's Lane and Sunte Ave. Current volumes are dangerous and anti-social e.g. speeding, jamming, horn-blowing from 06:00 hrs each day.

It's a shame you have linked the crossing points with narrowing the road. Any road narrowing is going to cause absolute havoc when heavy goods vehicles travel along the road. It can already cause huge jams. I would prefer you address the issue of cars parking on double yellows, such as opposite the bakers, maybe with the use of a camera. Road narrowing can be considered if heavy goods vehicles are re-routed around the high street. Ditchling high street is a fine example of how bad a narrow high street can be.

Enough parking already, priority should be reducing speed on entry and exit to High Street just adds to congestion

I cannot see any logic in removing the centre line - people will still have to drive along the High St and this will cause more hold ups .

Please see comments on Q5

This would cause considerable traffic build up and congestion (particularly with lorries). Parking should be created in alternative, less congested areas, away from the High Street.

This will simply make the High Street more congested for little benefit. Have a pedestrian crossing - but not road narrowing/additional parking. Parking could be provided elsewhere without impacting flow on the high street. Commercial deliveries (3 pubs and multiple shops) would also be impacted making congestion worse.

There are already enough crossing points and parking. With the current parking situation the road is narrow enough. Money would be much better spent filling in the potholes throughout the area and resurfacing roads to make them better for pedestrians, cyclist and motorist.

High Street is congested enough which could be remedied by better policing of illegal parking. Any parking bays considered at the High St / Brushes Lane junction would need to be sufficiently sited away from the junction so as to avoid difficulty in turning left out of Brushes Lane.

Put double yellow lines down the East side with additional pedestrian crossing

Removal of centreline seems too risky an option (too dangerous?). Additional parking bays are not appropriate - would, I think, affect traffic flows adversely.

If there are restrictions in Lindfield High Street, then the only alternative north/south route is along Summerhill Lane/Portsmouth Lane/High Beech Lane, referred to in the previous point. Is there any additional land for car parking, near the new housing developments, to alleviate parking in the High Street? Where do shop owners park their cars and could they walk/use public transport, to free up spaces to encourage shoppers to shop in the village?

High Street

Remove existing centreline, provide additional parking bays, additional pedestrian crossing points including buildouts and road narrowing

For 127 Against 82

I think we should have 20 mph speed limit through the village
I have a young child and the lack of crossings are an issue further up the high street
implementing a 20 mph speed limit and cracking down on illegal parking would vastly improve the safety in the high street
anything to slow the traffic down the high street would be good
traffic jams form when delivery lorries stop and unload
Improvements are much needed! restrict speed in village to 20mph
Good idea
Correct parking must be enforced here as the traffic jams up when cars & vans are parked on the yellow lines. Yellow Lines must be repainted
No 8 re Welkin twitten - need for safe crossing, as cars speed up - possible - bumps, 20 sign, camera
plus 20 mph through high street and ban on large heavy weight lorries through village and double yellow lines outside Red Lion Pub
I don't think this will make much difference although pedestrian crossing points would be good. Can HGVs be stopped from using the road as a through route
In favour of additional crossings but feel there is enough parking on the High Street
there is a need to deter heavy traffic using village as a through route
traffic slowing measures required by the pond and at the top of the high street by Lindfield House
The main problem is allowing parking on both sides of the road. It must be a nightmare for lorries and busses and we get quite a few tractors with huge trailers
High!
Nowhere near enough, speed reach & exceeds 50mphs at top and around the point which incredibly hasn't been included in the study
Anything that slows the traffic down is good
The High Street is too hazardous for cyclists. May improve safety for pedestrians. The pot holes will also slow traffic. I push my bike along the pavement. Existing road markings (yellow line, white lines) must be maintained!
No traffic lights
Priority 7 Agreed but no traffic lights
Against road narrowing additional parking. Suggest you revisit the previous consultation on the High Street. Pedestrian crossing needed near the Red Lion Pub. Should be 20mph although traffic can rarely do more. Reinstate the Toll Gate? Aim: to make it difficult for large lorries to negotiate by arranging parking bays. Crossing needed near 'The Tiger' - pavement too narrow traffic aggressive.
The fumes and back up of traffic could cause problems if the High Street is narrowed so it is important to ensure traffic can flow through. At present cars/lorries negotiating space to pass takes drivers attention from pedestrians and cyclists need to use the pavement. It is a B road. Ditchling has been wrecked.
Too much
Extend 20mph limits throughout the village, not just near schools (additional benefit reduced clutter)
This will help reduce HGV traffic through Lindfield, and we should maximise narrowing to reduce HGVs and their damage
Traffic needs to slow down Dukes Rd / High St turning right may be a safety issue
Leave all as is BUT add zebra crossing and light at pond where lollipop man guides children. Outside school drop off and pick up hours it is very dangerous to get small kids and older people safely across to get to common from the pond and vice versa
Leave centreline please. Other measures sound good.
Enforcement of existing parking restrictions would make most new proposals unnecessary
Agree but there is ample free parking in the village
In favour but without additional parking bays; we have two free car parks
Enforce Parking Restriction (RED LINES) in areas where no Parking Bays
Road narrowing would be counterproductive. The smooth flow of traffic reduces air pollution from vehicle exhausts
I'm not convinced about road narrowing
Please introduce speed restrictions. Pedestrian crossing points VERY much needed - especially by the Post Office! Perhaps a pedestrian traffic light with this crossing
but Against more parking bays - where would they be?
Against buildouts unless associated with one pedestrian crossing
It will deter traffic including HGVs from using Lindfield as a through route. It will also have the effect of reducing speed
Check positions for PO delivery vans etc
Agree, so long as it doesn't impact on village beauty - e.g. please don't remove grass verges. Again raised crossing points are good but not too many please
Only in favour if effective measures also implemented at the same time in the Luxford Road / Brushes Lane / Dukes Road corridor, otherwise the problems in the corridor will be made worse by the impact of the proposed work to the High Street
Please keep the centre of Lindfield as a village Also most people need to cross from Welkin to church. A lot will not cross further down to suit traffic planners
Against extra parking. Sometimes almost impossible to cross the road on foot. Long wait for a break in the traffic. Too many cars parked on both sides making it difficult for buses to get through
? At top of High Street from Hickmans Lane to just north of church is particular problem for pedestrians
Build outs, road narrowing, 20mph limit and a radar trap supported by speed indicating devices would be preferable to the absence of any effective measures by WSCC
Traffic calming measures are welcomed
Most dangerous are to cross for pedestrians, including disabled people and children in prams, is at the top of the High Street, near the church
20 mph restriction would help calm traffic
Vans and cars parking near bakery cause traffic queues

High Street

Remove existing centreline, provide additional parking bays, additional pedestrian crossing points including buildouts and road narrowing

For 127 Against 82

Limit on parking time, but this would be pointless unless enforced; as is the case with parking on "double yellow" lines e.g. Denmans Lane junction/High St

Traffic calming measures would be welcome. Crossing point necessary at north end of High Street

The use of raised tables/speed ramps and built out pedestrian crossing points would also be beneficial in limiting traffic speed to **20mph** both in the High Street and around past the pond

The use of raised tables/speed ramps and built out pedestrian crossing points would also be beneficial in limiting traffic speed to **20mph** both in the High Street and around past the pond

Minimise additional signage and road clutter

The High Street as presently presented prioritises traffic. As such, the village is bisected by (largely) a high volume of non-resident through traffic. THE social amenity of the village would be greatly improved by this suggestion as pedestrians would be given parity of status as traffic when crossing the road; and the additional parking bays are required as is evidenced by the density of parking on Compton Road and other ancillary roads leading off the High Street. Lindfield is rightfully proud of its High Street and the many retail outlets which attract people from all around. It adds to the vibrancy of the village and its economy. But it is imperative that village accommodates this success by paying equal attention to the residents; and in my opinion this suggestion addresses the important social issue of maintaining for all the utility of the village and its amenities.

build outs don't appear necessary - ideally resurface high street in granite setts or similar to give more of a village feel and deter spread through surface undulation. Suspect implementation maintenance cost may however be prohibitive.

Speeds along this road are often too high. Especially large heavy vehicles which would not be able to stop quickly. There is a lot of crossing to and fro for pedestrian with prams and children. This would be a good safety improvement

All the measures mentioned in this point are supported. However I believe a 20 mile an hour speed limit should be put in place, Brighton has adopted this in the centre of Brighton and works well.

- Traffic calming measures are welcomed.
- The most dangerous area to cross for pedestrians, including disabled people and children in prams, is at the top of the High street, near the church.
- 20mph restriction would help calm traffic
- Vans and cars parking near bakery cause traffic queues
- Street parking should be limited e.g. half an hour/two hours, unless those parking have residency permits.

Any measures that help to keep traffic flowing and pedestrians safe on this busy access road and high street must be welcomed.

In favour if it slows traffic between Hickmans Lane and the church.

Traffic calming measures and pedestrian crossing points (particularly at north end of High Street) would be welcome.

Pedestrian crossing opposite the pond would be great (9) Extra parking not essential - not sure where it would go?? (5) No road narrowing - when big lorries try to get down the street there will be gridlock (1) - unless a priority system is introduced like in Ditchling?

These are good ideas; however, the real problem is the junction between Hickmans Lane and High St. There is no room for 2-way traffic and no control or signalling to ensure that traffic is moving only one way into the entrance of Hickmans Lane. Visibility is poor, often causing near-collisions and necessitating dangerous reversing. Also potentially lethal for pedestrians as no walkway. Suggest solving this by a traffic light on High St and Hickmans ensuring one-way movement of traffic only into the junction. Alternatively make Hickmans Lane one-way, with the traffic circuit going from High St into Hickmans and continue onto the B2028, then back up to High St.

3

1

In favour of some additional parking and one crossing point (by the Bent Arms), but do not believe the others are necessary. More parking enforcement in the village would be better - particularly trade vehicles stopping for the bakers, and deliveries to pubs etc.

Pedestrians have a very difficult time. But traffic can become completely clogged up with big vehicles meeting each other

Provided there are more parking spaces and an improvement of traffic flow I am in favour. However I am very disappointed that the study does not include the High Street outside King Edward Hall which desperately needs a crossing and is completely ignored by the proposals.

The briefing paper points out a crossing point has been previously considered at Pondcroft Rd but through difficulties with utilities being not deeply buried, and land forming part of the common, this could not be achieved. 20 years on and the need for this crossing has increased and the stretch of road needs to be reanalysed to see what is possible, if not at Pondcroft Rd can it be closer to the KEH. I was very annoyed that the parish council recently stopped the installation of such a crossing point claiming that crossings were covered by this study and that the crossing of the High Street was to be seen as part of wider picture, that picture is not being displayed here.

Drivers are in a hurry and frustrated at waiting for example joining the High St from Lewes Road. I think measures here go hand in hand with Lewes Road actions

However there is NO provision for deliveries to the shops in the centre of the High Street. The Off Licence, Post Office/Paper shop (now a parcel collection point as well), Chemist, Red Lion etc all need supplies. Also parking to the right of Alma Road will make exiting difficult/dangerous with restricted vision. Has a one way system down from Hickmans Lane to Denmans Lane (or for large vehicles further to the other end of Hickmans Lane) been considered?

Be careful not to replicate the chaos that is now Hurstpierpoint High Street.

Lewes Road Brushes Lane Corridor

Raised table at junctions Newton Road / Dukes Road, Brushes Lane / Brushes Lane, Luxford Road / Harvest Close

For 118 **Against 55**

Detail E - 9

not needed if traffic lights at Lewes Road done properly
can't see this will deter traffic. It would increase noise as drivers accelerate

The pedestrian crossing points are already there. Raising the level is not necessary.

Ditchling style build outs only

Don't use much Can't comment:- but turning into the High Street from Brushes Lane - either left or right is difficult for cars because of speed of traffic. For walkers, the pavement is narrow but safe. For cyclists - the visibility is good will increase CO2 and NO emissions as cars accelerate / decelerate over the table. Noise levels will increase too not necessary

This route takes traffic going N/S away from High Street. Bumps would be really irritating for people living in these roads.

Would slow traffic exiting from the High Street and Lewes Rd possibly causing accidents

I think this might cause accidents

This will increase pollution due to cars slowing and increasing speed

Waste of money

This would make the High Street worse and access to Ardingly more difficult

Raised tables tend to lead to accidents

I question if this is necessary? I do not think that these junctions are difficult for pedestrians to use.

Waste of money

I believe that although these are residential roads they give access to housing developments, there have been no improvements to these roads to take account of such developments. So they are feeder roads and while there are restrictions on the junction at the High Street I will continue to use these roads as my route to home.

Implementing the No Entry restriction at Dukes Road should negate the need for these changes

Not aware of this area

The current proposals will not stop the increase in use of this corridor by traffic seeking a way around the High Street/Lewes Road issue.

Not sure it is really necessary.

I see no real benefit from this. There are no pedestrian issues in this area there are plenty of place to safely cross and traffic does not speed in this area. Not sure what problem is being solved.

This seems an unnecessary expense, given that most residents in all roads everywhere would prefer to have less traffic.

May possibly deter drivers from using the roads to avoid the High Street.

Lewes Road Brushes Lane Corridor

Raised table at junctions Newton Road / Dukes Road, Brushes Lane / Brushes Lane, Luxford Road / Harvest Close

For 118 Against 55

Safer

please prioritise crossing on Luxford Road - lack of pavement makes it dangerous for children.

Please also take the large hedge on the turning of Lewes Road into Eastren Road into account. There have been a number of accidents due to lack of visibility

improved safety
would be helpful

slowing traffic on what is a rat run - very desirable

Not sure what benefit this will have. The junction work well at the moment & can be crossed by pedestrians at all times. Any thoughts of introducing a one way system or road closures would be nonsense. High St would become even more of a nightmarre

Not sure how the residents will feel who are directly affected

Speed limit should be reduced to 20. A lot of these problems caused by issue with Lewes Road & High Street
PLEASE take into consideration "EASTERN ROAD" as well as above roads. Since study was carried out, Eastern Road has become a significant rat run as well as Luxford Road. Cars regularly travel over 30mph as parked cars all on one side.

Luxford's parked cars are staggered which helps keep speed down
could be useful

this will reduce parking and not deter speeding. The road will still be used as a rat run although with traffic lights on Lewes Road maybe not so much

Unnecessary

Agree

In favour

if this slows down traffic this will be good

Subsidiary proposal to stop north bound traffic in Dukes Road would force extra traffic at High Street / Lewes Road junction

BUT not in favour of the no-entry from Newton Road into Dukes Road EXREA TRAFFIC IN HIGH STREET! Suggestion: one way system round Luxford Road and Eastern Road

This would definitely slow and put people off using the route as a cut through

Helpful to residents

Luxford Road and Eastren Roads should be blocked off at top of roads thereby stopping a 'rat run'

OK

stop rat run slow traffic

This is a good idea to reduce speed of through traffic

The proposals will not achieve anything so we have made a suggestion in the covering email which cannot be set out in only 50 words but at least would work!

Another road used as a rat run to avoid the village

In favour with speed indicating devices

Yes I do agree we need to slow the traffic down. Speed bumps would be helpful and a 20mph sign

Only if supported by residents of the roads concerned. Volume of traffic rather than speed would seem to be the issue here. (I would not support closing access to Northbound vehicles at Dukes Rd/Newton Rd junction

Proposal is welcomed

This should reduce the number of vehicles using this route as 'rat run' to High Street. If traffic lights installed at Lewes Rd / High Street this would regulate traffic flow.

Proposal is welcome

As above would help to reduce traffic speeds - this must be preferable to mobile cameras??

Unfortunately the addition of traffic lights at the junction of Lewes Road and the High Street is very likely to encourage the use of Luxford Road /Brushes Lane corridor as a "Rat Run" for traffic. The use of raised tables / speed ramps and built out pedestrian crossing points should go some way to help discourage this.

Unfortunately the addition of traffic lights at the junction of Lewes Road and the High Street is very likely to encourage the use of Luxford Road /Brushes Lane corridor as a "Rat Run" for traffic. The use of raised tables / speed ramps and built out pedestrian crossing points should go some way to help discourage this.

Although not quite the "rat run" that many thought might develop after the new development of the Limes, it is necessary to address the issue of through traffic usage and this solution seems very sensible to me.

such calming is relatively unintrusive and provides a measure of speed management.

Welcomed

These measures might dissuade drivers from using these roads as yet another "rat run" through Lindfield and help to keep pedestrians safe. Ranking 1

Proposed positioning at either end of Dukes Rd is however misguided as parked cars already effectively achieve the same end. A raised table half way along would be preferable to deter motorists from exceeding the speed limit along the mid-section, which is in fact very prevalent.

Seems sensible.

Welcome these proposals.

Lewes Road Brushes Lane Corridor

Raised table at junctions Newton Road / Dukes Road, Brushes Lane / Brushes Lane, Luxford Road / Harvest Close

For 118 Against 55

High priority. Cars speed along here in a hurry to get to their destination.

Cars travel so fast along these residential roads, using them as a cut through. Some form of traffic calming is required. although I'm not quite sure I understand the proposed plans

I think more should be done to prevent this road being used as a rat run. A lot of traffic avoids the High Street already. Yes, these are popular cut through roads to avoid Lewes Road/High Street junction, and it would be good to slow traffic through here.

This corridor is very useful, but residents need protection. No. 7

I am favour of using these calming measures as a means to prevent a rat run further developing. I am against the possible closure of Dukes Road to Northbound traffic, and note that the author suggests this would be a "second phase" ie not something to be done at this current time! The report notes the traffic calming presence of parked cars and it seems a marginal difference in speed will be obtained by introducing these raised bits of road.

Should also consider road narrowing markings especially where the road rises and increased acceleration" kicks in".

May possibly deter drivers from using the roads to avoid the High Street.

Lewes Road / High Street

Provision of Traffic Signals (phasing Option 2) / No entry restriction at junction of Dukes road /

Newton Road

For 119 **Against 97**

seems to be best option

No one way at Lewes Road. I live on the East side of the village and would block the school run to Lindfield Primary. The diversion through HH would be lengthy and unnecessary

traffic signal option 2 - concern over impact on traffic movement but safeguards must be put in place to protect pedestrians

No consideration given (not in consultants brief) for traffic calming measures outside KEH. This would reduce risk at Lewes road / high street junction set the lights in Lewes Road back near to the Flower shop i.e. before the road narrows

anything to improve this bottleneck / danger spot might be an option

Most residents nearby have witnessed vehicles (mainly SUVs) mounting pavements etc. Needed before any fatalities. restrict speed in village to 20mph

anything other than existing 30 sign would help

New by pass from Luxwood Road to roundabout at Backwoods Lane close to playground will solve this traffic problem; but there will be objections to overcome for taking a small part of the common but where there's a will there's a way. Otherwise traffic will get more & worse!

Definitely

traffic lights worked perfectly some time ago when work was carried out with the pond wall. Best option. Safe!

yes

This is a fantastic idea. I like the 4 stage signal idea. The lights will need to be carefully timed to stop traffic building up along the High Street or Lewes Road

I find this junction very dangerous and also poor for pedestrians

Very much in favour. Good idea for Lewes Road Traffic to move in 1 direction

the biggest priority for the village

very good idea - would regulate flow too

Any objections about visual impact are nonsense

Provide more calming measures re (1) 20 mile signs as you enter village (2) sleeping policeman especially around pond (3) light up sign for 20mph limit, smiley face. This need not interfere with the historic village as could be paced near existing traffic lights as you enter Re 5. Safety surely outweighs "visually intrusive" signs in the village PAINT THE ROAD "20"

With some reluctance & reservations

or a roundabout. So much congestion!

Most Important. This should be the top priority due to the volume of traffic & creation of a rat run at Luxford / Brushes Lane

will help flow of traffic and may relieve other issues around Lewes Road

Against making Dukes Rd one way. Would traffic lights cause back up by the pond

perhaps for peak times

This has to be done, with some urgency. The footpath by "The Penny Black" is currently being used as part of the road as there is no room for traffic to pass. Very dangerous for pedestrians. The Q's along the Lewes Road are shocking during rush hour and all the side roads are blocked - Well done!

Long overdue

could work well if phased lights

good idea

Fully in favour - but ensure lights are all way back from junction as proposed

In favour

this is easily the most important!

a nasty junction

Traffic Lights outside the King Edward Hall might cause problems for pedestrians accessing the hall

Traffic trying to turn right out of Denmans Lane would face a stream going up the High Street AND a queue coming down

these should be temporary until the reduction in traffic flows has been proven

Essential

This has been needed for years

Lights worked perfectly some years ago when the pond wall was renovated

Providing they are far enough back from Frederick Cottage to alleviate pollution from standing vehicles

Absolutely vital. Dangerous at present. Widen foot path High Street to traffic light

Trial with temp lights first to discover whether scheme is viable

Trial with temp lights to sort any problems before permanent solution

Let's try it something has to be done

could help make the village safer but what is expected effect of new buildings planned south of village

will probably help at peak times

Most dangerous place for walking as vehicles mount the pavement to get through the very narrow entrance. New Walstead development will make it even worse.

Traffic signals at this junction would ensure drivers were clear about priorities and stop the dangerous turns being made at present

worth a trial

I do agree that traffic lights would help with the volume of traffic + slow things down in an orderly way

In favour

Traffic signals would ease congestion and heavy vehicles must be restricted in the High Street especially at High St/Lewes Road junction

Present arrangement dangerous for pedestrians and at peak times exiting at junction to turn north is very difficult. Lights would address both these issues

Great in theory & probably the best solution - but phasing & stop lines would probably need to be trial to find the best option

Traffic lights need to be coordinated with a pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Co-Op. This would improve the safety of both pedestrians and the traffic exiting Lewes Road. Fundamentally traffic needs to be slowed to 20mph both in the High Street and around past the pond.

Enforce no parking restriction High Street to Denmans Lane

Lewes Road / High Street

Provision of Traffic Signals (phasing Option 2) / No entry restriction at junction of Dukes road / Newton Road

For 119 **Against 97**

Traffic lights need to be coordinated with a pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Co-Op. This would improve the safety of both pedestrians and the traffic exiting Lewes Road. Fundamentally traffic needs to be slowed to 20mph both in the High Street and around past the pond.

Lewes Road traffic will continue to grow, most planned growth to the village seems to lie in that direction. Therefore the substandard junction with the High Street will continue to require a solution. The idea of making Lewes Road one way with no escape for the traffic presenting at the No Entry signs defies belief. However there is merit in making Lewes Road one way - but it needs a new road building across/round the common to feed traffic from the new roundabout at Gravelye Lane to the roundabout at the top of Black Hill something which should have been done when the Steam Laundry was redeveloped many years ago. This is radical but a new route for traffic to the High Street will eventually be needed. In the meantime traffic lights and the restrictions they will bring is necessary. The idea of a crossing point outside King Edward Hall to restrict vehicle access, deliveries and disabled parking is unthinkable. Lindfield is going to need more car parking to take the growth associated with the current new build. This is a very dangerous narrow entrance into Lewes Road. Only one large vehicle at a time can turn the corner. I have seen pedestrian having to take avoiding action so that cars do not hit them their prom or their small toddlers.

The first part of Lewes Road is very narrow and on a daily basis I see large SUVs / Vans and Trucks travelling East mounting the pavement when trying to pass vehicles coming in the opposite direction. I believe an accident involving pedestrians and vehicles will happen. THIS IS AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN!

I'd prefer the originally proposed roundabout but am in favour of the staggered junction and traffic lights.

This would seem to be a good idea perhaps as the view to the High Street is somewhat restricted

Would prefer the informal roundabout option to be explored further as would expect traffic lights to exacerbate congestion at peak times. Am very opposed to the option of making Lewes Rd one-way only as this would utterly dislocate local access & village life for Lindfield residents trying to reach schools, nurseries & facilities & also displace large volumes of traffic onto other overstretched Haywards Heath routes & junctions.

However would like to see +3.5 ton vehicles banned from Lewes road to gravely lane

Lewes Road / High Street Junction

Provision of Traffic Signals (phasing Option 2) / No entry restriction at junction of Dukes Road /

Newton Road

For 119 Against 97

seems to be best option

No one way at Lewes Road. I live on the East side of the village and would block the school run to Lindfield Primary. The diversion through HH would be lengthy and unnecessary

traffic signal option 2 - concern over impact on traffic movement but safeguards must be put in place to protect pedestrians

No consideration given (not in consultants brief) for traffic calming measures outside KEH. This would reduce risk at Lewes road / high street junction set the lights in Lewes Road back near to the Flower shop i.e. before the road narrows

anything to improve this bottleneck / danger spot might be an option

Most residents nearby have witnessed vehicles (mainly SUVs) mounting pavements etc. Needed before any fatalities. restrict speed in village to 20mph

anything other than existing 30 sign would help

New by pass from Luxwood Road to roundabout at Backwoods Lane close to playground will solve this traffic problem; but there will be objections to overcome for taking a small part of the common but where there's a will there's a way. Otherwise traffic will get more & worse!

Definitely

traffic lights worked perfectly some time ago when work was carried out with the pond wall. Best option. Safe!

yes

This is a fantastic idea. I like the 4 stage signal idea. The lights will need to be carefully timed to stop traffic building up along the High Street or Lewes Road

I find this junction very dangerous and also poor for pedestrians

Very much in favour. Good idea for Lewes Road Traffic to move in 1 direction

the biggest priority for the village

very good idea - would regulate flow too

Any objections about visual impact are nonsense

Provide more calming measures re (1) 20 mile signs as you enter village (2) sleeping policeman especially around pond (3) light up sign for 20mph limit, smiley face. This need not interfere with the historic village as could be paced near existing traffic lights as you enter Re 5. Safety surely outweighs "visually intrusive" signs in the village PAINT THE ROAD "20"

With some reluctance & reservations

or a roundabout. So much congestion!

Most Important. This should be the top priority due to the volume of traffic & creation of a rat run at Luxford / Brushes Lane will help flow of traffic and may relieve other issues around Lewes Road

Against making Dukes Rd one way. Would traffic lights cause back up by the pond perhaps for peak times

This has to be done, with some urgency. The footpath by "The Penny Black" is currently being used as part of the road as there is no room for traffic to pass. Very dangerous for pedestrians. The Q's along the Lewes Road are shocking during rush hour and all the side roads are blocked - Well done!

Long overdue

could work well if phased lights

good idea

Fully in favour - but ensure lights are all way back from junction as proposed

In favour

this is easily the most important!

a nasty junction

Traffic Lights outside the King Edward Hall might cause problems for pedestrians accessing the hall

Traffic trying to turn right out of Denmans Lane would face a stream going up the High Street AND a queue coming down

these should be temporary until the reduction in traffic flows has been proven

Essential

This has been needed for years

Lights worked perfectly some years ago when the pond wall was renovated

Providing they are far enough back from Frederick Cottage to alleviate pollution from standing vehicles

Absolutely vital. Dangerous at present. Widen foot path High Street to traffic light

Trial with temp lights first to discover whether scheme is viable

Trial with temp lights to sort any problems before permanent solution

Let's try it something has to be done

could help make the village safer but what is expected effect of new buildings planned south of village will probably help at peak times

Most dangerous place for walking as vehicles mount the pavement to get through the very narrow entrance. New Walstead development will make it even worse.

Traffic signals at this junction would ensure drivers were clear about priorities and stop the dangerous turns being made at present

worth a trial

I do agree that traffic lights would help with the volume of traffic + slow things down in an orderly way

In favour

Traffic signals would ease congestion and heavy vehicles must be restricted in the High Street especially at High St/Lewes Road junction

Present arrangement dangerous for pedestrians and at peak times exiting at junction to turn north is very difficult. Lights would address both these issues

Great in theory & probably the best solution - but phasing & stop lines would probably need to be trial to find the best option

Traffic lights need to be coordinated with a pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Co-Op. This would improve the safety of both pedestrians and the traffic exiting Lewes Road. Fundamentally traffic needs to be slowed to 20mph both in the High Street and around past the pond.

Enforce no parking restriction High Street to Denmans Lane

Lewes Road / High Street Junction

Provision of Traffic Signals (phasing Option 2) / No entry restriction at junction of Dukes Road / Newton Road

For 119 Against 97

Traffic lights need to be coordinated with a pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Co-Op. This would improve the safety of both pedestrians and the traffic exiting Lewes Road. Fundamentally traffic needs to be slowed to 20mph both in the High Street and around past the pond.

Lewes Road traffic will continue to grow, most planned growth to the village seems to lie in that direction. Therefore the substandard junction with the High Street will continue to require a solution. The idea of making Lewes Road one way with no escape for the traffic presenting at the No Entry signs defies belief. However there is merit in making Lewes Road one way - but it needs a new road building across/round the common to feed traffic from the new roundabout at Gravelye Lane to the roundabout at the top of Black Hill something which should have been done when the Steam Laundry was redeveloped many years ago. This is radical but a new route for traffic to the High Street will eventually be needed. In the meantime traffic lights and the restrictions they will bring is necessary. The idea of a crossing point outside King Edward Hall to restrict vehicle access, deliveries and disabled parking is unthinkable. Lindfield is going to need more car parking to take the growth associated with the current new build. This is a very dangerous narrow entrance into Lewes Road. Only one large vehicle at a time can turn the corner. I have seen pedestrian having to take avoiding action so that cars do not hit them their prom or their small toddlers.

The first part of Lewes Road is very narrow and on a daily basis I see large SUVs / Vans and Trucks travelling East mounting the pavement when trying to pass vehicles coming in the opposite direction. I believe an accident involving pedestrians and vehicles will happen. THIS IS AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN!

I'd prefer the originally proposed roundabout but am in favour of the staggered junction and traffic lights.

This would seem to be a good idea perhaps as the view to the High Street is somewhat restricted

Would prefer the informal roundabout option to be explored further as would expect traffic lights to exacerbate congestion at peak times. Am very opposed to the option of making Lewes Rd one-way only as this would utterly dislocate local access & village life for Lindfield residents trying to reach schools, nurseries & facilities & also displace large volumes of traffic onto other overstretched Haywards Heath routes & junctions.

However would like to see +3.5 ton vehicles banned from Lewes road to gravely lane

Lewes Road Pedestrian Crossing Facility

Pedestrian crossing point

For 167 **Against 30**

children & people cross at the flower shop from common (playground) they will not walk to Eastern Road part to cross.

This would help children from Challoner Road area going to school and back. This is urgent

Lollypop exists

not needed if traffic lights

Not in favour of additional obstructions in the road, whether crossing points or parked vehicles. They reduce visibility.

Replace WSCC plastic platform with Ditchling style build out

not necessary

there is a build out on Lewes Rd

Ample crossing points already in evidence

There is the facility of an existing narrowing point for pedestrians to use

I do not think we currently have sufficient pedestrians to justify the expense or the disruption we do need more car parking though! There is one there already for the schoolchildren and that forms a blockage!

Whilst it can be difficult to cross at peak times it is generally not too difficult.

There is already a 'refuge' crossing point

This proposal should only go ahead if the increase in traffic flow through Luxford/Dukes Road is recognised and addressed with the correct actions to stop traffic using this rat run.

There is a crossing point in place. Maybe the addition of a raised table.

Why is a this proposal presented together with road narrowing and parking - creating more congestion and pollution.

Parking can be created here by using the 'dead space' between the current footpath and the ditch at the bottom of the Common - not narrowing the road. The Common land should be used for this - just as it has been used by the tennis courts and bowling green etc. This space is not utilised at all at present.

I live on Lewes Road and I do not want this outside my house!

Lewes Road Pedestrian Crossing Facility

Pedestrian crossing point

For 167 Against 30

- safer for school children
yes - island not working
improved safety for school children
definitely need this pedestrian crossing
already built but they only assist prams, invalid vehicles. But very dangerous as vehicles have no warning
pedestrian safety/school children e.g.
Urgently restrict speed in village to 20mph
very necessary
- Pedestrian crossing points on Lewes Road would be very welcome. Please can they be zebra crossings that are manned by lollipop people for the school. Do not encourage school cars to stop along the road. It will be too dangerous. It is already difficult when people park to go to the circus & other events on the common.
extremely good idea narrow pavement is very dangerous
it will make it safer to cross on to the common. It may also slow congestion down the busy road
It will slow traffic which may reduce congestion at junction with High St
There used to be a lollipop person for the afternoons. Put back in place? Crossing would slow traffic
Agreed needs boosting for increased pedestrian safety
As a zebra crossing
- In favour, crossing Lewes Road can be difficult especially for school children at rush hour. However, I think a zebra crossing would be better
Maybe a zebra crossing half way along the common on Lewes Road to make crossing safer for children going to school
We used to have one for the junior school - maybe it should be reinstated?
This is essential because the volume and speed of the traffic which is continual
Essential as traffic is continual
- Presumably this would be further down the road (going towards Wanstead) and in addition to the current school crossing
Positioned at the existing school crossing point
Agree, one would be suitable where the lollipop lady now stands
I feel that more than one crossing point should be provided, because the volume of traffic using Lewes Rd has grown so much
Opposite flower shop
OK
to slow traffic
but not traffic lights
- A suitable pedestrian crossing is vital as lots of school children need to cross this very busy road at peak times. (Lollipop lady only there in the morning). Current crossing is more danger than help!
But only if it is sited where the children cross the road to go to and from school near to the florists shop
Speed must be reduced
Huge amount of traffic on this road. Parked cars causing massive problem. No room for two way traffic
Vehicles coming into Lindfield from Walstead do not restrict their speed so crossing the road can be tricky, but crossing not very attractive. Safety is important
in FAVOUR but supported by buildouts and radar trap with speed indicating devices
Crossing point where the current road narrowing bollards are
This is needed especially with all the new developments here The common is used by both the elderly + youngsters Dog Walking School / Football + cricket + would be helpful to all. The road has already had accidents + is another accident waiting to happen
Well used route for schoolchildren would assist school crossing patrol officers
Welcome this proposal
- The most dangerous place to cross is at the entrance of the carpark opposite Flowercraft Lindfield. This area is heavily used by pedestrians with young children walking to/leaving Lindfield Common playground and Primary Schools
Required at car park opposite Flower Craft
Very much welcome! Why can't the limit be [unreadable]
an excellent idea on a road that can be very difficult to cross safely
The use of built out pedestrian crossing points would also be beneficial in limiting traffic speed to **20mph**
This is desperately needed at Noahs Ark/Eastern Road end to slow traffic and help pedestrians
Pedestrian crossing point where the existing site is used for mainly the children going to school and back would be ideal as cars are pulling out after stopping for parked cars from the garage and High Street especially in the morning. A pedestrian crossing for this site would be ideal for both ways.
1. School crossing island gives some protection for S.C. patrol working here. Removal increases danger for school crossing patrol
 2. Adopt 20mph speed limit at school times
 3. Stop parking close to school crossing island
- The use of built out pedestrian crossing points would also be beneficial in limiting traffic speed to **20mph**

Lewes Road Pedestrian Crossing Facility

Pedestrian crossing point

For 167 Against 30

In keeping with safer routes to School initially. Will naturally slow traffic along Lewes road.

3 - this creates parity of utility between cars and the pedestrians who cross the Lewes road either way for many access reasons - nature reserve, scouts hut, shooting range, school, common, Edward Hall and the Club, visiting food vans, visiting friends, pubs and restaurants, visiting charity shop and parish council. it will not decrease the utility of road users, rather make their own use of the road safer. Very good proposal.

The number of parents with prams and young children walking in the area, any assistance in crossing roads is to be encouraged.

The most dangerous place to cross is at the entrance of the carpark opposite Flower Craft Lindfield. This area is heavily used by pedestrians with young children walking to/leaving Lindfield Common playground and Primary Schools.

slows down traffic keeps pedestrians safe.

Perhaps a good idea for safety's sake.

Not our neck of the village but I hear it's bad.

Pedestrian crossing proposal to be welcomed.

Any additional pedestrian crossing is a good idea.

1 This is vital. Road getting very busy.

A pedestrian crossing to enable safe access to the common makes sense.

Yes can be very difficult to cross this road, the flow of traffic is constant at times. It would probably slow the traffic too.

Agree this would be helpful

Pedestrians need more protection.

I am in favour of these but don't think these designs will really make that much difference. A greater improvement would be doing something at the North end of Lewes Road, providing access from the village centre towards the common/King Edward Hall/primary school. Many pupils walking to school from the Newtons Road area go to the High Street, cross at the co-op then back across at Pondcroft Road, but a safer route (no longer in distance) would be along Chaloner road and then have a crossing on Lewes Road near Mead Cottage, going to the ginnel at the back of KEH - only one road crossing not two.

This could be included at the lights on Lewes Road.

Crossing OK, not sure about parking spaces along common side of Lewes Road, enlargement of parking area the other side of common probably more use.

Currently it's dangerous crossing the road.

Lewes Road / Scamps Hill

Remove centreline, provide additional parking bays, road narrowing

For 80 **Against 92**

slows traffic too much → more congestion
would slow traffic flow too much, leading to more congestion in high street
not really necessary
this would alter character of road too much. A width restriction is what is needed and perhaps a mini roundabout at Eastern Road junction would slow down traffic where it is need - on the straight bit
Against removal of existing centreline and provision of additional parking bays. Crossing points for pedestrians might work
introduce other traffic calming measure to slow traffic down e.g. speed cameras - sleeping policeman
do not need additional parking on road
see general comments
Do not add parking bays along Lewes Road!
Not in favour of additional parking
Utter nonsense
I feel the traffic lights will reduce traffic speed
Ditchling style build out between Noahs Ark Rd and Eastern Rd only
Additional parking bays will make crossing the road more difficult for pedestrians. It will also bring traffic to a halt as the road is too narrow for parking and two way traffic
not necessary
for same reasons as overleaf
why?
I can't see how this would help. Some of the problems of sight-lines are caused by overgrown hedges! A mini roundabout at the junction of Gravelly Lane and Lewes Road would be beneficial, but the idea of a no left turn from Gravelly Lane to the village is ridiculous. For some a good 10 minute journey to the High Street via Haywards Heath!!
Don't think this road is wide enough to accommodate three lanes of traffic!
The road along the side of the common, certainly up to the end of the units, is not wide enough to accommodate this proposal
Road narrowing will cause chaos in an already busy road
Not required
It is dangerous to exit west View due to poor visibility to the east due to parked cars. Please don't make this worse by allowing cars to park to the west too. (Also Noahs Ark Lane exit view is hindered by new hedge!)
No traffic must be kept moving. How about a speed camera? What about lower part of Gravelly Lane?
Unnecessary
Think vehicle activated traffic sign would be effective especially if spot checks with speed cameras
I do not understand the notion of additional parking bays - surely not on this road? Don't we want to get parked cars off main thoroughfares. Terrible for Drivers. Too many parked cars.
Additional parking on Lewes Road??? The road is narrow enough
I do not feel that road narrowing would help. With lorries tractors + large cars these days. It would be safer on the footpaths if we had a pedestrian crossing on Lewes Road + Traffic Lights in the High Street this would slow things down before they get to us + a 20mph speed limit might help
Against encouraging parking alongside common. Already parking outside houses on other side + parking on commonside would lead to congestion. Would spoil ambience of the common.
Speed activated 30mph sign entering from east
These moves will surely lead to increased air pollution
Traffic calming measures on approach to Lindfield - a roundabout at the Gravelly Lane junction. Pedestrian crossing
Additional parking bays would be dangerous as it would block the site of oncoming cars even if stationary as everyone would need to watch traffic coming from High Street as well. A pedestrian crossing for this site would be the answer for both ways
1. Parking bays would be hazardous, especially when parked cars moving in & out onto busy road
2. Parked vehicles on common side restrict view of children & pedestrians
not necessary if above pedestrian crossing used
I am against any form of road narrowing, Some acceptance of the increase in traffic and parking from the new developments would seem necessary.
Will make the road more dangerous and impassable as it narrows the road. This will result in more stationary traffic and increased pollution.
Doesn't really seem necessary
Again, narrowing this road, when heavy good vehicles regularly use it would cause more traffic problems. Would it not be better to consider using the common verge up to the stream as an option to add additional parking. And re-routing the pavement closer to the stream behind the parking bays.
Don't understand motivation for this?
This is such a busy road now - with 2 way traffic, it would be twice as bad with the centre line removed.
Additional parking here on a busy road would create additional problems. Parking should be created elsewhere and the centre line kept.
This will narrow the road, put cyclists closer to traffic and increase congestion. Additional parking should be created using the space between the Common's 'ditch' and the road. Better option would be for vehicle activated speed signs and

Lewes Road / Scamps Hill

Remove centreline, provide additional parking bays, road narrowing

For 80 **Against 92**

reducing the approaching speed limit from Scamp's hill to 30 mph from the current 40mph.

I do not see any problem or need.

Previous comments about removal of centre line are appropriate. As too are comments about road narrowing.

Most houses along Lewes Road have off street parking. There is safe parking along West View and Meadow Drive, as well as the Enterprise Park at weekends. A few spaces could be created along the long slip road at Scamps Hill (near the

Gravelye Lane junction). Scamps Hill and the Lewes Road should retain two lanes.

See answer 6

Lewes Road / Scamps Hill

Remove centreline, provide additional parking bays, road narrowing

For 80 **Against 92**

Lewes Road / Scamps Hill

Remove centreline, provide additional parking bays, road narrowing

For 80 Against 92

restrict speed in village to 20mph

anything that slows traffic at times few cars travel at less than 40mph

Not sure additional parking bays needed

Need additional bays but need road widening for this - too narrow already with cars parked near Lindfield Motors

This would alleviate problems around the industrial estate

OK

to slow traffic

In favour of road narrowing and additional parking

Proposal is welcomed

Wouldn't this necessitate DYL's in front of the residences if parking bays were to be created? Anything that will slow traffic speed must be an improvement! Raised tables at junctions could provide crossing points.

Traffic needs to be slowed on entry to the village

The provision of additional parking bays would help to improve the limited parking spaces within the village. This would have the added benefit in helping to limit the traffic speed to 20mph. The addition of a roundabout at the junction Lewes Road and Gravelye Lane would greatly help reducing the speed of traffic from Scamps Hill into Lewes Road

The provision of additional parking bays would help to improve the limited parking spaces within the village. This would have the added benefit in helping to limit the traffic speed to 20mph. The addition of a roundabout at the junction Lewes Road and Gravelye Lane would greatly help reducing the speed of traffic from Scamps Hill into Lewes Road

Any steps to try to reduce average traffic speeds is good.

Welcomed

Traffic calming & additional parking good - pedestrian crossings good.

This is currently an unpleasant and dangerous stretch of road to cycle along as noted in report.

Welcome these proposals.

4

the provision of additional parking is most welcome though am concerned at the removal of centre line.

West View

Footway buildout to link Common and footpath to aid pedestrian crossing. Consider similar in Backwoods Lane

For 125 **Against 48**

does not warrant spend road too quiet as dead end road
a solution seeking a problem
this seems rather pointless. Never had a problem crossing there
no to pedestrian crossing as it is ugly

Backwoods Lane would be much more beneficial
is this really an issue?

see Lewes Road / Scamps Hill above
not necessary

Unnecessary and expensive work affecting the common area. A zebra crossing such as the one in Cuckfield (Hanlye Lane)
would be sufficient and effective

Why?

A lot of work for very few pedestrians (if any).

Unnecessary

Not required

A waste of money as cars won't see refuge due to parked cars (like current one on Lewes Road)

I don't feel that this would alleviate any traffic problems

Why not increase available parking in front of the residents by narrowing the overwide verge to produce oblique bays this
could benefit the residents & school drop offs/pick ups as well as users of the common!

This is normally a quiet slip road. Pedestrians would have better visibility if one parking bay to the north was removed

Doesn't really seem necessary

Not sure it is really necessary.

Not sure what problem is being addressed here. This is a cul-de-sac with very little traffic. Backwoods Lane is a much
busier road and it would be perhaps more appropriate.

These aren't busy roads and this seems an unnecessary use of the limited financial resources that we are told we have as
an area.

West View

Footway buildout to link Common and footpath to aid pedestrian crossing. Consider similar in Backwoods Lane

For 125 Against 48

safer for school children
improves safety for school children
sensible but expensive

Needed urgently for visitors to our common
more footpaths - a good idea
it makes sense to link the footpaths etc.

Feel there should be a proper pedestrian crossing here not just a build out. The one further up the road towards the village has been hit so many times and just facilitates parking either side restricting a residents views for crossing.

Will make crossing easier (often used by children on bikes) and will have no negative effect on traffic

This would be good as walking in these areas in the dark is worrying

as long as it is not too wide

Providing it is as wide as the buildout in Lewes Road, where the present school crossing is

8- West View 4 - Backwoods Lane

OK

aid pedestrian crossing

This actually needs a zebra crossing when crossing from Meadow Drive with parked cars it is impossible to see right

Of all proposals - this would be the best

In favour of buildout and in Backwoods Lane

Not sure what this means. However some attention should be given to restricting parking on the corner of West View and

Lewes Road. VERY dangerous

Proposal is welcomed

Proposal agreed

NNOT IN BACKWOODS LANE!! The narrow road already caused problems

As well, on the basis of safety (nearby school) consider the introduction of raised tables/speed ramps and built out pedestrian crossing points to slow the traffic along Backwoods Lane to 20mph

As well, on the basis of safety (nearby school) consider the introduction of raised tables/speed ramps and built out pedestrian crossing points to slow the traffic along Backwoods Lane to 20mph

Not in particularly in favour but not against. This is a matter for local residents.

Think the build out/crossing should be closer to West View opposite the path from the tennis court car park. Backwoods

Lane would benefit from the same and again at the end of the path coming up from the tennis courts

Any steps to try to help Pedestrian and to reduce average traffic speeds is good.

Welcomed

Busy traffic at peak times during the day as well as regularly parked cars make crossing road difficult. Ranking 1

This seems like a good solution. Perhaps Backwoods Lane is higher priority given proximity to school.

Welcome these proposals

8 - I think Backwoods Lane needs this MORE than West View!

There is a need for a pedestrian crossing or similar on Backwoods Lane where the pathway emerges from the common (by the cricket nets) for the children crossing the road to go to and from school. Currently very unsafe and pedestrian traffic / cars will only increase with all the development going on at Gravelly Lane.

I support the move to ease this crossing between the parked cars, though am against the staggered pedestrian guard rail as these make the path difficult to push baby buggies, and I would rather see the path enhanced for young cyclists to use on their way to school.