

# A23 Active Travel Scheme – Phase 1 – Further Consultation Report

1. Introduction
2. Methodology
3. Headlines
4. Stakeholders Responses
  - a. Summary of Public Feedback (Drop-In Workshops)
  - b. Summary of Public Feedback (Emails)
  - c. Summary of Stakeholder Meeting Engagement Feedback
5. Public Drop-In Workshop Postcards

## **1. Introduction**

At the July 2021 Environment, Transport and Sustainability (ETS) Committee it was agreed to undertake further stakeholder engagement and public consultation in regards to the developing A23 Active Travel Scheme.

The Scheme was subsequently split into three phases for delivery. This report covers the feedback gathered from stakeholders at both public drop-in workshops and from stakeholder engagement sessions held online via MS Teams for the Phase 1 area.

The consultation approach for this scheme was to present designs to stakeholders, undertake meaningful conversations, and gather feedback and implement this feedback into design revisions where possible.

## **2. Methodology**

### **Public Drop-In Workshops**

Postcards were delivered to 2,568 addresses within the vicinity of the Phase 1 area inviting local residents and frontages to public drop-in workshops.

These workshops were held at St Augustine's Arts & Events Centre in Stanford Avenue between Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> December 2021 and Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> December 2021, between 9am – 5pm each day.

The public workshops featured large scale physical A1 print-outs of the plans which attendees were invited to make their comments on using post-it notes. These post-it notes were then gathered and logged at the end of each day.

This approach ensured that should stakeholders have any questions, members of the project team were on hand to discuss the schemes principles, objectives, and design specifics. In general, the conversations were constructive and presented an opportunity for both project officers and stakeholders to share opinions. On the whole, the conversations were positive and productive.

### **Stakeholder Engagement Sessions**

Invitations were sent to various stakeholder groups inviting them to attend stakeholder engagement sessions via MS Teams. These stakeholder groups are listed in Table 3.

The stakeholder sessions included a presentation from the project team that outlined the scheme background and objectives, presented the preliminary designs in detail, and offered headline figures on the proposals.

Discussions were encouraged and feedback was logged at the end of each session.

### 3. Headlines

Tables 1 and 2 below provide a summary of feedback grouped by primary and secondary theme.

Table 1 relates to primary comment themes. Comments were primarily themed on their focused mode of transport. As the table indicates, the highest number of comments (35%) were focused on cycling. Comments focusing on vehicles not including buses or motorcycles accounted for 26% of all comments received. Primarily walking based comments made up just over 21% of comments.

**Table 1: Primary Comment Themes**

| Primary Comment Theme                   | Comment Count |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Cycling</b>                          | 141           |
| <b>Vehicles (not inc. buses or MCs)</b> | 104           |
| <b>Walking</b>                          | 85            |
| <b>Buses</b>                            | 38            |
| <b>Other</b>                            | 31            |
| <b>Motorcycle</b>                       | 1             |

*Table 1 – Comment counts by primary comment theme*

Table 2 shows the number of comments captured based on the comments secondary theme, separated by the primary theme. The secondary theme identifies the more specific content of a comment and allows officers to have better insight into feedback in the context of each mode of travel.

**Table 2: Secondary Comment Themes**

| Row Labels            | Comment Count |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| <b>Cycling</b>        | <b>141</b>    |
| <b>Infrastructure</b> | 66            |

|                           |            |
|---------------------------|------------|
| Route                     | 35         |
| Safety Concerns           | 18         |
| Priority                  | 6          |
| Surfacing                 | 5          |
| Signage                   | 4          |
| Lining                    | 3          |
| Cycle Parking             | 2          |
| Floating Bus Stop         | 1          |
| Street Clutter            | 1          |
| <b>Vehicle</b>            | <b>104</b> |
| Congestion                | 25         |
| Parking Restrictions      | 23         |
| Parking                   | 17         |
| Speed Reduction           | 10         |
| Infrastructure            | 9          |
| Lining                    | 4          |
| Safety Concerns           | 4          |
| Swept Paths               | 3          |
| Signage                   | 3          |
| Speed Restrictions        | 2          |
| Route                     | 2          |
| Taxis                     | 1          |
| Rat Running               | 1          |
| <b>Walking</b>            | <b>85</b>  |
| Pedestrian Crossing       | 43         |
| Street Clutter            | 12         |
| Infrastructure            | 11         |
| Safety Concerns           | 9          |
| Side Road Entry Treatment | 4          |
| Route                     | 2          |
| Street Furniture          | 1          |
| Wayfinding                | 1          |
| Lining                    | 1          |
| Signage                   | 1          |
| <b>Bus</b>                | <b>38</b>  |
| Bus Boarder               | 16         |
| Infrastructure            | 12         |
| Floating Bus Stop         | 9          |
| Fares                     | 1          |
| <b>Other</b>              | <b>25</b>  |
| Air Quality               | 6          |
| Drainage                  | 5          |
| Arbs                      | 4          |
| Stakeholder               | 3          |

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Data</b>                      | <b>2</b>   |
| <b>Education</b>                 | <b>2</b>   |
| <b>Signage</b>                   | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Construction Safety</b>       | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Skateboarding</b>             | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Out of Consultation Scope</b> | <b>6</b>   |
| <b>Motorcycle</b>                | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Use of Bus Lanes</b>          | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Grand Total</b>               | <b>400</b> |

#### 4: Stakeholder Responses

**Table 3: Stakeholder Group List Contacted**

| Stakeholder Group                                 | Stakeholder Organisation                                  |
|---|---|
| Residents   |   |
| Frontages   |   |
| Preston Park Ward Councilors                      |   |
| Withdean Ward Councilors                          |   |
| Patcham Councilors                                |   |
| Active & Inclusive<br>Travel Forum (AITF)         | AITF Chair  |
|   | ETS Chair   |
|   | ETS Labour Spokesperson                                   |
|   | ETS Conservative Spokesperson                             |
|   | Assistant Director - City Transport                       |
|   | Head of Traffic Management                                |
|   | Head of Transport Policy & Strategy                       |
|   | Head of Transport Projects & Engineering                  |
|   | Head of Parking Services                                  |
|   | Business Development Manager                              |
|   | Senior Project Manager - Transport Behavioural Change     |
|   | Senior Project Manager, Transport Project Team            |
|   | Principal Transport Planner / Transport Policy & Strategy |
|   | BTN Bikeshare Manager                                     |
|   | Fire Service  |
|   | Brighton & Hove Bus Company                               |
|   | The Big Lemon Bus Company                                 |
|   | Brighton & Hove Community Transport                       |
|   | Stagecoach South  |
|   | Sussex Police   |
|   | National Express  |
|   | Compass Travel  |
|   | South Downs National Park                                 |
|   | Rottingdean Parish Council                                |
|   | Taxi Trade  |
|   | BADGE   |
|   | Beach Access Team   |
|   | Bricycles   |
|   | Brighton Chamber of Commerce                              |
|   | Cycling UK  |
|   | Community Works   |
|   | Sussex Safer Roads Partnership                            |
|   | Pedal People  |
|   | Buswatch UK   |
|   | Shoreham Port Authority                                   |
|   | Sustrans  |
|   | Govia Thameslink Railway                                  |
|   | Brighton & Hove Motorcycle Action Group                   |
|   | Enterprise Car Club                                       |
|   | B&H Local Access Forum                                    |
| Public Rights of Way                              |   |
| B&H Friends of the Earth/Transport Action Network |   |
| Living Streets                                    |   |
| Tenant Disability Group                           |   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Amaze   |
|  | Carers Centre                                       |
|  | Zedify  |
|  | Sussex Ehlers-Danlos Hypermobility Syndromes (SEDS) |
|  | BTN Bikeshare / Hourbike                            |
|  | Brighton Bike Hub                                   |
|  | Guide Dogs  |
|  | Brighton Active Travel                              |
|  | South East Community Rail Partnership               |
|  | Active Sussex                                       |
|  | 20 minute neighborhoods                             |
|  | Brighton & Hove Ramblers Group                      |
|  | Trust for Developing Communities                    |
|  | BHCC Public Health                                  |
|  | University of Brighton                              |
|  | Sussex University                                   |
|  | CityClean   |
| Economy, Environment<br>& Culture Colleagues | Assistant Director for Transport (Mark Prior)       |
|  | City Transport Heads of Service                     |
|  | Transport Projects and Engineering Managers         |
|  | City Clean  |
|  | City Parks  |
|  | BHCC Comms Team                                     |
|  | Arboriculture                                       |
|  | Permit Team   |

#### 4a: Summary of Public Feedback (Drop-In Workshops)

|  |
|--|
| Existing Pedestrian crossing across <i>Rookery Close</i> needs narrowing   |
| Difficult crossing <i>Lovers Walk</i> currently  |
| Concerns about proposed road widths on Preston Road for southbound right turners into flats / businesses.                          |
| Bins on Pavement at southern end of scheme cause issues currently  |
| Not much space on pavement due to street clutter (bins)  |
| Dyke Road Drive - issues with not knowing who has priority in current layout   |
| Existing cycle lane (contraflow) on Argyle Road is too narrow  |
| Subsidise bus fares in the city - cost too high  |
| Service road in Preston Park (parallel to Preston Road) should be utilised   |
| Include signage for NCN20 at Preston Circus junction   |
| Tranche 3 - Redesign New England Street cycle facility   |
| Potential for Bus Stop south of Argyle Road  |
| Include give-way lines at mouth of Argyle Road for vehicles entering side road   |
| There is a ponding issue in the cycle lane & footway near Argyle Road  |
| Argyle Road/ Preston Road width reduction will have impact on buses & will subsequently increase pollution in the area.            |
| Make Springfield Road/Preston Road pedestrian crossing a Toucan to facilitate movements from Springfield Road into the cycle lane. |
| Make Springfield Road a contraflow for cycles - a toucan at the pedestrian crossing (Springfield/Preston) could facilitate this    |
| Concerns about reduction to single lane along Preston Road under the viaduct.  |
| Additional signage under the viaduct highlighting parking restrictions   |
| Cars don't look left as they enter Dyke Road Drive from Preston Road - signage?  |
| Utilise Springfield Road Bus Stop  |
| Concerns about bins on the footway   |
| Put new pavements across grass verge into Preston Park near bus stop alongside the Park  |
| Include cycle parking provision along the route  |
| Will there be additional street furniture (benches etc.)   |
| Could the route include cycle hangers? (Argyle Road)   |
| Formal pedestrian crossing requested to cross Preston Road between the Rock Gardens and Preston Park                               |
| Keep the pedestrian refuge island near Cumberland Road   |
| Include pedestrian wayfinding totems throughout route  |
| Teach etiquette & respect between users  |
| Preston Drive / Preston Park [cyclist] separation [from vehicles] welcomed   |
| Bus border conflict concerns   |
| Are there options for additional parking towards the southern end of the scheme?   |
| Dyke Road Drive stop line should be behind pedestrian crossing point   |
| Refuge islands cause issues for cycle lanes as large vehicles do not stay in lane as they go past                                  |



|   |
|---|
| Springfield Lane should have a contraflow cycle lane  |
| Springfield lane contraflow cycle lane  |
| Contraflow cycle lane down Preston Road to Preston Circus rather than a bi-directional cycle lane   |
| Beaconsfield Road cycle & walking facilities need upgrading   |
| Unsafe feeling heading north from Preston Circus onto Preston Road as a cycling - pinch point near Dominican café   |
| Modelling required for single-lane proposals between Argyle Road & Springfield Road   |
| Parking/Loading for residential properties near Stanford Avenue / Preston Road junction - currently deliveries pull onto footway, provide formal area.  |
| Lack of left-turn movement from London Road onto New England Road leads to vehicles heading up Preston Road and using Argyle Road/Campbell Road as rat run route to head up New England Road                      |
| Parking Permit area 'J' - people come from other areas to park and utilise train station  |
| Cycle routes with less signal stopping points along the route would make for a better route. Valley Gardens as an example is a good route but has too many places that cyclists need to stop to wait for traffic. |
| Issues with vehicles parking on the cycle lane & footway to use the café/bakery just north of South Road. Specifically 199 Preston Road.  |
| Who has priority (cyclists/vehicles) on new parallel crossing arrangement   |
| Vehicle crossover issues at 103 Preston Road (The Dentists)   |
| Is the cycle track stepped through Preston Drove/South Road junction?   |
| Bus borders - who has priority at these?  |
| Footway parking under the viaduct a real issue currently  |
| Provide vehicle crossing points for 103 Preston Road (dentists)   |
| Differentiation of colour past bus lanes for cyclists   |
| Concerns about tailbacks under the viaduct due to reduction in carriageway widths   |
| Visibility coming out of Springfield Road is an issue   |
| Dyke Road Drive - signage for drivers to look right for cyclists  |
| Provide a feeder/extra lane up Stanford Avenue to ease traffic congestion   |
| Make the stretch of Preston Road under the viaduct 20mph up until the junction of Stanford Avenue/Preston Road  |
| Cumberland road needs red surfacing across the mouth for cyclists.  |
| Too many bins on the footway  |
| Signalise Preston Road/Stanford Avenue Crossings  |
| Considers the volume of vehicles using Lauriston Road   |
| Parking & Deliveries in bus layby near Sainsburys a problem currently   |
| Provision for skateboards   |
| Ensure any painted surface in cycle lanes is smooth   |
| Concerns about capacity for right hand turners into Preston Drove   |
| All cyclists should be required to have bells by law - make it a local bylaw for the city   |
| Where is the crossing for pedestrians into the rookery?   |
| Physical separation through Preston Road/South Road junction for cyclists the preferred solution  |

|  |
|--|
| Toucan between rookery & Preston Park allows cyclists heading northbound along the park service road to cross legally and join the northbound cycle lane   |
| Taxi/Deliveries parking in the stepped track highly likely al along Preston Road   |
| Stepped cycle track not safe for young children  |
| Segregation on stepped tracks preferred @1.5m with 0.5m physical separation that 2.0m with only stepped protection   |
| Stanford Avenue / Preston Road junction could work quite affectively as a CYCLOPS junction<br>Switch the bi-directional cycle lane under the viaduct to separate 1-way lanes on either side of the road (1-with flow, and 1 contraflow lane). Useful for Tranche 3 |
| Dislike of Shared Space @ Argyle Road junction   |
| West side bi-directional along Preston Road creates issues with southbound lane on eastern side of Preston Road as an option for Tranche 3   |
| Bins & Footway parking on Argyle Road is an issue  |
| Pedestrian crossing @ Rookery must be maintained and upgraded to toucan crossing   |
| Double parking issues a treatment like speed route   |
| Congestion concerns at viaduct   |
| Lots of potential conflicts on corner for bikers, peds, buggies, & e-scooters. Need good visibility into Argyle Road.  |
| Monthly air quality updates would be preferred than yearly   |
| Pedestrian pinch point by café opposite Argyle Road  |
| Bollards could be used to prevent footway parking on corner of Springfield Road - this is currently and issue  |
| Risk of extra conflict if a cyclist chooses to use the road in order to get to Stanford Avenue when heading northbound   |
| Toucan crossing at Springfield Road would be preferred   |
| Congestion concerns from lane reduction near viaduct   |
| Manage street furniture placements & other barriers/potential conflicts on pavement  |
| Very supportive of reducing to one lane for cars under viaduct   |
| 20mph needed north of viaduct  |
| Visibility low due to parked cars when turning right from Springfield  |
| Emergency vehicles will get caught in the lane reduction area under viaduct  |
| Construction noise & impacts need to be managed well - please provide lots of notice   |
| Footway widths Infront of 124 Preston Road an issue  |
| 20mph along Preston Road should continue all the way to Stanford Avenue junction   |
| 20mph along Stanford Avenue would make the area safer  |
| Green spaces between vehicles & cycle lanes/footway (or bushes)  |
| Mark the NCN20 route along the cycle lane on Preston Road  |
| Speed reduction measures are needed on Preston Park Avenue   |
| Obstruction form trees etc. when cycling   |
| Pedestrian refuge island at Cumberland Road is required  |
| Heavy traffic in & out of Sainsburys car park should be taken into account   |
| Combine southbound lanes through Preston Drove junction  |
| Painted bike lanes to signify movement from Preston Road to Preston Drove  |

|  |
|--|
| Café parking north of south road a real issue for cyclists   |
| Rookery close traffic splitter / pedestrian refuge island missing  |
| Crossing points over Preston Road need to be increased not decreased   |
| Air quality monitor missing & pollution from tailbacks   |
| FLOODING is an issue on North Road - inclusion of a raised table at entry to North Road could mitigate the flooding issues   |
| Real estate agents (Michon Mackay) parking on pavement in North Road & on footway at PD/SR junction  |
| Possibility to raise cycle lane or footway to prevent flooding on Middle Road, North Road.   |
| North road - no-through road could mitigate issues - prevent traffic from going past the thin section  |
| Air quality monitor data requests for pre-scheme/post-scheme to be available for public  |
| Contraflow on Campbell Road not visible/road users are not aware of arrangement and causes conflicts.  |
| Street Parking on corner of Argyle Road / Campbell road an ongoing issue for all users   |
| Issues with vehicles parked in cycle lane (whole route)  |
| Good scheme - could provide further space for cyclists on Bi-directional cycle lane instead of 1m wide separation  |
| Provide a contraflow on Springfield Road & Toucan crossing at junction of Springfield/Preston Road   |
| Potential to formalise crossover movements travelling southbound along Preston Road to join bi-directional cycle lane without using new crossing at Stanford Avenue/Preston Road |
| Refresh the coloured surfacing currently used along the route to highlight conflicts   |
| Encouragement for cyclists about using a bell to warn other road users   |
| Offer bike maintenance training programme to youths using abandoned bikes  |
| Concerns regarding the separation of parking zone 'J'  |
| Use messaging on buses to indicate conflict at Bus border stops (like Lewes Road)  |
| Concerns about left hooks into Argyle Road   |
| Enforcement required at junction of Argyle Road/Campbell Road for parking  |
| Ponding issues during heavy rain in vicinity of Viaduct  |
| Zebra crossing at Stanford / Preston Road junction outside 1-16 Preston Road is blind due to bushes preventing sight lines   |
| Place a mirror on highway to allows peds to see vehicles approaching zebra crossing outside 1-16 Preston Road.   |
| Signing for southbound cyclists going to go up Stanford Avenue to stay on carriageway and not filter off onto pavement   |
| Bus border arrangement welcomed  |
| Change in island width/length at Preston Drove junction aids car movement but will make it more difficult for a bike turning right out of Lauriston Road                         |
| Lack of pedestrian crossing to Sainsburys (Cumberland road refuge)   |
| Reduce distance between dog-leg crossings at Preston Drove/South Road junctions  |
| Pull up crossing point to desire line on South Road  |
| Rookery crossing is missing  |
| Contraflow cycle lane on Springfield Road  |

Concerns that cyclists will not see pedestrians waiting at ped-x behind tree at Springfield/Preston Road ped-x

Move pedestrian crossing to between Grange Close bus stops

#### 4b : Summary of Public Feedback (Emails)

The junction with 3 pedestrian crossings. Will the bike lane also have priority over motor traffic here? From the drawing, there are no give-way markings for vehicles. I am concerned that cyclists may assume priority or end up using the pedestrian crossing right next to the cycle lanes. It would also maybe overload drivers with the different expectations for each kind of crossing.

Coming southbound on Preston Road (against traffic flow) it looks like cyclists are expected to turn right into Argyle Road and then follow Campbell Road to New England Road (A270) where they are expected to cross 3 lanes of traffic, whilst waiting in the middle with traffic passing on both sides, to continue onto Elder Place etc.

This is a highly risky/sketchy part of the journey in order to eventually link up with the bike lanes in Valley Gardens. So my feedback here would be why cant the bi-directional lane continue up Preston road all the way until it becomes bi-directional to motor traffic.

My first comment is with regards to provision for the safety of motorcycle riders, like myself.

I have not heard of or read of any assessment made for the consideration of safety of motorcycle riders?

I would therefore ask that consideration is made to allow motorcycles (known as powered two wheelers) to be allowed to use the bus lanes that fall within this project to aid protection.

Powered two wheelers are currently permitted to use many bus lanes for their safety, including the A23 south bus lane from The Deneway to Preston Drive and for a period of time the bus lane north bound by the Rookery, opposite Preston Park.

I am not aware of any incident occurring by any powdered two wheelers that would not allow their future use of the protection of these bus lanes.

I ask you please to make provision to allow powered two wheelers in the bus lane north bound for their protection in this project and for the assurance that for the remainder of the A23 project that powered two wheelers retain the safety of the bus lane south bound.

The second point I would like to make is that I am concerned that the floating bus stop at Preston Drive South bound will completely block traffic progress when a bus stops to pickup or set down, blocking the junction behind. I would suggest the Preston Drive bus stop was moved to opposite the Sainsbury's in Preston Village, opposite Preston Drive bus stop north bound.

Northbound bit of cycle lane on A23 between South Road lights and Preston Drive, (which is painted full bright red with solid line traffic demarcation and on a double yellow line, also with clear "no loading at any time" signposts and road markings), is a death trap for cyclists much of the daytime. This being mainly due to cars and vans often parked up illegally, completely obstructing the cycle lane, to get coffee from coffee shops there. This forces cyclists out into the main road between the two major junctions. Moving traffic on that short stretch creates a precarious situation as a lot of vehicles speed through the junctions to catch the lights while they're still green at each junction, and to try to beat each other the merge further up by Sainsbury's. Also, speed around the corner from South Road after being frustrated by other drivers holding them up a few seconds by not noticing the left-turn filter... and/or the diabolically positioned Shell Garage entrance/exits. Also changing across three lanes to turn right up Preston Drive, and some pulling out of Middle Road at speed to try fit into a gap, and hoping for the best while blinded to the traffic mayhem due to parked up "coffee parking" to their right..... and beer delivery lorries completely flouting all road rules there outside the two pubs to deliver kegs.

Regards the A23 Active Travel Scheme - I am broadly in agreement with the proposals but I would just like to add some feedback.

- This scheme is isolated so will not have maximum impact i.e. there is no direct connection to the city centre. The cycle lane should be extended down Preston Road to London Road.

So, here are a couple of cross section diagrams I suggested earlier that may or may not inspire some alternative designs. Both around the subject of adding a green infrastructure barrier between the A23 & cyclists and pedestrians.

The pavement around the rockery on the western side of the a23 is a bit wider than the rest so possibly that could be used a little bit. I think it is that northbound cycle lane that could be used the most out of the two cycle lanes with the southbound much less used due to the option of the park.

We also talked about the parking in front of Bungeroosh cafe. I recommend taking 20mins one morning and simply observing pedestrians walking past that section as I have found it to be a pinch point.

We also discussed a FAQ, releasing air quality monthly diffusion tube data every month, the pavement in front of Wellend Villas being very narrow & a possible bus lane up to Argyle Rd.

One other thing I forgot to mention that I really wanted to mention was the speed limit along this section (and on Stanford Road). Can we please reduce it to 20mph so it is the same for the whole one way system. For the Beaconsfield A23 one way system, the speed limit goes from 20mph -> 30mph -> 20mph. As the 30mph section is uphill and the downhill is 20mph it increases the chance of speeding and is inefficient. I really think this whole area should be 20mph (it actually used to be and then it was changed). I would like to see, at the point where the A23 coming into Brighton, joins Stanford Road, very large signs at this point signifying central Brighton is 20mph only.

I include my sketch of a possible cycle lane for Stanford Avenue & Beaconsfield Road. This section has a lot of scope due to the wide road and would add a brand new cycle lane. I would like to see this concentrated on soon as it would create a new cycle lane.

the lack of understanding about how much cross town traffic uses Preston Drove/South Road. To reduce the current 3 lanes when turning left out of South Road to 2 lanes will cause a huge backup of traffic on a South Road, particularly during rush hour. Currently when the 2 lanes heading north are jammed, cross town traffic can at least get into the turn right lane and proceed. By reducing the road to 2 lanes traffic will be stuck as most north bound motorists will not notice that one lane is turn right only. Arrows on the tarmac only work if there isn't a car on top of them

the floating bus stops at Preston Drove will cause more congestion as it appears that the buses will have to stop all traffic flow when they stop. As a regular user of these stops, they are often quite busy. I am very rarely the only person waiting, so the buses will be stopped for sometime. Also the Preston Drove stop going north is also a coach stop so traffic will be further delayed by passengers loading luggage on to coaches

I am concerned about pedestrian safety between Stanford Avenue and Argyle Road. It is bad enough already with bikes, pushchairs (in both directions) and wheelybins. If you give cyclists more priority they will travel faster and there may be more accidents if pedestrians step into the bike lane to pass pedestrians going in the other direction.

it's not clear on the plans how people will be able to cross the road to the Rock Garden in future

I am not sure that the plans address the biggest problem which is the lack of space for pedestrians walking from Preston Circus to Preston Park, which I do regularly. Because of the trees, bins, and parked cars, there is very little space for pedestrians (especially if they have bags, wheelchairs etc). I frequently have to step into the cycle path and am always nervous of cyclists. If the cycle Lane is widened then I would be even more anxious as I'd assume cyclists might feel safer going even faster.

Also, the start of Argyle Road that turns off Preston Road is difficult for pedestrians. The large rubbish bins block visibility of cars and cyclists, and I frequently almost collide with other pedestrians or cyclists when turning left out of Argyle Road onto Preston Road, because we are all funnelled into a tight area and can't see what is coming round the corner.

Last but not least the quality of the pavements in this area is appalling with very large puddles and slippery leaves which pedestrians have to navigate around, forcing us into the cycle paths and /or road.

Are you planning any more physical consultation events please? I was unable to get to them last week.

Looking at the plans close to where I live (4 Knoyle Road), you are removing the traffic island at the bottom of Knoyle Road. Where will the pedestrians, including dozens of children who cross there every day, now cross the road? There is a major cut through from Cumberland Road across this crossing to Knoyle Road for children at BHASVIC, Cardinal Newman, Varndean and Stringer. It is exacerbated by the Sainsbury's shop, which is used by dozens of people every day from the houses and flats in the area to the east of Preston Road. You should stand there in the morning between 7.45 and 8.30, and after 3 in the afternoon. You are inviting a disaster there. Please put in a Traffic signal crossing point.

The floating bus stops are a nightmare. I am both a pedestrian and cyclist, and a car user. These designs involving people stepping on and off buses and having to cross a cycle lane will result in accidents. Most bus users in this vicinity are elderly or disabled, and unfortunately many cyclists travel too fast and are inconsiderate of pedestrians. Have you consulted with disabled people's organisations?

What are the planned changes to the layout at the bottom of Knoyle Road. It is not specified in the drawings. If it is to be 'no right turns' into Preston Road, will you enforce it? The best option would be to close off the bottom of the road to traffic all together.

The section at the beginning of the plans, Campbell Road area, seem to continue the current layout of a cycle lane that disappears. Perhaps you could ride a bike from the north Preston Road into Brighton and see the chaos that the current layout creates. The diagrams don't seem to show any improvements.

The cycle journey from Preston Circus to Argyle Road has not been changed and is very dangerous for cyclist. I was nearly knocked off my bike last week by a bus cutting me up. The line of trees on that section also makes the road dark even in summer. Why not put in a dedicated cycle lane there?

Consideration for a CYCLOPS junction at the Stanford Avenue/Preston Drove junction (see email for drawings) [DESIGN FILE PDF HERE](#)

The plans for the A23 cycle lanes are reasonably good however it is let down by one particular aspect, this is the redesign of the signal controlled A23, Preston Drove and South Road Junction. Its new design is inadequate.

Whilst adequate provision has been made for cyclists continuing along the A23 there is little to no provision for cyclists joining or leaving the A23 such as cyclists coming from Preston Drove and turning right to head North towards Patcham or northbound cyclists turning right leaving the A23 to join Preston Drove and travel east. The new design also fails to address left hook incidents which are lethal to cyclists. This leads to an overall loss in the number of people who feel safe enough to use the new cycle lanes and leads to a massive reduction in the overall quality in what is otherwise an excellent scheme.

For the reasons stated above the A23, Preston Drove and South Road junction should therefore be a CYCLOPS junction. This would cater for all movements at the junction whilst keeping cyclists completely safe. As Manchester has shown a CYCLOPS junction can be built whilst maintaining existing traffic flows. I understand that a CYCLOPS junction would increase the cost of the scheme slightly, however the scheme must be built right first time and failure to build it right will undoubtedly lead to deaths and injuries for cyclists.

|   |
|---|
| <p>I'm not a local resident to the area of the A23 which this is happening on, but I do have some concerns over parts of the current design of the cycle track.</p> <p>PFA PDF highlighting the areas of concern. The largest concern is over the junction at South Road / Preston Drive as the current design restricts and almost forces all cyclists to go ahead only. I'd suggest a CYCLOPS junction would be best suited here, however I presume it is much too late in the design stage to change that now.</p> |
| <p>One thing I think BHCC should explore specificity is a cycle gate instead of an advance stop line at Preston Drive, not many of these exist in the country yet, but introducing one into Brighton would allow locals to experience a wider range of cycle infrastructure and potentially want them in more place as they provide a much higher level of safety for right turns than an ASL, and more efficient than dedicated cycle phases.</p>  |
| <p>How are cyclists meant to travel between Ditchling Rise &amp; A23/Argyle Road?<br/>Could Puffin be made into Toucan with short shared area to the north?</p>   |
| <p>Preston Road (approach to Argyle) Will the lane reduction be signed far in advance with merge in turn signage?</p>   |
| <p>Argyle Road (mouth) - Unclear priority over turning traffic?</p>   |
| <p>Argyle Road (contraflow) - What measures to stop parking on cycle lane/track There is lots of illegal parking on double yellow lines completely blocking footway in this area. People will park in it if physically possible</p>   |
| <p>Argyle Road (contraflow join to shared space) - What is with this gap?</p>   |
| <p>Springfield Road Ped-X - Could carriageway not be shifted East to minimize the pinch point on the cycle track?</p>   |
| <p>Springfield Road Ped-x - What markings for toucan crossing to make it clear Toucan crossing should only be used one way for cyclists?</p>  |
| <p>Springfield Road /Preston Road buildout - Will this still be a shared area to allow cycles to exit from Springfield Road onto the cycle track?</p>   |
| <p>Bi-directional outside 103 Preston Road - Cycle track appears to be level with footway. Will this be marked by a shallow kerb or a white line?</p>   |
| <p>Splitter lanes on Preston Road leading to Stanford Avenue (n'bound) - Will there now be signage directing road users what lane to be in on the A23?</p>  |
| <p>Preston Road southbound to Stanford Avenue junction - Cycle lane junction at bottom of park has radii of 0</p>   |
| <p>Preston Park South - how does cycle lane tie into park facilities?</p>   |
| <p>Stanford Avenue / Preston Road junction - Will new pedestrian paved area be similar to current paving?</p>   |
| <p>Preston Road / Stanford Avenue Zebra (outside 1-16 Stanford Ave. - No zig-zag markings on foul side of zebra crossing shown</p>  |
| <p>Stanford Avenue / Preston Road - No cycle symbols shown on parallel crossing</p>   |
| <p>Stanford Avenue / Preston Road island - where will bikeshare hub be relocated?</p>   |
| <p>Stanford Avenue / Preston Road junction - bolisha beacons missing from drawings</p>  |
| <p>Preston Drive / South Road - Junction would operate better as a CYCLOPS</p>  |
| <p>Preston Drive / South Road - How can A23 cycles run in parallel with pedestrian crossing with a conflicted left turn. Surely a stop line needs to be provided on the exit of junction before the pedestrian crossing.</p>  |
| <p>Preston Drive / South Road - ASLs removed - what is the reason? Part of LCWIP route 35.</p>  |
| <p>Preston Drive / South Road - How do southbound cyclists turn right into south road?</p>  |
| <p>Preston Drive mouth - would a cycle gate work better than ASL? (LTN 1/20 Fig. 10.33)</p>   |
| <p>Preston Drive / South Road - What measures are in place to prevent parking in cycle lane?</p>  |



|   |
|---|
| Middle Road - Giveaway line missing   |
| North Road - Should ban left turns into minor road to allow NB cycle track to run in parallel with A23 NB   |
| North Road junction - How are right turns made from cycle track - LCWIP route 32?   |
| Preston Drive - How do southbound cyclists run in parallel with crossing as crossing is two stage and no stop line.   |
| Cumberland Road - Refuge island instead of right turn pocket  |
| Cumberland Road - Cycle lane appears from behind Giveaway line (northbound through floating bus stop) - visibility issue  |
| The proposed 2 way cycle lane, between Argyle Road and Springfield Road, appears to be another case of creating gridlock in Brighton.   |
| Removing a lane of traffic will cause unnecessary congestion.   |
| The cycle lane works as it is. Perhaps asking cyclists to just slow down and be more vigilant for this small section would be a better idea?  |
| The people who make these decision appear to have very little common sense.   |
| I remain concerned about your response to the issue of the pedestrian crossing at the bottom of Knoyle Road. I am not clear as to whether it will be removed as part of Stage 1 or whether you are saying that it is part of Stage 2 as is not affected by this consultation. The diagrams clearly state that it is to be removed.<br>You reference stakeholders having raised this: does this include the schools whose children will be affected by any change please? This will include at least 3 secondary schools, 2 Sixth form colleges, and several primary schools.<br>In addition your response to my comments about the planned changes to the bottom of Knoyle Road seem ambiguous. If it is in Stage 2 then why is it shown in the Stage 1 drawings.<br>My comments about floating bus stops; it is essential that the consultation about this design is fully explored with disability and age related groups. The council has a facility to do this and confirmation that this is being done would be helpful. |
| I use this area daily, roughly half as a cyclist, half as a motorist, and occasionally as pedestrian.   |
| The plans seem largely well thought out and should benefit all.   |
| My biggest concern is the indication that the traffic island at the end of Cumberland Road (right on the Phase 1/Phase 2 border) will be removed, with nothing replacing it. This is a heavily used pedestrian crossing and without it the crossing would be very dangerous. This needs to be reconsidered.   |
| Also, where do southbound cyclists go when they reach Argyll Road? The provision here is very lacking.  |
| I live in Edburton Avenue and am a cyclist/driver/pedestrian who regularly uses Preston Park.   |
| I like the general intention of your proposed improvements and specifically the aim of enhancing walking and cycling.   |
| However I cannot see why you persist in creating a cycle path on the existing road (the A23 as it passes Preston Park) when there is a wide existing roadway within the park itself that runs parallel to the A23.<br>Why not divert cyclists onto the roadway that is within the park so that they are completely separated from the motorised traffic on the A23 ?  |

This would make for less cramped carriageways for both drivers and cyclists and a more pleasant and safer route for cyclists.

It is possible to improve the environment for walkers and cyclists without restricting the carriageway for motorised vehicles.

The more restricted the roadway is for drivers, the more likely it is that there will be congestion causing increased pollution from stationary or slow-moving vehicles.

I am writing in connection with the proposed plans for the improvements in road usage for the above area. Generally i am very supportive of anything that improves pedestrian and cycle access around the city. I have had a good look at these plans and i have a couple of concerns.

I live in Knoyle Road and it seems madness to remove the traffic island crossing , its used by a steady stream of school children's from Dorothy Stringer walking to and from the Sainsburys on the other side of the road. Additionally residents of the area use the crossing in the same manner. And although there are traffic lights and a crossing further down towards Preston drove the reality is that the school children use this point and will continue to do so even if the island is removed. Its an incredibly congested spot with two lanes becoming one and traffic free to turn left and right from Cumber land road.

Additionally traffic heading north out of town turning right into Knoyle Road causes an additional blockage and has to cross not just on coming car traffic but also the bike lane and the pedestrians . It would ease things is right turns from the main road into Knoyle Road were stopped.

What does the phrase ' existing side road arrangement reconfigured mean ? There is no explanation of what this means practically so its hard to offer a view on what is proposed.

I support upgrades to the cycle lanes but pedestrians using floating bus stops need some protection from cyles that travel at high speeds down these roads. This problem is increasing with the electrification of cycles - they have speed and weight . How are they going to be forced to slow down at crossing points ?

Concerns around narrowing of vehicle lane under viaduct

Concerns regarding decreased air quality as a result of congestion from reduction in vehicle running lanes under viaduct

Merging on Preston Road south of Argyle Road too blunt - longer taper needed for effective zipping by drivers

Stats covers in cycle lane should be asphalt filled not slippery metal

I'm writing in support of the proposed scheme for phase 1 of the A23 active travel scheme. My family regularly travel into this area from West Hove and these proposals will greatly improve safe cycling and pedestrian mobility in the area. In particular, the floating bus stops are ideal for both cyclists and bus users.

Concerns for accidents at bus boarders

Concerns around increased congestion and impact on Air Quality.

It's disappointing that Phase 1 doesn't attempt to improve the poor cycle provision along Campbell Road through Elder Place and to the North Laine. Surely if you are going to implement a two-way cycle lane along Preston Road you could extend this all the way to Preston Circus and introduce a junction for cyclists to get on to Elder Place.

The proposed layout at the end of Ditchling Rise looks pretty chaotic to me and could end up being a real bottleneck of cyclists, cars and pedestrians. I think just labelling something as 'shared use' is not good enough in such a small area.

Frankly you might as well remove the small segregated cycle lane heading north on Preston Road before this junction anyway as it's completely redundant. It's also disappointing that there is no provision given for cyclists turning right out of Campbell Road which is a safety concern. Finally, the crossing has some of the longest wait times I've ever experienced on a pedestrian crossing – most users get bored waiting and cross anyway.

There is also no provision or thought for cyclists coming west along the contraflow cycle lane on Ditchling Rise – how are they meant to safely turn right or get onto the Argyle Road cycle lane? Is there a possibility to move the pedestrian crossing south before the junction to where the single-lane reduction occurs? This would allow you more easily to extend the two-way cycle lane around the corner onto Argyle Road without interruption and allow Ditchling Rise cyclists to access the infrastructure.

In my view the below configuration at the bottom of Stanford Avenue also needs a re-think. It's very inconvenient for cyclists heading south into the city on the A23 to have to go across two crossings just to access the new bi-directional cycle path. In fact what happens now is that most cyclists cut across two lane of traffic before the junction (where the right-turn lane at Telecom House is) and ride the wrong way along the small section of cycle path before joining the two-way section. It would be good if the arrangement could accommodate that option to improve safety.

#### 4c: Summary of Stakeholder Meeting Engagement Feedback

|   |
|---|
| Note: There is residential parking at 117, 119, and 121 Preston Road (Stanford Ave. Junction). This needs to be accommodated for in the detail design.  |
| <i>Preston Bowls Club</i> need to be consulted in-depth regarding changes near their entry point  |
| Preston Drove/South Road is an Air Quality Management Area - will reduction in capacity increase emissions?   |
| Councillor Steve Davis will be interested in discussing the Bus Service Improvement Plan in this area.  |
| Pelican Crossing's at Preston Drove/South road junction being upgraded to Puffin Crossing's will mean that the 'green man' signal will not be facing pedestrians until they're on the tactiles waiting to cross. Pelican's current have green man on opposite side of road so easily visible to peds on reverse-staggered arrangement.  |
| How are right hand turns into South Road for southbound cyclists managed?   |
| Potential to provide a break in the segregation at stop lines in the Preston Drove/South Road junction to allow cyclists to get into lane before the traffic starts moving. Similar to an ASL.  |
| Consider 'Two-Stage Turning' for right hand turners from Preston Road into South Road. Cyclists would travel half-way through the junction and wait behind the island, before completing their movement in the next phase.  |
| Set stop line back 4m and create ASL.   |
| Zebra crossings across Bus Borders could be useful to indicate to cyclists that there is a hazard ahead and to be cautious.   |
| Realign stop lines on Preston Road outside Shell garage to provide a two-stage straight across crossing.  |
| How are we going to manage or prevent the traders/shop/vehicles from parking across cycle lane  |
| 1. Will the cycle lane be stepped to deter pedestrians drifting into the cycle lane?<br>2. The tree opposite Springfield Road in the cycle lane is a hazard – there is conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. Is it possible to take space from opposite side and move cycle lane over  |
| How will changes in height between pedestrian and cycle be signalled. How is this going to be clear to limited mobility or sensory issue users - we need to ensure designs are accessible   |
| The crossing point at Springfield Road is currently used by cycle traffic - would like to see cycling provision improved, i.e.. crossing point needs to include cyclists.   |
| Pleased to see this junction improvement - Feedback from shopkeeper on Springfield /Preston Drove advises daily near misses - this improvement will help pedestrians, cyclists and motorists - brilliant!   |
| I would like to echo Leo's comments.<br>There are issues with the bus stop and business under viaduct parking opposite creating conflict. How will this be managed?   |
| What about the cyclists heading up or down Stanford Avenue?   |
| The problem is further south between Argyle Road and Valley Gardens - it's the missing link.  |
| Why do we not have cycle lane in park coming south?   |
| I support the idea maintaining cycle lane along road : Preston Park is not level, condition of surfacing is not ideal and excavation work / resurfacing would be needed. Much better along road. Stepped height is helpful which will hold cars from parking especially near Rock Gardens. Although the bus stop 1.5m for peds/ bus users but cycle lane is 3m.<br>Past Springfield Road at bus stop - traffic hazard – cars coming up being parked bus and getting out and back into north lane, feels cramped |

|   |
|---|
| The area of footway by this bus stop at 1m is not adequate width for all users, particularly wheelchair users to feel safe. The 5B doesn't stop here.   |
| We could remove this bus stop – 5 and 5A stop could stop at next stop.  |
| You could move the Lover's Lane bus stop further south.   |
| The idea of mini zebra crossings across cycle lanes is a good idea – people exiting buses will complain that bus users can't cross cycle lane but if there is a visual sign that will help mitigate   |
| Are people stepping off bus straight into cycle lane. Looks hazardous.  |
| If we were to remove previous bus stop this might give more wriggle room to allow for solution here but we do need to consider less mobile bus users. This conflict is potentially problematic.   |
| Could we narrow carriageway and have better bus stop arrangement.   |
| Too many bus stops here as well – one here and one outside pub. Is there potential to reduce bus stops. What is time line for scheme?   |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Past South Road there is an area where vehicles park across cycle lane – is the cycle lane stepped? It is dangerous parking and an obstruction for cycle lane.</li> <li>2. If there is a bus stopped won't this block traffic?</li> <li>3. Absolutely fantastic to see – a whole lot safer for everyone.</li> </ol>   |
| The Sainsbury's bus stop, and the Preston Park hotel bus stop (southbound) are also coach stops, including coaches to Gatwick, so a lot of passengers will have a lot of luggage.   |
| Great work - all the work is amazing!   |
| Can we make the cycle lane green  |
| Parking is an issue in and around Argyle Road / under the viaduct - historically parking over footpath and cycle lane   |
| Is there potential to extend pedestrian crossing to include cyclists so that cyclists can cross without getting off bike?   |
| Regarding Dan's point could we not use a toucan crossing at these crossing points?  |
| Have we considered the impact of the lorries coming in and out of Anston House - potential to ruin the cycle lane   |
| Currently working with developers for Anston House on relocating bus stop   |
| Consideration needs to be given for drainage - need to use gully ID numbers on drawings   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the review of on-street parking spaces (and I hear that there has been an overall reduction) considered the potential for better located, and possibly more, Blue Badge bays?</li> <li>• Taxis/private hire: at a meeting with some members of the Taxi Forum last week they asked about previous requests for private hire vehicles to use the bus lanes and have some concerns about the introduction of Red Routes on pick-up and set-down. I know that the bus lanes or RR operations are not part of your remit but just wanted to make you aware of this issue!</li> </ul> |
| VMS signage available for use for publicity prior to works taking place - bear in mind.   |
| We currently have cameras at both ends of this phase and we are enforcing illegal parking via CCTV at the north end for the mandatory cycle lanes on the stretch between Preston Drove and Cumberland Rd.   |
| I wanted to make you aware we can only enforce mandatory cycle lanes which are part of a carriageway and have double yellows and a no loading restriction. We are not currently able to enforce vehicles blocking a segregated cycle lane.  |
| It was mentioned using enforcement to keep Argyle Road clear but I am not sure if the cameras at that end would see much more than the junction entrance.   |
| As I briefly mentioned yesterday, I have a few concerns about what the impact of utility works will be on the road, in particular on the stretch between Argyle Road and Springfield Road once we   |

|  |
|--|
| <p>have reduced the space for vehicles down to one lane, when works need to be done in the remaining carriageway.</p>  |
| <p>It looks like we are going to have a pinch point at Argyle Road and the pedestrian crossing – with a carriageway width of 4.5 metres and an absolute minimum carriageway width for one way traffic of 3 metres required by the Safety CoP, once a works needs to be more than 1 metre off the kerb line (0.5 metres safety zone required) we won't have enough space to keep traffic going past. As there's not an obvious solution to this we may just have to accept that if works take place in the carriageway in this section the road will have to be closed.</p>   |
| <p>Where we currently have parking bays it would be great if they could be kept all along that stretch, to give us more width to work with. I can see why you are considering widening the footway under the viaduct, because of how narrow it is there, but that would create another pinch point.</p>  |
| <p>Once past the Stanford Avenue junction and back into the two way section of road I suspect we might need to use traffic control more often – we'll have less than a metre for works (including the safety zone) before it's too narrow to allow two way traffic past any works. Once we get into the section with the bus lane we'll have more overall width to use, as we can suspend the bus lane if necessary.</p>   |
| <p>As it's going to be a stepped cycle lane, when works need to take place within it, will there be regular points where we can inform cyclists that the cycle lane is closed ahead and they have a safe option to move into the carriageway?</p>  |
| <p>For works in the footway, obviously our first choice would be for the works to be able to leave a minimum width of footway for pedestrians, but where that isn't possible, our options are likely to be either to put a walkway into the cycle lane and move the cyclists onto the carriageway; or to ask pedestrians to cross the road to use the opposite footway, which isn't great on such a busy road, and I'm sure most pedestrians will just walk into the cycle lane anyway rather than crossing. So the same query as above about giving cyclists safe points to move into the carriageway will apply.</p> |
| <p>I don't think any of these issues are insurmountable, we just need to be prepared for them, and if they can be mitigated by what you build that will be really helpful.</p>   |
| <p>Consideration regarding potential placement of two new Bikeshare hubs at The Deneway / Preston Road junction, and Old London Road / Preston Road (south) junction. Details in email link.</p>   |
| <p>Concerns regarding the alignment of the South Road/Preston Drove junction</p>   |
| <p>noted the Springfield Road stop was mainly an alighting stop so not necessarily reflected in the data. RV agreed.</p>   |
| <p>agreed in principle with combining the two stops. As a general rule, fewer bus stops is good for journey times; however, need to consider accessibility when doing this.</p>  |
| <p>said that S106 was allocated to these stops and said we should request a change to the S106 so the funding is not lost.</p>   |
| <p>queried what modelling had been done on the loss of a lane on the A23. JM said this will be provided in due course. AS said need to consider the knock on impact of this.</p>   |
| <p>said that parking currently restricts the flow somewhat.</p>  |
| <p>felt it would make more sense to provide the cycle route in the park. Felt this would be a missed opportunity and lighting shouldn't be a reason not to.</p>  |
| <p>disliked the bus boarders – cited the sightseeing stop on the seafront. Felt this was too much risk – preference would be for cycle route to be behind the bus stop. Acknowledged that pedestrians may not feel comfortable between a cycle lane and carriageway but need to do more for safety.</p>  |
| <p>need signing and lining at bus boarders – has seen zebras elsewhere.</p>  |

|   |
|---|
| said it was difficult to get cyclists to do what you want them to – LTN 1/20 asks for sightlines, topography etc. to be taken into account. It is a new concept for people to get used to. Need modelling and analysis of how we think bus boarders will work.  |
| said that Dyke Road Drive should not give priority for cyclists because he felt this would impact on safety.  |
| noted that the floating bus stop will cause traffic to queue behind the bus which could impact on the junction and other buses. AS wanted to see more modelling.  |
| said that Preston Drove junction capacity is not helped by cycle priority on all arms.  |
| queried why there is a need to take out a traffic lane.   |
| felt northern crossing could be staggered in order to reduce its width and ‘wasted space’ from hatching.  |
| 50% loss in capacity at the Preston Drove junction was a big issue. RV shared these concerns.   |
| In terms of the Preston Road/Argyle Road/Stanford Road arrangement, I was surprised to hear that no modelling had yet been carried out and would be very keen to understand the impact of the changes.  |
| I note the desire to relocate the bus stop to just after Dyke Road Drive and would not be opposed to this. I would also agree that there is an opportunity to then assess the possibility of rationalising this stop and the one at Stanford Ave to a new location in between the two. Further consideration does need to be given to the fact that the next northbound stop is at Nestor Court and whether the revised walking distances are reasonable.   |
| My frustration is similar to Nick and Adrian's in that the southbound cycleway cannot be routed via the park along the whole stretch. I would like to refer you to an excerpt from the LTN 1/20 Guidance, which I believe supports our prediction that cyclists themselves would prefer this and thus opt to shun the new lane. (4.2.17 Cycling and walking provide a more sensory experience than driving. People are more directly exposed to the environment they are moving through and value attractive routes through parks, waterfront locations, and well-designed streets and squares. Cycling is a pleasurable activity, in part because it involves such close contact with the surroundings, but this also intensifies concerns about personal security and traffic danger. The attractiveness of the route will therefore affect whether users choose cycling as a means of transport.)            |
| It would be helpful if further work could be carried out for the new bus stop arrangement near the Bowling Green, There is significant potential for congestion to result from buses, now stopped on the highway, impeding the progress of subsequent services under this proposal.   |
| In relation to bus borders, I think we have to be really careful. I would anticipate that quite high speeds could be achieved by some cyclists. There is potential for genuine conflict between cyclists and, particularly, alighting bus passengers. Have stopping sight distances and stopping distances been properly considered for cyclists? Will the measures to prevent conflict be intuitive for bus users? Does space allow for the appropriate modal filters to work effectively? Have the provisions for impaired bus users been fully considered under the Equality Act?  |
| It will come as no surprise that I am alarmed at the proposals for the reduced junction capacity at Preston Drove. Whilst a 20% reduction is concerning enough, I would like to understand this better in terms of vehicle numbers at peak periods. Given that the northbound traffic lanes will reduce from two to one, I fail to see how the impact won't actually be worse. Moreover, it is immensely frustrating that a scheme penalising public transport so dramatically is being considered in this form without compensatory relief. Furthermore, we have suggested this approach in favour of a bus priority measure in many schemes (including this one) only to be told that the capacity reduction cannot be tolerated. At the moment, I don't understand what makes this location so unique. I cannot emphasis enough how significant this aspect of the scheme is to us and how strongly we feel. |

|   |
|---|
| Once again, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in the consultation and trust my remarks will be helpful in developing the scheme effectively. Broadly, of course, we support any initiatives to promote cycling and walking but I must highlight the point that public transport is also a large part of the solution in reducing traffic congestion and the negative environmental impacts associated with it. We all need measures for these modes to be complimentary in order to realise the full potential they can collectively deliver.                   |
| is it suitable for heavy vehicles to access to empty bins i.e.. Go over the raised kerbing and into cycle lane to access bins or will they have to pull the bins into the carriageway (Lynsay needs to check with operations)   |
| This stretch is mainly apartments so different collection methods - i.e. drive into the property to collect   |
| North Road - potential 7.5 tonne truck may empty these bins - but will ask whether trucks do go down that stretch   |
| Do we have data on current and expected cyclists  |
| Does monitoring include various points of day?  |
| What impacts do you see for CityParks   |
| risk of damage to trees where kerblines of existing road alignment are widened adjacent to trees. Are there instances of the footway narrowing towards trees to accommodate the proposed cycle ways ?   |
| Potential for increased tree maintenance where new cycle ways are being introduced along road sections with trees in footway or verge.  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any resurfacing/excavation close to street trees is problematic as generally very shallow rooted within hard surfaces especially. Consideration re design adjustments and mitigation required on a tree by tree basis as any civils (even just resurfacing) within tree RPAs may not be compatible with tree retention. We would expect a detailed Arb Method Statement produced for contract specs (as per BS5837:2012) to ensure tree protection has been considered and conditioned upon the contractors to follow</li> </ul> |
| Being involved in the design process is great and happy to provide input on tree issues however we find a significant problem is the construction phase of schemes within the city and the lack of implementation of specs regarding tree protection. I would like to see British Standards applied and enforced across the board to prevent asset damage we see across the city on a weekly basis.   |
| Obstruction around garages on Argyle/Campbell Road. With parking left on southern side it will keep road quite narrow but prefer cycle lane on road.  |
| What about blind corner - what is the buffer and how is that being managed.   |
| Contraflow needed on Springfield Road and Ditchling Road contraflow is not marked on drawings. Springfield road is a big problem as it is used as a rat run: east/west movement   |
| Need to look at how design parts of consultation are accessible   |
| Disabled bay on Argyle Road - where are the provisions for accessible parking - where disabled users going to park.   |
| The connections with the surrounding area are its weakness at moment.   |
| Ditchling Rise needs to be a toucan. Could northern kerb be curved?   |
| Bottom of Springfield needs to be shared space if no pathway through.   |
| Argyle Road junction potential conflict, table needs to be deeper, allows more freedom of movement.   |
| Request more protection on Argyle road for cyclists   |
| Request, if possible, speed reduction from 30mph to 20mph from Preston Drove  |
| Mindful that it [speed limit reduction] needs to be realistic - ie. Look and feel of 20mph so that it can be enforced   |



|   |
|---|
| What are the priorities through this section - crossings through Preston Road/Preston Park who has priority with  |
| For cyclists going southbound turn right before hitting the Preston Park junction - are there any wands or division between road/cycling path.  |
| Buses - couldn't there be an island bus stop taking into account the two bus stops north/south  |
| Parallel crossings - real issue in practice - most drivers stop for the stripes. Southbound drivers won't necessarily stop for parallel crossing cycling element. Would it not be worth thinking about dyke road drive becoming parallel crossing?  |
| Bus stop boarders - is there still not a way of making floating bus stop.   |
| What is intention for island - bike share hubs  |
| Bus stops - has BHCC viewed the data to support model - when merging two stops into one need to be mindful of accessibility. Springfield road on east has potential concerns as ramp will extend and any wheelchair users will be physically unloading into cycle lane. The bus drivers get a lot of complaints around bus boarders |
| Disabled stakeholders lived experience may not be reflective in the data. Bus experience is inconsistent and messaging around when it is safe to cross the road needs to be considered for all users  |
| Are there opportunities for more crossings or signalling some of the crossing points?   |
| Is there enough space for coaches to pass safely thus ensuring pedestrian safety and cyclist safety   |
| We have lost the crossing to main entrance to the rookery - is it possible to move splitter crossing further south and formalise.   |
| With regards to the bus boarders south bound there is potential to swap footway and cycle track around  |
| Highlighted his concern around road widths and national expresses   |
| If there is space for a floating bus stop that would be better.   |
| Is it possible to formalise the access near the Travel Lodge ie. Removable bollard so that there isn't any temptation for cars to use this.   |
| Access to use covid testing centre has been problematic - is it possible to have some provision for accessible parking in this area? Is it possible for JM to provide annotation on the maps for where may be possible for accessible parking for BADGE to take to parks?   |
| Large lorries that park on west side - what will they do when they see a cycle lane there?  |
| Parking for covid centre is essential for disabled users.   |
| How do the floating bus stops work for disabled users?  |
| Crossing to Rookery has been lost and would benefit from formalised crossing.   |
| Pavement in this area is quite wide - cycle lane is on 1.5m - can the cycle lane be increased?  |
| Keep cycle lane as wide as possible for as long as possible. With regards to design for floating bus stops considerations were given around visibility and bus shelter do not have advertising on them so that people could see what was happening beyond bus stop.   |
| Lover's Walk - central island on road do appear to show tactile paving from both with dropped kerbs   |
| Is Preston Drove early release for cycles   |
| Middle Road and North Road are two ways for cycles, but this isn't marked on drawings.  |
| Currently there is a high occurrence of parking across cycle lane currently outside sandwich shop and real estates. The guardrails is also not included on drawing.   |
| Originally, I believe guard rail was there to deter parking. There needs to be further consideration given to stop parking across cycle lane and to protect cycle lane throughout junction.   |

Undertaking and overtaking through this junction is rife. There is need to regularise movement and definitely a 20mph starting at this junction would benefit.

With regards to South road it is very tight on footway - is it possible to push crossing on to the wider mouth of that junction and be more on the desire line

Echo points re pedestrian crossing on desire lines and noted that the guardrail takes away space from pedestrian however cycle lane does need protection and raised kerb won't do it.

Also, the pedestrian crossing point for Sainsbury's needs to be retained.

Need to ensure dropped kerbs are at least 2m wide for accessibility purposes

can we reduce dog leg at bottom of Preston Drive.

Welcomes straight across crossing point on Preston Road.

Regarding Preston Drive layout when turning right this design means that you are now further left and unable to navigate to turn right if needed. No benefit for being in left lane when turning left as there is no early release

This section has potential for damaging traffic flow and in particular impacting bus operators. What does the traffic modelling show - traffic has potential to stack across junction and impacts all active travel modes.

Reiterated Adrian's points

More accessible parking on south side please outside Costa etc

## 5. Public Drop-In Workshop Postcards

**One Journey Better**



**Active Travel Fund - A23 Phase 1  
Argyle Road to Cumberland Road**

### Have your say

In February 2021, after successfully securing funding to make walking and cycling improvements to the A23, we consulted with residents and stakeholders on our plans for changes to support everyone who uses it, including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and drivers.

Having been granted approval by members of the council's Environment, Transport and Sustainability committee in July 2021, we now want your views on our revised design for the area between Cumberland Road and Argyle Road.

### A23 - Phase 1 Area



**We're inviting you to attend one of our drop in sessions listed below to discuss your thoughts on the scheme design.**

These will take place at:  
**St. Augustine's Arts & Events Centre,**  
Stanford Avenue, Brighton BN1 6EA on:

|           |                 |           |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Wednesday | 1 December 2021 | – 9am-5pm |
| Thursday  | 2 December 2021 | – 9am-5pm |
| Friday    | 3 December 2021 | – 9am-5pm |
| Saturday  | 4 December 2021 | – 9am-5pm |

You can see plans and further details by visiting [www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/onejourneybetter](http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/onejourneybetter)

For more information or to request an alternative format please e-mail [transport.projects@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:transport.projects@brighton-hove.gov.uk) or call 01273 293536

**If undelivered, please return to:**  
Transport Policy and Research, Room G41,  
Hove Town Hall, Norton Road, Hove BN3 3BQ

7320 Brighton & Hove City Council Communications Team

