

Report to	Lead Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
Date	27 June 2005
Report By	Director of Transport and Environment
Title of Report	Battle Local Area Transport Strategy
Purpose of Report	To seek approval to the Local Area Transport Strategy for Battle

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. To approve the Local Area Transport Strategy (LATS) for Battle, subject to those amendments proposed in Appendix A; and**
 - 2. Note that the LATS will automatically become a daughter document to the Local Transport Plan (LTP), and will be used to inform allocations of funding that reflect a prioritised package of local integrated transport schemes and to provide a framework to assess planning proposals to ensure that they complement LTP objectives.**
-
-

1. Financial Appraisal

1.1 The Local Transport Plan (LTP) seeks supported borrowing to finance a five-year investment programme for transport and has led to significant future indicative financial settlements from Government. The final draft Local Area Transport Strategy (LATS) for Battle, a copy of which is available in the Members' Room, will be used to help identify schemes and allocations of funding for transport investment under the Integrated Transport Capital Programme. It does not commit the County Council to any further financial outlay, although there may be revenue cost implications (both borrowing and maintenance) arising from the implementation of new schemes. This will be reported in detail when Lead Member's authority is sought to progress those individual schemes.

2. Supporting Information

2.1 The County Council has secured indicative borrowing approval from central government through the LTP, to deliver integrated transport improvements throughout the County as part of the Authority's capital programme. These funds need to be targeted to increase travel choices and to achieve the LTP2 objectives, corporate objectives and national shared priorities for transport.

2.2 The LATS is a set of policies and proposals for transport related issues in a particular geographical area. It is aimed at achieving a balance between all modes of travel and between competing demands for the movement of people and goods, to achieve the vision in a way that best meets the needs of the local people.

2.3 The development of the LATS has been led by the vision "to improve travel choice, safety, and access for all people who live in, work in and visit Battle and its satellite communities, to improve quality of life, and to facilitate economic and community vitality".

2.4 It provides a framework/delivery mechanism for investment in such schemes to be judged against their contribution to achieving the LTP targets and objectives and will be used to help allocate borrowing approvals as well as funding from other sources.

3. Strategy Development

3.1 A Steering Group of elected members from Town, District, and County Councils was established to provide a steer to the officers drafting the LATS aimed at maximising the opportunity to generate wide support from all local authorities, as well as the local community. Councillor Field chaired the Group as the local County Council Member.

3.2 The Steering Group has, in turn, been informed by the establishment of the Transport Forum for Battle. The Transport Forum comprises representatives from the local business community, local schools, tourism, local residents, transport users, and other interest groups such as the Battle Road Safety Group, Hastings and Rother Disability Forum and Battle Area Community Transport.

3.3 The views of the Transport Forum helped inform the development of the LATS by highlighting problems, identifying appropriate schemes and measures, and establishing priorities for implementation in the LATS area. A series of Working Groups were held with the Transport Forum members, focusing on public transport, roads, parking, and vulnerable road users. Subsequently, issues arising from working groups were considered by the Steering Group and Forum. The development of one of the schemes identified in the LATS programme of works - traffic calming on North Trade Road – is being considered elsewhere on the agenda.

3.4 The final draft of the LATS was presented to the Steering Group and to the Transport Forum for their consideration and comments in March 2005. Battle Town Council and Rother District Council considered the document during April and May and have endorsed the Strategy subject to agreement on a number of proposed amendments. The amendments proposed by Crowhurst Parish Council, Battle Town Council and Rother District Council, and members of the Transport Forum, including a suggested County Council response, are shown as Appendix A. Any further representations received, if appropriate, will be reported verbally at the Lead Member meeting.

3.5 The Chair of the Rother Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) has expressed concern that the LSP has not had opportunity to comment on the document. It was proposed to present the document to the meeting of Rother transport sub-group in early June, however this meeting was cancelled. Therefore, officers will share the document with the full LSP at its next meeting in September 2005.

4. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendations

4.1 The implementation of the Battle LATS will contribute to improving travel choices and bring about more environmentally sustainable transport within the town. It is therefore recommended that the Battle LATS with the amendments proposed in Appendix A is approved.

BOB WILKINS
Director of Transport and Environment
17 June 2005
LMTE:27June-BattleLATS

Contact Officer: Jon Wheeler Tel No. 01273 482212
Local Member: Councillor Field

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

East Sussex Local Transport Plan.
Battle Local Area Transport Strategy (Final Draft – June 2005).

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
	General	Resident of Netherfield	The draft Strategy relates almost entirely to the Battle Town area with very few proposals for the "Satellite" villages. I recognise that three of the four villages [Catsfield, Crowhurst and Whatlington] are represented by their own parish councils. However Netherfield is not since it is a part of the area of Battle Town Council, I would have thus expected that some of the specific "Netherfield" issues would have been included in the document.	Comments noted.	No change
	General	Battle Abbey School	The draft fails to accept that the preferred means of transport in the rural area is the private car, and attempts to address the need of all other groups at the expense of the car user.	The Strategy includes reference to the need to reconcile all modes of transport and competing demands for movement of people and goods, while embracing the concept of modal change to more sustainable modes of transport.	No change.
	General	Resident of Saxonwood Road, Battle	Battle has one Traffic Warden who is not very active. There are PCSO whose powers include action in cases of obstruction of the highway, waiting and limited waiting	Comments noted. The Strategy includes reference to enforcement of parking regulations, (for example p.19, 24)	No change
	General	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	The maps are out of date and do not show some residential estates.	The most up to date maps will be used.	No change
Vi	Executive	Resident of	Target for improved usage of car	Date added	"Investigate options for improved

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
	Summary	Glengorse, Battle-	parks; Document should include a date		management of visitor parking” amended to “Investigate options for improved management of parking by 2007.
1	1.2.1	Crowhurst Parish Council	Increase in traffic through Crowhurst means distances once walked are now driven. Does this increase in traffic go against the European and National commitments to protect the environment?	Increases in traffic will potentially have an adverse impact in the natural and built environment, with increased air pollution, vibration and noise. The Strategy seeks to increase travel choices to enable shorter journeys currently undertaken by private car to be undertaken by alternative means such as walking, cycling and public transport.	No change.
2	1.2.5	Crowhurst Parish Council	Section does not mention provision of food.	This is covered in 1.2.7	No change proposed.
2	1.2.7	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	“The Accessibility Strategy will set out how the County Council will improve access to key facilities and services: Healthy Affordable food.” Suggest delete “Healthy affordable food” and substitute “shops”. Healthy food is not, in my opinion, part of a LATS	Comments noted. Accessibility to Healthy and affordable food is one of the areas identified by the Department for Transport for inclusion in the development of a countywide Accessibility Strategy as part of the 2 nd Local Transport Plan. Therefore it is appropriate to make reference to Healthy affordable food rather than just shops. Section 5.5, Page A7 talks at greater length about access to local services. .	Bullet points following text “Employment, Education, Healthcare, Healthy Affordable food and other local priorities” taken out.
5	2.1.1	Darvel Down and area	Netherfield, lies within the Battle Town Council Area. An	The proximity of the satellite communities, including	“The boundary of the area covered by the Strategy consists of the town of

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
		Residents Association	explanation as to why this area has been omitted from the consultation area should be included in the draft.	Netherfield, and their interaction with Battle is recognised. The wording in 2.1.1 can be added to, as in the Executive summary; "Although these communities are not included within the Strategy area, they are near neighbours in terms of transport issues."	Battle, with reference to surrounding communities of Catsfield, Crowhurst, Netherfield and Whatlington. Although these communities are not included within the Strategy area, they are near neighbours in terms of transport issues". Changed to "The focus of the Strategy is the town of Battle, with reference to surrounding communities of Catsfield, Crowhurst, Netherfield and Whatlington, which are near neighbours in terms of transport issues". (see also 2.1.2 for same Fig. 1 also changed boundary – removed to reflect this change).
5	2.1.2	Rother District Council	Add after first sentence, "Battle Conservation Area comprises the historic core around the High Street and the battlefield."	Agreed	Sentence will be added as requested
11	4.1.2	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	Suggest, "There are no pedestrian crossing facilities on the A2100 at the top of Battle Hill. The safety of pedestrians depends on crossing the road because of a lack of pavements on the south side.	This issue will be highlighted in the document (4.1.2 and incorporated into the programme of works (Section 5).	Bullet point added to 4.1.2. "There is a lack of pedestrian facilities at the top of Battle Hill on the A2100" and 5.3 measure added "Develop options for pedestrian crossing facilities on A2100 for the east of Battle".
11 12	4.1.2 & 4.1.4	Darvel Down and area Residents Association	Public and permissive footpaths. Please refer to the Netherfield Action Plan	Bullet point added; "Improvements to the Rights of Way network would be welcomed" Bullet point added; "Improvements to the Rights of Way network, including signage", to leave more options	Bullet point added to 4.1.2. "Improvements to the Rights of Way (RoW) network have been requested". 4.1.4 "Improvements to signage for the RoW network" changed to "Improvements to the RoW network, including signage".

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
				open.	
13	4.3.3	ESCC Passenger Transport	Neither Kent County Council nor Stagecoach operate services in the area. Service 252 does not operate. All services in the study area, except 023 are supported by ESCC	Wording amended to amend these factual errors	Errors corrected.
14	4.3.3	Battle Town Council	Integration of bus and rail travel, and inability of bus operators to access Station Approach. We would like to see it highlighted in the document, including as a specific and deliverable measure.	Comment noted. We will amend the document to reflect this including reference in the Programme of Works to investigate integration of bus/rail travel at Battle rail station.	4.3.3 Bullet point added "A lack of integration between bus and rail travel including that bus operators cannot access Station Approach". 5. "Develop improvements to Battle Rail Station for cyclists, public transport, and pedestrians" expanded "Develop"pedestrians and disabled people, and to improve integration of bus and rail travel".
14	4.3.4	Resident of Saxonwood Road, Battle	Promoting Highway Code rule 198: In and around battle most aspects of the code are ignored by motorists.	Comments noted: no change proposed.	No change
14	4.3.4	Crowhurst Parish Council	The issue of infrequent bus services to rural areas is not addressed by the measures	There is a finite amount of funding available from the County Council to run non-commercial subsidised routes. The County Council will assess the areas/ most appropriate frequency for services and prioritise funding accordingly. The Accessibility Strategy is currently being developed as part of the 2 nd LTP.	No change
15	4.4	Crowhurst	Satellite communities are part of	We are informed that Crowhurst	No change.

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
		Parish Council	the vision but Crowhurst has not been included regarding Community Transport.	is not served by Community Transport, and we could add text to that effect.	
16	4.5.3/4	Crowhurst Parish Council	The issue of reduction of rail services to Crowhurst is stated but not addressed by the measures	Comment noted. Text can be added to 4.5.4, "initiating discussions with the rail operator to discuss provision of services."	4.5.4 Bullet point added "Initiating discussions with the rail operator to discuss provision of services".
16	4.5.4	Crowhurst Parish Council	Will the rail-bus link from Hastings to Bexhill take in Crowhurst?	The routing of a potential Hastings to Bexhill rail-bus link has not been determined, however the inclusion of Crowhurst can be considered as part of any proposal.	No change.
16	4.6.1	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	How can there be considerable potential to encourage more cycle use when there are no cycle lanes, the roads are steep and narrow, the population is mainly elderly and cyclists have been injured.	The measures outlined on page 17 of the Strategy are intended to encourage more cycle use on the area.	No change.
17	4.6.3	Resident of Saxonwood Road, Battle	Cycling: there are no cycle routes in the Strategy area. There are limited facilities for cycle parking at the top of the High Street by the fire station.	Comments noted: text can be amended from "...very few suitable cycle routes", to read "there are very few routes suitable for cyclists..."	There are a few suitable cycle routes linking residential estates to schools, particularly Claverham Community College" amended to "There are few routes suitable for cyclists linking residential estates to schools, particularly Claverham Community College".
17	4.6.4	Crowhurst Parish Council	Matters raised regarding maintenance of infrastructure have not been included in the measures.	Document can be amended to reflect comment. We can make reference in Section 5 that where possible implementation of integrated transport measures	4.6.3. Bullet point added "Poor maintenance of infrastructure, including sweeping can create barrier to cycling". + 5.1.5 wording added "wherever

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
				and maintenance work are combined.	possible implementation of integrated transport measures and maintenance work will be combined".
17	4.6.4	Battle Town Council	Cycle route to Claverham Community College. Discussions have taken place in the past.	Information noted, no change to Strategy text proposed	No change
18	4.7.3	Battle Town Council	Possible walking bus route, part of which owned by English Heritage is very muddy, and would need a hardened surface	Information noted, no change to Strategy text proposed	No change
19	4.8.5	Resident of Saxonwood Road, Battle	Many vehicles travel well in excess of the limit, more especially at both ends of the Battle High Street.	Comments noted. The Strategy includes reference to the issue of speed, however we could add A2100 to list of locations where speed is particularly as issue.	4.8.5 A2100 High Street added "speeding is perceived to be a hazard..."
20	4.9.4	Resident of Netherfield	Netherfield residents are concerned about the level and speed of traffic along Netherfield Road. It seems that the route is preferred to the B2096/A271 as access to the A21. We believe serious consideration should be given to reducing the speed limit in the 40 mph section to 30mph.	Text added to 4.9.4, "Speed and volume of traffic is excessive on unsuitable roads, including Catsfield Road, Netherfield Road, and Telham Lane."	4.9.4 Bullet point added "Speed and volume of traffic is excessive on unsuitable roads including Catsfield Road, Netherfield Road and Telham Lane".
22	4.10.1	Crowhurst Parish Council	Satellite communities are part of the vision but Crowhurst has not been included	Text added; "Powdermill Lane, and through villages such as Catsfield, Crowhurst and Netherfield."	4.10.1 text added, "and through villages such as Catsfield, Crowhurst and Netherfield."
23	4.10.5	Resident of Glengorse	Suggest adding, "Consider re-siting of weighbridge".	The re-siting of the weighbridge is outside of the County Councils control, however the issue is identified in the Strategy, and we will be raising the subject with the Highways	4.10.5 Bullet point added "consideration of relocating the weighbridge".

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
				Agency.	
23	4.10.	Darvel Down and area Residents Association	Roads and Traffic: HGVs use Battle High Street to reach Hastings because the Harrow Lane/A21/The Ridge junction is not driver friendly.	Wording added to 4.10.4; The use of the High Street to avoid the weigh bridge on the A21, "and the difficult turn at The Harrow junction in Hastings"	4.10.4 "The use of the High Street to avoid the weighbridge on the A21" added "and the difficult turn at the Harrow junction in Hastings".
24	4.11	Cllr Daniel	The Strategy should include more on Decriminalised parking, as the only way to deter parking issues.	The document refers to decriminalised parking, however Rother District Council has decided not to pursue this at the present time.	No change.
24	4.11.2	Rother District Council	"Car parking charging was extended last year, including on Sundays to improve the management of the available stock." This is not correct, Rother District Council has always charged on Sundays in its Pay and Display car parks.	Noted	The words " including on Sundays" will be removed from the document.
24	4.11.3	Rother District Council	"The additional parking adjoining Mount Street, the farmer's field is currently leased to Rother District Council". This additional parking is not leased to Battle Town Council.	Noted	The wording will be amended to correct this error.
24	4.11.3	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	The farmers field is currently leased to Battle Town Council	Wording amended to reflect current arrangements	"Currently leased to RDC" changed to "Currently leased to Battle Town Council
24	4.11.5	Rother District Council	Add, "The District Council considered the decriminalisation of on street car parking in December 2004 and resolved that no further action be taken on the matter". (It needs to be made clear that off-street car parking	Noted and agreed	The wording will be added as requested

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
			management, other than private car parks, is the responsibility of Rother District Council.		
24	4.11.5	Rother District Council	“Any initiative would need to be self funding, on a District wide basis, although any income generated (after costs) could be invested in the local transport infrastructure”. Delete comma after “self-funding”.	Noted and agreed	Amendment will be made
24	4.11.7	Rother District Council	“There are 13 designated coach parking spaces in the lower market car park...”, change to There are eight designated coach parking spaces at Upper Market car park and six coach parking spaces at the Lower Market car park.”	Noted and agreed	Wording will be changed accordingly
24	4.11.8	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	Amend to read, “Rail commuters who refuse to pay to park, park in residential roads.”	Comment noted, however we feel that the present wording is appropriate.	No change.
24	4.11.8	Resident of Saxonwood Road, Battle	Parking: a reduction in car dependency becomes increasingly urgent. On street parking is now becoming a major problem. Parking at Battle rail station between commuter train times can be very difficult.	Comments noted, and we feel the Strategy acknowledges these difficulties.	No change.
24	4.11.8	Resident of Upper Lake	A residents parking scheme for the area of Upper Lake, Lower Lake and Marley Lane should be introduced to improve road safety and quality of life of local residents which can be self-financing.	‘Investigate options for improved management of parking’ is identified as a short term measure in the programme of works and will include reviewing the potential to introduce residents parking schemes, where appropriate	No change

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
25	4.12.1	Rother District Council	Add "Signage will need to be sensitive to the surroundings, and appropriate for the Battle Conservation area."	Noted and agreed	Wording will be added as requested.
26	4.13.1	Rother District Council	In the second sentence delete, "first draft" and insert Revised Deposit". Also, delete reference to "traffic calming in Harrier Lane and Starrs Mead".	Noted and Agreed	Wording will be amended accordingly.
26 26	4.13.1	Rother District Council	Should read "revised deposit draft" rather than "first deposit draft". Harriers Lane should read Harrier Lane.	Wording amended Spelling corrected	4.13.1 wording amended "The First Draft Deposit of the Rother Local Plan" now "The Revised Deposit Draft or the Rother Local Plan".
27	4.13.4	Rother District Council	Delete sentence, "Applying adopted parking standards and the County Council adopted supplementary planning guidance on developer contributions", and insert "Applying District Council adopted parking standards and adopted supplementary planning guidance on developer contributions", to reflect the position that RDC is shortly to consider, with a view to adoption, new car parking standards and supplementary planning guidance on developer contributions.	Noted and agreed	Wording will be amended accordingly.
27	4.13.4	Rother District Council	Rother District Council has not adopted these measures yet. Supplementary Planning Guidance will be drawn up by	Document will be amended accordingly.	14.13.4. "Applying adopted parking standards and the County Council adopted supplementary planning guidance...." now "Applying adopted

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
			RDC, which may vary from ESCC approach to parking standards.		parking standards and supplementary planning guidance".
26	4.13.4	Crowhurst Parish Council	Will the new road and development of land at North Bexhill conflict with the Strategy measure to resist development in unsuitable locations?	No; the proposed Bexhill/Hastings link road will help Rother District Council to fulfil its housing allocation identified in the Rother District Plan and will be an extension to the existing settlement.	No change.
29	5.1.3	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	Delete "healthy affordable food", substitute "shops".	See 1.2.7 for comment.	No further change.
30	5.2	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Location specific</u> Bullet point 7 add "and disabled people"	Agreed.	Develop improvements to Battle Rail station for cyclists, public transport and pedestrians amended to "...pedestrians and disabled people".
30	5.2	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Cycling:</u> add "secure" between provide and cycle parking	Agreed.	Wording to be amended accordingly.
30	5.2	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Public & community transport</u> Bullet point 4, add "shelters, seating, and provision" between including and for	Agreed.	Amend document accordingly.
30	5.2	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	Add new bullet point, "Ensure that seating at bus stops is suitable for infirm passengers"	Agreed.	Text to be added to 4.3.3 under issues, "seating is often unsuitable for infirm passengers."
31	5.2	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	Add new bullet point on signing, "Minimise the number of obstructions required to support signage"	Agreed.	Text to be added to 4.12.2, " minimise the number of obstructions required to support signage."

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
31	5.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Location Specific</u> Bullet point 2 "Develop options for crossing facilities on A271 for Claverham Community College"; move entire point to short term	Agreed.	Amend document accordingly.
31	5.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Walking and accessibility for people with reduced mobility</u> Bullet point 2, "Increase seating at strategic locations to facilitate journeys on foot"; move entire point to short term	Agreed	Amend document accordingly
31	5.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Walking and accessibility for people with reduced mobility</u> Bullet point 4,"Examine the potential to provide suitably scheduled public transport"; move entire point to short term	The timetable for commercially run bus services is set by the operator, and the County Council has no powers to influence this. However, where the service is partially or fully subsidised, the County Council as part of the tendering process can determine the timetable of these particular services.	No change proposed.
31	5.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Public & community transport</u> Bullet point 3, "Investigate with the local rail operators providing a peak time dedicated commuter bus rail link or taxi bus service"; delete "peak time" and "commuter" There is no point in restricting this service to peak time commuters	Agreed.	Amend document accordingly.

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
			<p>and leaving the vehicles idle for most of the day. These vehicles should be used throughout the day particularly to move tourists. It might also be possible to provide a link between Battle Station and Claverham College for incoming students.</p>		
32	5.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<p><u>Public & community transport</u></p> <p>Bullet point 4, "In conjunction with local bus operators, review scope to run additional bus services to Hastings and/or Bexhill evenings and Sundays", add, "also review scope to add an hourly bus service to Hastings via Conquest Hospital"</p> <p>A sporadic service to Conquest Hospital does not work because patients feel they cannot rely on buses being available at the right times without risk of a long wait. An hourly service, ideally halfway between the existing services to Hastings, would give such confidence and slash the journey time compared with having to change buses.</p> <p>Continuation of this route to Hastings Town Centre would generate additional through-traffic to bolster viability.</p>	<p>Agreed. Text added "In conjunction with local bus operators, review scope to run additional bus services to Hastings and/or Bexhill evenings and Sundays, <i>including the Conquest Hospital.</i>"</p>	<p>Amend document accordingly</p>

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
32	5.4	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Location Specific</u> Bullet point 1, add "install a controlled crossing across Marley Lane at this junction"	Noted. As part of any feasibility work we will investigate pedestrian crossing improvements, but at this stage we are not able to say what these would be.	No change
32	5.4	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Walking and accessibility for people with reduced mobility</u> Bullet point 2, Investigate potential for "shop mobility" scheme in Battle"; move entire point to short term	Noted. We will endeavour to carry out measures at the earliest opportunity, but have to be aware of the limits of the available resources, and have programmed the measures accordingly.	No change
33	5.4	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Public & Community Transport</u> Bullet point 1, "Implement identified improvements to public transport waiting facilities"; move to medium term	Agreed	Amend programme accordingly.
33	5.4	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Public & Community Transport</u> Bullet point 2, "Subject to Subject to feasibility and discussions with rail operators, introduce commuter bus-rail link or taxi-bus service"; delete "commuter"	Agreed	Amend document accordingly.
33	5.4	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Public & Community Transport</u> Bullet point 3, "Subject to feasibility, introduce evening and Sunday services from Battle to Hastings and/or Bexhill and	Noted, however no change is proposed.	No change

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
			improve bus services to educational establishments outside Battle area"; as much as possible of this point should be moved to medium term		
36	6.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Strategy Target 2. People reduced mobility</u> Point 2 Increase the number of parking spaces for Blue Badge holders by 2007"; delete "by 2007" and add "immediately as required by current legislation. Also ensure that all ticket machines are accessible by all people with reduced mobility in car parks where these people are charged"	This target is linked to the improvement to the management of parking, which is a medium term measure in the programme, and as such it would be unrealistic to make changes immediately.	No change
36	6.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>People reduced mobility</u> Point 3, delete "2009" and add "2007"	2009 is felt to be appropriate, and no change is proposed.	No change
36	6.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Rail Services</u> Add a point, "Ensure full accessibility to all trains by 2007" The new "ACCESS FOR ALL" money announced by Transport Minister Charlotte Atkins in London in April 2005 should be targeted for this.	This would be outside of the County Councils influence, so we are not able to include such a target.	No change.
36	6.3	Hastings and Rother	<u>Roads and traffic</u>	The amendment will not make	No change

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
		Disability Forum	Add "at least" between by and 10%	the target specific, therefore no change is proposed.	
36	Target 3	Crowhurst Parish Council	Satellite communities are part of the vision but Crowhurst has not been included regarding the bus service strategic target	Amended to "Improve public transport facilities in the Battle area by 2007"	Target 3, "Improve public transport facilities in Battle by 2007" to "Improve public transport facilities in the Battle area by 2007".
37	6.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Signing</u> Add a new point between the existing two: "All signage at waist level should include the information in Braille and Moon along the top edge of the sign, with the Braille on the left hand side and Moon on the right. All script should be embossed to a depth of approx. 2mm to aid visually-impaired persons".	This issue will be added to section 4.2.3 as text.	Amend document accordingly
37	6.3	Hastings and Rother Disability Forum	<u>Strategy target 4: Community Transport</u> Point 1, add "Implement these by 2008"	Until the investigation of way to develop Community transport in the Battle area has been undertaken, we are unable to set a SMART target for implementation of any amendments to service provision.	No change
37	Target 11	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	Strategy targets: Add, "Reduce levels of parking in residential areas" "Identify further site for public off street parking"		5. Parking measure "Implement improvements to the management of parking including signage" to "Implement improvements to the management of visitor parking"

APPENDIX A

Page Number	Section Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Proposed change to document
			"Discuss increasing car parking facilities at Battle Station with Railway Authorities".		including signage".

Strategy Appendix

A6	5.4.1	Darvel Down and area Residents Association	Journeys to School: The number of pupils attending Netherfield Primary School in September 2004 was 125, not 64	The number of pupils has been checked and amended accordingly	Number of pupils will be changed from 64 to 125.
A7	5.6.2	Resident of Netherfield	Can I suggest that the wording "Battle area telephone exchange has" be amended to "All telephone exchanges in the area have" been activated for Broadband access.	Text will be amended accordingly.	5.6.2 will be changed from, "The Battle area telephone exchange has been activated for Broadband access" to "All telephone exchanges in the area have been activated for Broadband access".
	6.1.1	Crowhurst Parish Council	Satellite communities are part of the vision but Crowhurst has not been included in the intended outcomes	"...the future of <i>the Battle area that the vision for the community will be fulfilled.</i> "	6.1.1 "It is only by involving all those who have a stake in the future of Battle that the vision for the town will be fulfilled" to "It is only by involving all those who have a stake in the future of the Battle area that the vision for the community will be fulfilled".
A9	6.3.3 (Table)	ESCC Passenger Transport	Service 4/5 is operated wholly by Arriva. ESCC are not an operator of the 355. Kent County Council are not an operator. The note should read, "all services, except 023, receive full or partial support from ESCC".	Text amended accordingly	Text will be corrected.
A10	6.4	Darvel Down and area	Community Transport: Please refer to the Netherfield Action	Wording added: "A driver service to medical appointments is	6.4.2 paragraph added "The Battle Area Community Transport operate a

APPENDIX A

		Residents Association	Plan	provided in the area.”	service in the area including scheduled services, and a driver service for medical appointments is also available”.
A10	6.4	Resident of Glengorse, Battle	Community Transport providers struggle with a lack of volunteers and funds.	The section highlights the problems involved.	No change.
A14	6.9	Darvel Down and area Residents Association	Key roads: The B2096 is a key route between the Battle/Hastings area through to Uckfield and Lewes, and the A272 onwards.	The document will be amended accordingly.	6.9.1 Bullet point added “The B2096 carries traffic between Battle area, Heathfield and Uckfield and beyond joining the A271 west of Battle”.