

## **Appendix 2 - Supplementary Document**



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

## **Horsham District Council**

---

### **Horsham's First Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)**

**Supplementary Document  
Summary of Stakeholder & Public Consultation  
October 2020**

## Contents

Forward	1
<b>1. Summary of Responses to the LCWIP Consultation</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Summary of Stakeholders' General Comments and Responses</b>	<b>3</b>
2.0 - LCWIP Section Number 2 - Scope of Horsham LCWIP	3
3.0 - LCWIP Section Number 3 - Integration with Policy and Strategy	4
4.0 - LCWIP Section Number 4 - Active Travel Content	4
5.0 - LCWIP Section Number 5 - Route Network Planning for Cycling	4
6.0 - LCWIP Section Number 6 - Route Network Planning for Walking	4
7.0 - LCWIP Section Number 7 - Route Audits	5
8.0 - LCWIP Section Number 8 - Provisional Cost Estimates for Route Improvements	5
9.0 - LCWIP Section Number 9 - Integration, Delivery and Next Steps	5
<b>3. Summary of Public General Comments and Responses</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Summary of Corridor Comments</b>	<b>8</b>
Corridor 1a – North Horsham	8
Corridor 1b – North Horsham	8
Corridor 2 – Roffey	8
Corridor 3 – Forest School	9
Corridor 4 – Southwater	9
Corridor 5 – Broadbridge Heath	10
Corridor 6 – Warnham (Walking)	10

This document, which is to be read in conjunction with Horsham's first LCWIP, provides a summary of comments and points raised by both stakeholders and the public during its preparation. These will be considered during the design stages for any of the schemes and the LCWIP review.

## Forward



Horsham's first Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, (LCWIP), as set out in the Government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, is a new, strategic approach to identifying cycling and walking improvements required at the local level. The LCWIP will assist both the Highway Authority West Sussex County Council and the District Council to identify cycling and walking improvements across the town which could be delivered from future investment or grants in the short, medium and long term. It forms a vital part of the Government's strategy to increase the number of trips made on foot or by cycle.

The LCWIP will support the District Local Plan and the emerging Public Realm Strategy by providing new infrastructure and physical improvements to encourage behavioural change. By linking existing and new residential and business areas with key destinations such as the railway stations, schools and colleges, workplaces and the town centre, this will maximise the uptake of opportunities for everyday travel.

Working in Partnership with consultants WSP, this is Horsham's first LCWIP which it is proposed to review every five years with new routes being added or routes amended to keep pace with the changes across the town.

Horsham's first LCWIP has not been developed in isolation. I am grateful to all local stakeholders and the public who have given their time to support and develop our plan.

**Councillor Peter Burgess**  
**Councillor for Holbrook West and Cabinet Member for Horsham Town**

## 1. Summary of Responses to the LCWIP Consultation

To help inform the emerging document, a stakeholder and public consultation was held in August 2020.

There were 211 responses received from the public and 8 stakeholder replies. The responses ranged from a single comment in a paragraph to detailed replies of more than 8 pages. Stakeholders' responses were received from the local Parish Council, Neighbourhood Councils, Horsham District Cycle Forum, Horsham Blueprint Business Forum and the Horsham Society.

The online consultation allowed people to view the draft LCWIP, and included a short survey based questionnaire on cycling and walking habits, together with a section for detailed comments on the corridors into the town. Many comments covered the same or similar points so these have been grouped together in sections.

In general, there was an understanding that the Plan is in line with Government ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choices for shorter journeys or as part of a longer journey by delivering the infrastructure at a local level.

### Support

Comments received were very supportive of the Plan with over 32% of those who replied specifically mentioning their support for Horsham's first LCWIP. Here are a few extracts;

*"... acknowledge the LCWIP is a positive strategic document, and the routes are subject to funding which may take many years to deliver ..."*

*"... overall I feel the consultation paper is an excellent piece of work ..."*

*"... it is to be welcomed that at long last Horsham is actively looking at improving walking and cycling routes ..."*

*"... like the plans [LCWIP] and recognise a lot of thought and consideration are being put into this, great work ..."*

*"... there is little in the Plan to criticise. The vision is exciting, the methodology is sound, and the identified corridors offer good potential for district-wide model transfer ..."*

**Response:** Thank you for your positive and supportive comments.

<b>2. Summary of Stakeholders' General Comments</b>		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>LCWIP Section Number 2 - Scope of Horsham LCWIP</b>	
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
2.1	<p>Develop a complete cycling network for the town not just the 5 corridors.</p> <p>Routes through the town centre need to be considered as well.</p> <p>The town needs a well-connected series of interconnected routes between the 5 radial corridors.</p> <p>LCWIP needs to be extended to include routes to Crawley, Downs Link, Warnham, Christ's Hospital to Southwater, Mannings Heath, and North Horsham to Roffey.</p>	<p>The first LCWIP includes the main corridors into the town centre as a starting point. Additional or amended routes will be considered as part of the LCWIP review.</p> <p>Additional studies would be required for some areas such as the town centre.</p> <p>Additional routes are included in the West Sussex County Council LCWIP.</p> <p>Additional cross link suggestions are welcomed and will be kept under review.</p> <p>The LCWIP has identified the Key Corridors where investment will produce the best outcomes.</p>
2.2	<p>Further work should be undertaken on walking routes.</p> <p>A list of 'point interventions' where there are specific problems such as missing crossing points and better local standards that prioritise pedestrians wherever changes are made on the highway.</p>	<p>The LCWIP has been prepared in line with Government technical guidance and is not meant to be exhaustive.</p> <p>Detailed provision for pedestrians will be included at the design stage of any proposed scheme.</p> <p>Additional designs or routing could be considered in the LCWIP review.</p>
2.3	<p>Important that, where possible, new cycling &amp; walking routes should also benefit motorists.</p>	<p>User priorities need considering within detailed design stage and balanced response.</p>
2.4	<p>Two-way cycling in one-way streets, not favoured.</p>	<p>Assess impacts, alternative options and priorities to be considered at detailed design stage.</p>
2.5	<p>Priority for the LCWIP should be to deliver one route entirely. Only a complete route can fulfil its function properly and make a real difference.</p>	<p>The LCWIP establishes five key cycle corridors based on the propensity to cycle evaluation. We will seek to develop and deliver these key priorities where investment will produce the best outcomes while reviewing future schemes.</p>
2.6	<p>Important for consideration to be given to the ongoing maintenance of any scheme and therefore a commitment to ongoing maintenance with adequate funding provided.</p>	<p>Noted and agree.</p>

<b>3.0 LCWIP Section Number 3 - Integration with Policy and Strategy</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
3.1	<p>Cycle provision to meet minimum standards of the current Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance.</p> <p>Provision for disabled users who are particularly sensitive to poor standards of cycling and walking provision.</p>	Detailed route designs to be considered in line with current national and local design advice such as Local Transport Note 1/20 and Gear Change, West Sussex Cycling Design Guide.
3.2	Need to ensure that the aims of the LCWIP and Public Realm improvements are totally compatible and still necessary.	Noted. It is necessary now and in the future to secure growth and vitality.

<b>4.0 LCWIP Section Number 4 - Active Travel Content</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
4.1	Primary and junior schools should be destinations as these are priority destinations for both walking and cycling.	<p>Corridor 1a and 1b North Horsham, Corridor 3 Forest School and Corridor 5 Broadbridge Heath cover routes to both primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>Additional routes and destinations could be considered in the LCWIP review.</p>
4.2	Consider a lowering of speed limits for residential areas, 30 mph down to 20 mph zones.	<p>Recognise need to reduce speed limits in certain areas as well as cycle schemes.</p> <p>Local speed reductions in residential areas to be considered in the LCWIP review.</p>

<b>5.0 LCWIP Section Number 5 - Route Network Planning for Cycling</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
5.1	No specific comments received on this section.	No change.

<b>6.0 LCWIP Section Number 6 - Route Network Planning for Walking</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
6.1	No specific comments received on this section.	No change.

<b>7.0 LCWIP Section Number 7 - Route Audits</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
7.1	Introduce Low Traffic Neighbourhoods.	<p>The use of LTNs will be explored as possible options in the future.</p> <p>To be considered at the detail design stage and in the LCWIP review.</p>
7.2	Poor state of current infrastructure.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>To be considered at the detail design stage and in the LCWIP review.</p>
7.3	Width narrowing at some side road junctions is welcome whilst maintaining traffic flow on the main road.	<p>Noted and agree.</p> <p>To be considered at the detail design stage and in the LCWIP review.</p>

<b>8.0 LCWIP Section Number 8 - Provisional Cost Estimates for Route Improvements</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
8.1	<p>Query the costs of individual route estimates quoted.</p> <p>The cost estimates section needs to highlight the economic, health and environmental benefits of active travel.</p>	<p>Indicative high-level cost estimates to understand the broad scale of funding which might be required.</p> <p>Cost to be built up in detailed design stage and priorities assessed.</p> <p>We note that cycling has positive benefits as listed.</p>

<b>9.0 LCWIP Section Number 9 - Integration, Delivery and Next Steps</b>		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
9.1	<p>DfT Technical Guidance reads “it is envisaged that the LCWIP will need to be reviewed and updated approximately every four or five years”.</p> <p>Prioritisation of routes needs to be considered as there are a number of routes that have strong benefits without presenting significant engineering difficulties.</p>	<p>It is planned to update the LCWIP every five years and part of the review would include stakeholder and public consultation.</p> <p>The LCWIP establishes five key cycle corridors based on the propensity to cycle evaluation. We will seek to develop and deliver these key priorities where investment will produce the best outcomes while reviewing future schemes.</p> <p>The detailed design for schemes would include extensive case study with stakeholder and public consultation.</p> <p>Routes will be developed as and when funding becomes available.</p>

### 3. Summary of Public General Comments

	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blanket 20mph limit for all residential areas.</li> <li>• Generally supportive of more walking and cycling infrastructure.</li> <li>• Cycle lanes should only be created where there is sufficient room for the lanes without making the roads too narrow for other vehicles.</li> <li>• Improved provision of secure cycle racks or parking for cycles in town.</li> <li>• General tidy of the existing and sometimes confusing cycle signs in town.</li> <li>• Training required for cyclists.</li> <li>• Further work is needed on all walking routes.</li> <li>• Improve the existing cycle lanes first.</li> <li>• Safe cycle route along the A 264 Horsham to Crawley.</li> <li>• Connections to surrounding settlements, Warnham, Slinfold, Manning Heath, Downs Link, Christ's Hospital, Kingsfold, Rudgwick.</li> <li>• More provisions to ban cyclists in West Street.</li> <li>• Should be encouraging people to cycle, not just provide A to B routes which do not get used much.</li> <li>• The barrier of the A24 and the extremely poor quality of the Worthing Road from Hop Oast into Horsham</li> <li>• The Carfax and surrounding roads need to be considered for cyclists.</li> <li>• Better surely to improve pavements for pedestrians only.</li> <li>• Well designed separate cycle route not just painted lines in narrow road.</li> <li>• Town centre east/west route is required.</li> <li>• Circular route around Horsham.</li> <li>• Improved crossings where a road and cycle path cross.</li> <li>• Separate cycle and walking routes, not combined routes.</li> <li>• More interconnecting routes in the town centre.</li> <li>• Primary and secondary schools are the biggest source of traffic.</li> <li>• Would welcome speed reductions and safer junctions.</li> <li>• Cycle link from the new Enterprise Park to the railway station.</li> <li>• Further feasibility work needs to be undertaken on the town centre cycling movements.</li> <li>• Detailed design layouts were submitted for a number of major junctions.</li> <li>• It would be nice to have safe crossings for the wheelchair user.</li> <li>• The problem of motorists' excessive speed on these routes needs to be meaningfully tackled.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Thank you to everyone who responded. We appreciate the time people took to respond, and the wide range of views expressed. Your views will help ensure that a stronger and more collaborative LCWIP emerges as a result.</p> <p>The DfT has explicitly said that local authorities with Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans will be better placed to secure future funding which is why this Plan has been produced. The District Council will work in partnership with other organisations and the Highway Authority,</p>
--	--



West Sussex County Council, to secure funding which will enable delivery of schemes in the Plan.

The routes identified in the Plan were selected in line with guidance provided by the DfT and in consultation with the local stakeholders. Some of the points listed, and the interconnecting routes and destinations that are not identified in this Plan, are beyond the scope of this first LCWIP and would be the subject of discussion for inclusion as the LCWIP is reviewed.

In line with DfT guidance, the Plan focusses on infrastructure delivery rather than establishing new policy. The Plan has been amended to include a statement that the LCWIP is a key tool in helping to deliver local improvements to increase cycling and walking in the District and the emerging Horsham District Local Plan will ensure that due regard is given to this strategic document.

In line with DfT guidance, the focus of the LCWIP was to identify priority routes for investment based on their likelihood to encourage more walking and cycling. We recognise that longer distance routes connecting settlements are also important to encourage more cycling trips in rural areas.

In support of the decision makers and to set out more clearly what is expected of designers, the Plan has been amended to include reference to current national and local design advice such as Local Transport Network 1/20, Gear Change and the West Sussex Cycling Design Guide.

**The next section provides a breakdown of the core responses received for the main corridors identified for the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. These will be used to help inform the design and consultation process as and when these routes come forward.**

#### 4. Summary of Corridor Comments

##### LCWIP Reference 1a - Corridor 1a: North Horsham

	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Kings Road needs traffic calming with or without the cycle measures.</li><li>• Considerations made on Rusper Road.</li><li>• Layouts around the station need to be considered carefully due to lack of parking.</li><li>• A new bridge is needed over the railway in North Street.</li><li>• Strategic redevelopment of the New Street underpass would enable Horsham Park to better serve as an active transport aggregation point.</li><li>• Kings Road, narrowing the road will cause massive congestion, this is a main route into the town.</li><li>• No safe cycling route from the east to the west side of town unless you dismount in the subway that runs between New Street and Horsham Park.</li><li>• Parsonage Road/Kings Road roundabout is hazardous and has inadequate provision for walking/cycling. Needs redesigning.</li><li>• Station bridge, Existing bridge is narrow, a new pedestrian footbridge could be cantilevered on the side, and existing width reallocated for cycle lanes.</li><li>• Booth Way, Depot Road, New Street should be considered over using the railway bridge.</li></ul>

##### LCWIP Reference 1b - Corridor 1b: North Horsham

	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• North Heath/ Parsonage Road Roundabout needs improving for both drivers and cyclists.</li><li>• The cycle track on the side of North Parade would be much better if it was separated from the road.</li><li>• Utilise the width of North Parade seems to make the most sense.</li><li>• Much safer crossing of the A264 from Northlands Road to Old Holbrook and from Pondtail Close to Langhurstwood Road.</li><li>• Pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway between Parsonage Road and Richmond Road.</li><li>• Super crossing over Albion Way between London Road and Medwin Walk. Close the subway.</li></ul>

##### LCWIP Reference 2- Corridor 2: Roffey

	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Crawley Road one way system is interesting and promising.</li><li>• Crawley Road, reducing the speed limit to 20mph would increase road safety.</li><li>• Streetscape enhancements are welcomed.</li></ul>

<b>3. Summary of Corridor Comments</b>	
<b>LCWIP Reference 3 - Corridor 3: Forest School</b>	
	<b>Comment</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Queen Street sections in particular will make a big difference</li> <li>• Bennetts Road used as a rat run, also speeding up and down the road. The junctions at either end, and in the middle can be tricky.</li> <li>• Brighton Road, like Kings Road is a main vehicle route to and through the town. It is not safe to narrow down such busy roads.</li> <li>• Routes to nearby villages such as Mannings Heath.</li> <li>• Widening the footpaths under the bridge would improve pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>

<b>LCWIP Reference 4 - Corridor 4: Southwater</b>	
	<b>Comment</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe crossing over the A24 at Hop Oast roundabout with a cycle/walk-way into Horsham.</li> <li>• Safe cycling route Christ's Hospital to Horsham.</li> <li>• With access to public transport, consideration of a route to Christ's Hospital Station from Southwater which would be more attractive than negotiating Worthing Road.</li> <li>• Always wanted to cycle from Southwater to Horsham but this is FAR TOO DANGEROUS.</li> <li>• This route would change the way I travel to Horsham, it is currently unsafe to cycle to Horsham.</li> <li>• Need for a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the Hop Oast roundabout area.</li> <li>• Only route to walk into Horsham from Southwater is by crossing the very fast moving A24. This totally discourages me from walking into town.</li> <li>• Walking and cycling are too dangerous because of the weight of traffic and no safe way of crossing the dual carriage way.</li> <li>• Southwater would really benefit from a cycle/walking route into Horsham.</li> <li>• Southwater to Town Centre Corridor, Cedar Drive into Blakes Farm Road, could be developed as an alternative.</li> <li>• Safe route from Lovers Lane to Southwater Country Park would open up so much more access.</li> <li>• Pedlars Way would welcome a better surface and lighting, which would encourage more Southwater school kids to cycle.</li> <li>• Walking routes are badly needed in Horsham, especially from Southwater and Broadbridge Heath.</li> <li>• A cycle path from Southwater to Horsham is long overdue.</li> </ul>

### 3. Summary of Corridor Comments

#### LCWIP Reference 5 - Corridor 5: Broadbridge Heath

	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Farthings Hill urgently needs cycle infrastructure from Tanbridge roundabout to Farthings roundabout.</li><li>• Link from Farthing Hill roundabout along the Guildford Road into town</li><li>• Broadbridge heath roundabout is awful for cyclists to negotiate.</li><li>• Priority crossings for pedestrians and cyclists along the Guildford Road rather to avoid the constant stop/start.</li><li>• There is potentially a good safe route from BBH into town.</li><li>• A longer continuous track is preferred with fewer 'give ways' along its length. The current Guildford Road lane is disjointed at each road junction it crosses.</li><li>• Broadbridge Heath village, the present arrangements in Billingshurst Road, Old Guildford Road and Guildford Road, A281 means they are far too dangerous to use.</li><li>• Need for a pedestrian crossing on north side of the Bishopric junction.</li><li>• Hard to overstate just how poor the design and condition of this route is at present for both pedestrians and cyclists.</li><li>• Covert Tanbridge House School junction into a continental roundabout.</li><li>• The route behind Tanbridge House is great being car-free, but very overgrown with brambles which prevents two way walking and cycling.</li></ul>

#### LCWIP Reference 6 - Corridor 6: Warnham (Walking)

	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rookwood underpass could be incorporated in a 'greenway route' for walking and cycling.</li><li>• Warnham Road is dangerous to cross, any safer crossing points would be welcome.</li></ul>