

Notes from MSDC/TRRA representatives meeting, 25th November, 2019, via Microsoft Teams

Introduction

The meeting was held via Microsoft Team at the request of Robin Walker, as the designated and agreed contact point for communications between the Theobalds bridleway users and residents' community and MSDC on the topic of the route for non-motorised travel between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath. This meeting was first promised in an email from Mr Spilsted on 5th November, 2019, to include also their designers (Sustrans' Mr Young). This was later rescinded but we did meet with Mr Young, as part of his broad fact-finding process.

On 20th December 2019 Mr Spilsted stated the meeting should be deferred until after Mr Young had delivered his report and it had been considered by Councillors at the next Members Steering Group meeting, at that time scheduled for January, 2020. In the event, probably due to the Coronavirus, Mr Young's report was not published until May, 2020. In the intervening time a lot of changes and updates had taken place and new information had come to light which made this a good time to discuss the topic at this stage.

START OF THE NOTES OF THE MEETING

Meeting Time and date:

25th November, 2020, 12:00 – 13:00 Hrs

Attendees:

For Theobalds bridleway users and residents: Robin Walker, Sarah Roberts, Richard Maltby
For MSDC: Cllrs Jonathan Ash-Edwards and Judy Llewellyn-Burke and Officers Judy Holmes, Sally Blomfield and Nathan Spilsted
Sarah Davies - Chief of Staff & Office Manager for Mims Davies MP

No formal note-taker was identified, these therefore represent a summary of the key points made by either side. Since some comments provoked some follow-up questions, these are combined below in a separate section. I also include images and photos referred to in the text as Appendix 2

We should express our thanks that all of the relevant people on MSDC's side were able to join the call, which is much appreciated.

Introductory Comments

Jonathan expressed a hope that, whilst both sides might not agree about everything, communication might help some of the issues to be addressed.

Since we had requested the meeting, we felt it was only fair to provide some specific questions to which we were seeking answers at this stage. This does not constitute the totality of questions but given the ongoing work, the three questions defined the structure. MSDC were asked if there was anything that they wished to add, which they did not.

Judy Holmes raised a very important initial point (which was related to the comment at the end of question 3). She stated that we seemed not to trust MSDC and not to be willing to let the relevant officers and outside consultants do their job. She wanted to emphasize that multiple routes – 14 routes and route segments in total – were under active consideration and that nothing had been decided upon and nothing had been ruled out.

We fully support Judy Holmes' reasonable determination to protect her officers' probity and freedom to do their jobs. Nor did we suggest other western routes were not being considered (indeed, the email from Nathan made it clear the primary route is to the west of the railway line).

Sally Blomfield summarised the governance process and that it should be noted that the public engagement results were considered by the Members' Steering Group (MSG). Having taken these into account, the MSG asked officers to continue to review alternative routes and to investigate the potential for a reduced scope scheme for the eastern route to address the objections; this is the work referred to above and that will be reported to the MSG for consideration.

I would therefore like to clarify *once and for all that it is not, and never has been, our view, that MSDC is not considering other/multiple routes.* Indeed, my point as stated was "*why is MSDC trying so hard to look anywhere but here?*". For clarity, "here" was specifically referring to the potential for a "central route". "anywhere" meant "anywhere" – not "eastern route only".

I apologise if my meaning was unclear but it was provided in the context of the *information available to us in the public record*. We are not privy to whatever else is available to MSDC – either as fact or intention.

This is:

- Policy 37 indicative routes from 2019 showing an "eastern" proposed cycleway and a "western" set of possible routes – and no central route.
- The Sustrans feasibility study which discounted the potential of any central route on the basis of the need to go over the unmanned rail crossing, which was considered unsafe, plus ownership issues.
- Our detailed response to the above pointing out the multiple errors of fact, including but not limited to the assertions made about non-viability of a central route on the basis claimed.
- The CJFounds report on public engagement on the Place and Connectivity Programme which mentioned new proposed alternative central routes but stated they had all been discounted in whole or in part by the Feasibility Study. Our proposed "Central route" taking advantage of MSDC's 2013 land purchases alongside the railway was not visibly considered (though it is fair to reference Mr Spilsted's comments related to Heaselands Estate).

Judy Holmes pointed out the Public Engagement report does not rule out any route -this is not its purpose. In the next section under 'Next Steps' it states "The feasibility and deliverability of the alternative routes suggested will be reviewed". This is the review work referred to above that is currently assessing 14 potential routes/ variants of routes.

Judy Holmes also made the point that it would be preferable to provide a choice of routes to the non-motorised user, rather than just one. This is a view we fully endorse; there is no disagreement there.

Our view is, and has always been, that the Theobalds bridleway (even if the Highways group do agree to provide safe cycle and walking space on both Fox Hill and Valebridge Road, which is not clear at present), is too long and indirect a route. It is a very popular recreational route, however, primarily today with walkers and equestrians with some cyclists (including both Sarah and Robin).

Questions

Our high level questions, with the answers we received in the meeting:

1. We received the email from Mr Spilsted, which, together with the published CJ Founds report, creates confusion with its disparities:
 - a. the scope is “radically reduced” – however this is not what is visible in either the Reg 19 submission or the report from CJ Founds. So, what exactly is planned?
 - b. The surface treatment view has changed – so what is it now?
 - c. Lighting is “Not suggested for phase 1”, which implies it is still in the plan for later according to the CJF report. What is the intent?
 - d. There is still no clear commitment from WSCC Highways to connect at either end. Surely, this commitment should come first?
 - e. The primary route is now the “western route”; So, is the “Eastern route” back-up, or what?

Nathan Spilsted was able to provide clear and unambiguous answers to the majority, but not all of these questions as the work is still ongoing, which is fair enough. The answers are summarized below:

- there is no plan to make any change on the metalled part of Theobalds Road;
- there is no plan to change the bridges, but only to look at the approaches on either end of them;
- there is no intent for public art to be included and no plan for lighting at any stage.
- The plan is for the surface to be non-sealed, both the nature of this and the height above the surrounding area has not been finalized; due note is being taken of what ESCC Highways is currently doing at the eastern end of the bridleway.
- On the vexed question of width, the view is to work within the available width and not plan for “minimum 3m”
- There are strict rules, and significant weight given, to environmental issues and environmental experts are part of the team
- The issue of cyclist speed was recognized
- The intent of the so-called “high level boardwalk” was to provide a raised path to the west of the eastern bridge, where flooding is a particular issue
- Drainage is dealt with below
- There are ongoing discussions with WSCC Highways

The ideas for the eastern route are not yet finalized and we should wait for these to be provided as part of the next round of public consultations.

This led to a broader discussion about demand.

- Nathan commented that demand for the route stems from a long held aspiration, expressed in the Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plans for a traffic free route between the two towns (See note below). 133 schemes were assessed through a Multi Criteria Assessment Framework for inclusion in the Place and Connectivity programme of which such a link was a top five scheme. In addition it was outlined that there are a host of qualitative reasons for achieving such a link. In terms of quantitative data, it is known that the 2011 census data records 33 cycle commuters between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath for work purposes in comparison to over 2,000 private vehicle movements. (See note below).

- It was noted that the 2011 census data is fairly dated and recorded under current difficult conditions.
- This is entirely consistent with our analysis of the 2011 census data (LSOA), which was 8 users for the eastern route and a further 9 for a western route. However, we would expect, based on the same proportion of cycle commuters with distance, and a 7.5% HH-bound commuter model for the completed Northern Arc (greater than the BH-HH average) a further 16 users would be added to this total, making 25 users for the western network. The annual Department for Transport statistics show that Mid Sussex average commuter cycling (all distances, 3 days/week) for 2017/8 was 2.3%, considerably below the average used. – However, see additional notes on demand: MSDC used the higher level MSOA data for a broader geographical area, using the method of travel (only available at MSOA level)

This answers Sarah's question and confirms there is no other user demand and analysis data.

- Sally made the reasonable point that the aim was to create a permanent shift away from car use; we entirely support this, and always have.
 - One target user group identified is school and college students, some of which are expected to go from southern Haywards Heath to the proposed Northern Arc Secondary School. (see notes below).
 - The objective is to provide both for commuter and recreational use (this has always been our understanding as well). Regarding commuter use, the level of traffic on both Valebridge Road/Rocky Lane and Isaac's Lane probably discourages both current and potential new adopters. Again – we agree with this
 - Robin pointed out, given the lack of take-up of both walking and in particular cycling in recent years, and the clear and unarguable drop-off of that proportion with increased distance, that there is no argument for any route (east or west) that cannot, in greater measure, be made of a central route, which, as the shortest, flattest and most convenient route, would accrue the greatest utilisation.
2. *We have identified drainage as the critical issue on multiple occasions.* When Mr Young visited, Sheila Blair, one of the residents, who has lived here all her life (we daren't ask how long that is!), as did her parents before her, made the point that drainage was the #1 issue and all previous efforts to improve the bridle path end (mainly around and between the two bridges) eventually failed because of this. *So, specifically, what are the plans to address drainage?*
- Nathan agreed this is a major challenge with no clear and obvious solution at present (though he was at pains to point out that the work on this was not complete).
 - Robin stated that winter rains raise water levels in the stream to the point where in several places (including but not limited to the area identified above, where the high-level plastic boardwalk was intended to address this) where it is two feet deep and (at those times) with significant flow; photographs of this were previously sent to the attendees (see Appendix 2 below). This has been the reason why every previous attempt (and there have been many) by ESCC PRoW groups to address the issue had been short-lived.

- ESCC have added hardcore to raise the path at the eastern end, the results of which will be studied.
- Robin pointed out that lack of flow (outside of winter storms) did not help – there is only a very shallow gradient between the eastern bridge on the bridle path and the pond leading into the Valebridge reservoir to the west of the viaduct.

We will be very interested to study the plans to address this in due course.

3. *We have pointed out that most of a “central” route sits already within MSDC’s ownership since 2013.* We understand this was not purchased with a route in mind at that stage, but that is irrelevant – the land is owned by MSDC, is not used at present and, as we have pointed out, would make a shorter, flatter, and unarguably, most direct, 100% traffic-free route. It could also (ref our previous comments about creating a twin underbridge where the Valebridge Viaduct is) make a truly exciting route which would also open up Bedelands Nature Reserve to residents from southern Haywards Heath. So, what, if anything, is happening on that (note that CJ Finds pre-dismisses this altogether, citing the Sustrans report, itself inaccurate, but not taking MSDC’s land ownership into account, either). *So, simply – why is MSDC trying so hard to look anywhere but here?*

For discussion on the final point, see above. For the rest:

- The 14 routes and route segments currently being studied does include what could be defined as a “central route”
- The challenge to any central route has always been the need to pass through part of the Heaselands Estate (HE). Nathan pointed out that MSDC had approached HE several times over the years but had always been resolutely rebuffed
- However, HE has now engaged with their consultants on multiple routes and have expressed a willingness to discuss options and meetings have taken place concerning multiple route segments; this is certainly a very positive step
- We pointed out that (whatever the original purchase purpose), the strips of land owned by MSDC since 2013 which run alongside the western side of the railway track would certainly eliminate most need for new land, and they are not currently used for anything.
- One significant challenge is crossing the river and avoiding what is certainly an issue at the Rocky Lane railway underpass bridge. Nathan has forwarded our proposal for a dual bridge attached between the gaps on the current viaduct (which we pointed out would make a really exciting feature and provide the possibility of interest points on railway history) to Network Rail’s Asset Protection Team and this would be considered in the report on route options.
- CJFinds’ remit is to look at all the responses and input from the public engagement and evaluate all the alternative route options.

Other topics:*Funding flow*

Robin asked about the progress; the current stated timeline is to carry out the necessary surveying and analysis and then have the next round of public engagement in Spring 2021. Given the need to commit at least some of the funds during the 20/21 financial year, we recognized this was a constraint and Robin asked whether there were sufficient project elements that could be delivered that would use the affected tranche of funding without loss; Nathan confirmed this was indeed the case.

“Cycleway”

Sally noted that Policy DP7 of the District Plan was the parent Policy to Sites DPD Policy 37 and this refers to the creation of a multi-functional route between the two towns. The wording of Policy 37 also refers correctly to multi-functional routes. However Sally acknowledged that the associated illustrative map refers incorrectly to the eastern route being described as a “Cycleway” and that a minor change to reflect this would be proposed at submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

Additional questions and clarifications

The meeting generated a few further questions and requests for clarifications, which are included below:

Source of demand numbers

Mr Spilsted identified 33 cyclists compared with “over 2,000 private vehicle journeys”. RW asked about the source of the private car journeys and cycle journeys. Both statistics (car/van and bicycle) were confirmed by MSDC as:

Note the data source is Census 2011 - WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)

A check with the 2011 Census confirms these numbers include travel between Burgess Hill (all MSOA, either as residence or work location), and all of Haywards Heath, Cuckfield, Ansty, Lindfield and Walstead MSOA (either a residence or place of work). “Private vehicles” includes both cars and vans (i.e. tradesmen’s vehicles).

An extract is supplied as Appendix 1. The raw totals are:

Total Car/Van	2,163	
Total cycling	33	1.5%

From HH+* to BH

Driving Car/Van	1,470	
Cycling	22	1.5%

From BH to HH+*

Driving Car/Van	693	
Cycling	11	1.6%

*All MSOA within Haywards Heath as far north as Borde Hill plus Ansty, Cuckfield, Lindfield and Walstead

Note the percentage of (cycling/(cycling + car + van) is between 1.5 and 1.6%, i.e. very consistent with the proportion willing to cycle the distances involved between the more distant of these MSOAs

Methodology Comparison

The methodology used to give the result of 8 for the eastern route was derived from LSOA (Lower level Super Output Areas), from the same 2011 Census data as only the potential for an Eastern route was analysed in detail. The range of LSOAs was more constrained (i.e. only considering those journeys which might conceivably be convinced to use one of the proposed routes).

The same methodology provided an expected further 25 cyclists who would use a western/central route but including a contribution of an estimated 16 to come from a fully occupied Northern Arc. (3,500 units * 1.75 workers/unit * 7.5% who would travel to HH * 3.4% who cycle (given the shorter distance).

The annual Department of Transport's Walking and Cycling Statistics prove the averages for Mid Sussex haven't moved (in fact they have reduced; the latest tables show "cycling for travel" reduced from 2.3% (3 times a week) in 2017/8 to just 0.8% for the same metric, for Mid Sussex, in 2018/9.

Source of "Long held Aspiration" expressed in Neighbourhood Plans

Nathan Spilsted stated the concept of a multifunctional route:

"stems from a long held aspiration, expressed in the Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plans for a traffic free route between the two towns"

A statement frequently made by MSDC.

Extracts from both town's current Neighbourhood Plans are included:

From the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan, dated January, 2016.

In a 90-page document, there are only two references to this link. The section on Footpath and Cycle Links there is one sentence in the Supporting Text;

"A cycle link to Haywards Heath is also supported."

The actual Policy G6 states:

Quote

POLICY G6 FOOTPATHS, RIGHTS OF WAY AND CYCLE LINKS

All existing footpaths, public rights of way and cycleways within Burgess Hill will be retained and maintained by the appropriate authorities and owners. New development will be expected to provide links to the existing network where appropriate. New crossings will be proposed in locations of new residential development such as the town centre, Leylands Park, Keymer Tile Works and Victoria Road.

St Wilfrids Bridge will be replaced and will continue to be an important access point for transport and a key link between the east and the town centre. The specification to improve the Bridge will reflect a range of transport modes.

Unquote

i.e. – it is not mentioned at all.

The cycle link makes it into the IDP section at the back as a "Cycle scheme – Burgess Hill to Haywards Heath" – which recognizes it is not part of the Neighbourhood Plan but proposes a £100,000 budget from WSCC or developer funds.

From the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan dated December 2016:

Beyond a general desire for greener transport, there are only two specific references in supporting text:

3.6 There are opportunities to protect the rural setting of the town, to improve the provision of cycle routes within the town and to neighbouring villages and Burgess Hill. MSDC has already produced a cycling strategy which will need to be implemented during the life of this Plan.

Within the section on Transport, there is

8.9 The strategy must include proposals for improving walking and cycling to access the green spaces within the town, the countryside beyond and to the nearby villages including Cuckfield, Lindfield, Ardingly, Scaynes Hill, Ansty and the town of Burgess Hill. This will be funded over time by developer contributions arising from the requirement for infrastructure contributions in accordance with MSDC planning policy and its implementation will support making the town more sustainable.

Plus the general points:

8.5 Good pedestrian and cycle connections are:

- short and direct,
- designed as pleasant places to be,
- accessible/useable to all in the community.

Once again, in neither document does this “ambition” actually make it into the relevant policy. Note that both the references for Haywards Heath refer to it being driven by MSDC policy.

MSDC response to these comments:

Both Neighbourhood Plans express support for a link and this aspiration is reflected in Policy DP 7 of the District Plan.

Secondary School Student use

Sally’s point about secondary students from south Haywards Heath using the future Northern Arc Secondary school is supported by reference to the current (January, 2019) West Sussex County Council “Planning School Places” document (p.90), which explicitly states that although current demand of 509 students in HH is 89% of PAN (570), any growth would be accommodated by the Northern Arc provision.

CJ Founds Report Comments

Judy Holmes stated MSDC disagreed with our statement in Question 3

Quote:

(CJ Founds Report) mentioned new proposed routes but discounted, without question or comment, any central route, quoting the Sustrans feasibility report but failing to record the factual errors this contained.

Unquote:

Judy stated (perfectly accurately):

Quote:

It notes that alternative routes were submitted during public engagement and makes the factual point that the routes submitted during public engagement were discounted either in full or part by the Feasibility Study.

Unquote

Robin replied:

Quote:

On the basis that CJFounds' report was dated September, 2020, and as you are aware, I identified the potential for a central route at council meeting in July, 2020, such that it could be included in deliberations of the working group meeting held on the 13th August, my point was that CJ Founds relied on the Feasibility Report to state that the "Alternative Central Routes" were discounted, either fully or in part.

Notes prepared by Robin Walker and input provided by Judy Holmes

12th December, 2020

Appendix 1: Data extract from 2011 Census, table WU03EW.

Table 1: Live in Burgess Hill and travel to Haywards Heath, Cuckfield, Ansty, Lindfield or Walstead

WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)								Total car/van	2,163	
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]								Total cycling	33	1.5%
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census							From HH+ to BH		
units	Persons							Driving Car/Van	1,470	
date	2011							Cycling	22	1.5%
place of work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008 (2011 super output area - middle layer)							From BH to HH+		
	Lindfield and Walstead							Driving Car/Van	693	
	usual residence							Cycling	11	1.6%
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015		
All categories: Method of travel to work	2001 specificat	135	169	120	37	50	53	36		
Work mainly at or from home		0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Underground, metro, light rail or tram		0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Train		1	3	1	2	6	10	8		
Bus, minibus or coach		4	0	2	0	0	0	0		
Taxi		4	4	0	0	0	0	0		
Motorcycle, scooter or moped		0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Driving a car or van		58	108	99	32	42	31	25		130
Passenger in a car or van		6	23	7	2	0	4	2		
Bicycle		4	3	4	0	0	5	0		5
On foot		57	26	9	1	2	3	1		
Other method of travel to work		1	0	4	0	0	0	0		
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.										
WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)										
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]										
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census									
units	Persons									
date	2011									
place of work	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009 (2011 super output area - middle layer)									
	Central Haywards Heath									
	usual residence									
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015		
All categories: Method of travel to work	536		644	637	297	329	302	198		
Work mainly at or from home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
Train	9		6	10	20	54	59	22		
Bus, minibus or coach	14		11	10	5	14	6	3		
Taxi	3		4	6	0	1	1	0		
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	8		5	6	0	3	2	2		
Driving a car or van	292		253	308	243	228	207	158		836
Passenger in a car or van	48		42	58	25	26	20	9		
Bicycle	17		22	28	1	0	4	0		5
On foot	144		300	224	3	2	3	4		
Other method of travel to work	1		1	3	0	0	0	0		
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.										
WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)										
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]										
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census									
units	Persons									
date	2011									
place of work	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010 (2011 super output area - middle layer)									
	Eastern Haywards Heath									
	usual residence									
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015		
All categories: Method of travel to work	99	70		91	22	23	17	17		
Work mainly at or from home	0	0		0	0	0	0	0		
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	0		0	0	0	0	0		
Train	3	2		6	1	2	0	2		
Bus, minibus or coach	1	2		3	0	2	1	0		
Taxi	0	0		0	0	0	0	0		
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	0	0		0	0	0	0	1		
Driving a car or van	56	33		65	19	19	13	13		64
Passenger in a car or van	2	3		5	1	0	1	0		
Bicycle	5	1		2	0	0	0	1		
On foot	31	28		16	1	0	2	0		1
Other method of travel to work	1	0		4	0	0	0	0		
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.										
WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)										
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]										
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census									
units	Persons									
date	2011									
place of work	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011 (2011 super output area - middle layer)									
	Southern Haywards Heath, Ansty, Cuckfield and Whiteman's Green									
	usual residence									
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015		
All categories: Method of travel to work	228	334	292		138	165	161	105		
Work mainly at or from home	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		
Train	3	8	3		1	4	8	1		
Bus, minibus or coach	9	14	6		9	16	16	7		
Taxi	1	5	6		0	0	2	0		
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	1	1	0		1	1	0	0		
Driving a car or van	146	154	108		112	128	113	87		440
Passenger in a car or van	19	14	30		8	8	13	6		
Bicycle	6	6	7		1	4	3	3		11
On foot	43	132	133		6	4	6	1		
Other method of travel to work	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.										

Table 2: Live in Haywards Heath, Cuckfield, Ansty, Lindfield or Walstead and travel to Burgess Hill

WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)								
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]								
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census							
units	Persons							
date	2011							
place of work	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012 (2011 super output area - middle layer)							
	Western Burgess Hill and Victoria Industrial Estate							
	usual residence							
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015
All categories: Method of travel to work	37	66	28	32		142	232	93
Work mainly at or from home	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Train	3	4	2	1		0	2	2
Bus, minibus or coach	1	1	1	2		3	0	1
Taxi	0	0	0	0		1	0	0
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	0	1	1	0		5	4	1
Driving a car or van	26	57	18	25		99	96	60
Passenger in a car or van	6	3	4	4		14	8	7
Bicycle	1	0	0	0		8	18	6
On foot	0	0	1	0		12	104	16
Other method of travel to work	0	0	1	0		0	0	0
								126
								1
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.								
WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)								
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]								
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census							
units	Persons							
date	2011							
place of work	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013 (2011 super output area - middle layer)							
	Eastern Burgess Hill and World's End							
	usual residence							
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015
All categories: Method of travel to work	5	14	9	11	22		46	18
Work mainly at or from home	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Train	0	2	1	0		0	0	2
Bus, minibus or coach	0	1	1	0		0	1	0
Taxi	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	1	0	0	0		0	0	0
Driving a car or van	3	8	7	10	20		33	11
Passenger in a car or van	1	1	0	1	0		2	1
Bicycle	0	2	0	0	2		3	2
On foot	0	0	0	0	0		7	2
Other method of travel to work	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
								28
								2
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.								
WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)								
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]								
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census							
units	Persons							
date	2011							
place of work	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014 (2011 super output area - middle layer)							
	Central Burgess Hill							
	usual residence							
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015
All categories: Method of travel to work	89	125	102	137	486	308		311
Work mainly at or from home	0	0	0	0		0		0
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	1	0	0		0		0
Train	16	14	11	12	4	9		5
Bus, minibus or coach	1	4	4	6	3	22		1
Taxi	0	1	2	4	0	2		1
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	0	0	1	1	1	9		2
Driving a car or van	66	94	69	99	251	242		165
Passenger in a car or van	4	5	9	8	32	36		23
Bicycle	0	2	2	2	16	21		12
On foot	2	4	3	5	179	165		101
Other method of travel to work	0	0	1	0	0	2		1
								328
								6
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.								
WU03EW - Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work (MSOA level)								
ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 12 December 2020]								
population	All usual residents aged 16 and over in employment the week before the census							
units	Persons							
date	2011							
place of work	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015 (2011 super output area - middle layer)							
	Southern Burgess Hill							
	usual residence							
Method of travel to work	E02006611 : Mid Sussex 008	E02006612 : Mid Sussex 009	E02006613 : Mid Sussex 010	E02006614 : Mid Sussex 011	E02006615 : Mid Sussex 012	E02006616 : Mid Sussex 013	E02006617 : Mid Sussex 014	E02006618 : Mid Sussex 015
All categories: Method of travel to work	63	79	62	60	203	241		290
Work mainly at or from home	0	0	0	0		0		0
Underground, metro, light rail or tram	0	0	0	0		0		0
Train	3	11	7	0	2	1		2
Bus, minibus or coach	1	4	3	0	2	5		6
Taxi	0	0	0	1	0	1		1
Motorcycle, scooter or moped	1	1	0	1	0	3		1
Driving a car or van	55	59	46	51	126	144		130
Passenger in a car or van	1	2	4	6	18	24		24
Bicycle	0	1	1	0	5	19		18
On foot	2	1	1	1	49	44		108
Other method of travel to work	0	0	0	0	1	0		0
								211
								2
In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.								

Appendix 2: Photos and Images referred to in the text:

Image of bridle path part of Theobalds Bridleway after typical winter rain, provided to MSDC in advance of the meeting.



Robin's rather quick and dirty mock-up of how a twin bridge could be created within the intra- arch gaps that already exist on Valebridge Viaduct.

