

**DORDRECHT WAY – CONVERSION OF FOOTWAYS TO SHARED USE****STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED**

	<b>Comment received</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>ESCC response</b>
1	<p>This is a comment on the proposal.</p> <p>It allows cyclists to ride across the pavement at these two crucial access points for pedestrians to the park. Pedestrians at the moment feel safe on the pavement because they can be reasonably sure there will be no vehicles on it; this reassurance would be lost and the benefit of a feeling of safety when entering or using the park would be undermined.</p> <p>The corner is often congested with traffic trying to turn right onto St Helen’s Park Road, which reduces visibility for both pedestrians and cyclists crossing Dordrecht Way at that point, leading to distraction and possible collisions. Cyclists crossing at any speed are particularly vulnerable to collisions with cars turning into Dordrecht way and accelerating along it.</p> <p>There are considerable numbers of families with children using these two access points, and it is not safe to allow cyclists to cross the pedestrian routes. The children, who move suddenly and unpredictably, would be at particular risk.</p>	Resident	<p>The scheme proposals have been through a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit undertaken by a specialist audit team that is independent of the design team.</p> <p>No safety issues pertaining to the comments raised were identified in the audit report.</p> <p>Adequate signing and surface markings will be provided as a part of the scheme to warn cyclists of the approaching junction, as well as signage to vehicles using Dordrecht Way.</p>
2	<p>I am writing to say that I object to this section of path at Dordrecht Way being changed to a shared footway/cycleway. It is not necessary and will be a waste of money, as cyclists will have dismounted to cross at this busy junction. It is a very dangerous crossing point and changing the use of a short section of footpath won’t make any difference. I should know as I jog this way every day.</p> <p>Perhaps instead you could concentrate on creating a pedestrian crossing here, or even better, close Dordrecht Way at this end, to stop it being the rat run that it has become. It is a very dangerous junction and cut through and often difficult to cross here. If you closed Dordrecht Way</p>	Resident	<p>The scheme proposals have been through a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit undertaken by a specialist audit team that is independent of the design team.</p> <p>No safety issues pertaining to the comments raised were identified in the audit report.</p> <p>Closure of Dordrecht Way would introduce a number of different issues, including the need to make provision of adequate space for vehicles to</p>

	Comment received	From	ESCC response
	<p>you could create short term parking for park users and make it a much safer bit of road.</p>		<p>turn.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>I object to the proposals in the strongest terms possible.</p> <p>As a regular pedestrian commuter and I have a wealth of experience of being failed by the cycling community and the local authority. both need to demonstrate improvement and long-term commitment.</p> <p>in no specific order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authority has chosen NOT to maintain any of the existing roads to a state suitable for cycles. I draw attention to St Helens rd which since the latest works regularly floods when 1mm per hour of rain is seen</li> <li>• St Helens road surface covering is falling away in places already</li> <li>• the pedestrian crossing points are not maintained and are below the road surface now</li> <li>• the road surface is higher than the pavements</li> <li>• drains are filled with debris from the road surface</li> <li>• run off from the road surface regularly spills over the paths and into the park area.</li> <li>• the Authority has chosen not to maintain the cycle path signage - and has failed to implement clear signage.</li> <li>• there are many instances of misleading cycle signage</li> <li>• the authority has chosen NOT to enforce mandatory regulation signage in the pedestrian areas - the red circle signs which mean cycles not to be use - only pushed</li> <li>• the authority has chosen to allow the obstruction of pavements in town</li> </ul> <p>the authority clearly cannot afford the full cost of ownership of cycle paths or shared cycle paths.</p> <p>proposed park shared use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the authority currently fails to enforce the cycle ban - encouraging</li> </ul>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>The scheme proposals have been through a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit that was undertaken by a specialist audit team that is independent of the design team.</p> <p>No safety issues pertaining to the comments raised were identified in the audit report.</p> <p>Many of the issues raised by the objector relate to long-term maintenance issues and not related, specifically, to the proposal to permit cyclists to cycle across the footways at Dordrecht Way to travel between the Upper and Lower parks.</p> <p>These items will be forwarded to the ESCC Reactive Maintenance to take into consideration as part of their annual programme of works.</p>

	Comment received	From	ESCC response
	<p>instead the use of cycles on surfaces which when damp are slippery even to pedestrians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposals encourage cycles over metal foot bridges - and as shown this week the irresponsible cycles which use the foot paths fall off, this week into the metal bridge and across the path of pedestrians and dogs on leads being walked responsibly</li> </ul> <p>the proposal does nothing to protect pedestrians from motor traffic using the pavement to pass other motor vehicles when trying to enter St Helens road.</p> <p>it is unacceptable for this hazard to be increased by the allowance of use by cycles.</p> <p>The authority MUST demonstrate full funding for all aspect of ownership of the proposals and current cycle paths and shared footpaths.</p> <p>The authority MUST demonstrate full responsibility for the use of footpaths and pedestrian zones by cycles</p> <p>the authority MUST demonstrate full enforcement of mandatory regulation regarding cycles.</p>		
4	<p>I am authorised to reply on behalf of Surrey and Sussex Police and the Chief Constables of those forces.</p> <p>I refer to your e-mail of the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020, in respect of the above matter. I can confirm that your correspondence fulfils your legal obligation to consult with Sussex Police under the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).</p> <p>I have considered this carefully and I can confirm that we have no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>If I can help any further, then please do not hesitate to speak to me.</p>	Sussex Police	Noted

	Comment received	From	ESCC response
5	We have no comments to add.	ESCC Parking	Noted
6	<p>Many thanks for the detailed route design plans. I am grateful for your efforts to keep me informed on this and the other route projects.</p> <p>I will discuss these plans with my colleagues.</p> <p>The only initial issue that I am not clear about is what safety measures will be installed at the critical crossing of Dordrecht Way. To be honest this is an existing danger point for people on foot who cross the road at that point with traffic turning in from St Helens Road</p>	Hastings Urban Bikes	<p>The scheme proposals have been through a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit that was undertaken by a specialist audit team that is independent of the design team.</p> <p>No safety issues pertaining to the comments raised were identified in the audit report. In addition, no crashes have been recorded along Dordrecht Way or junctions in the last 3-year period up to 31/3/2020.</p>