

Appendix 5 – North Laine Permeability TRO Comments

Title	Support/Object	Reasons
Resident	Object	<p>For political reasons sometimes someone produces a daft plan. This one excels many. There have always been issues of bicycles and cars; these do not mix. The assumptions behind this include two major errors. The first is that cars respect the 20 mph zone which according to the police is unenforceable and generally ignored. The second is that a significant level of cyclists do not respect anyone other than themselves. Whilst there are many that do there, most in the area have seen incidents where many do not. They ride at high speed without lights at night and are a danger to pedestrians and cars alike, have no insurance and do not respect the rules of the road. Whilst vehicle drivers have a range of ways to control behaviour such as loss of licence no such penalties are available. Roads in the North Laine are narrow and do not have enough space for a vehicle and cyclist at the same time and I believe that this proposal will make the risk to life and limb significantly higher. I predict that the present level of accidents with both vehicles and pedestrians will increase dramatically with the obvious results.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>I am most concerned about this matter and I would like you to record this as a personal objection to the scheme unless the scheme includes a painted cycle lane for the entire length of each and every street covered by the scheme. I am partially sighted and the hardest type of vehicle to see for partially sighted people is a bike. Many partially sighted people have enough vision to get about and lead independent lives. A high contrast painted cycle lane will remind partially sighted people to look for cyclists coming from the other direction to the main traffic flow and will make the scheme wholly acceptable. Without this in place the whole area will become immediately not accessible for people with visual disabilities. These comprise a larger group of the population than you might at first think. They have money, spend it in shops, and contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>There was a load of, in my view, wholly irrelevant discussion in the meeting last night around issues of what people should do and where liabilities lie and whether cyclists, vehicle drivers or pedestrians were the most irresponsible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It is all very well to say people are taught to look both ways when crossing a road, but in reality many don't if they know it is a one way street and it is not immediately obvious there is a cycling contraflow. Unless a contraflow cycle lane is marked for the entire length of the street partially sighted people will not be aware of it as they are too busy concentrating on negotiating curbs and street furniture and traffic to notice signs and road markings just at the end of a street, put only there to avoid "clutter". * It is all very well to have increased enforcement against cyclists without lights for a couple of weeks after the clocks go back but it is a reality some cyclists hurtle down hills without lights. That is a fact. * There was discussion about who's fault it might be if there was a collision - surely the point is it is better to design out the chances of a collision and while most motorists behave responsibly many do not and many motorists and cyclists do not stick to the (we learned last night) unenforceable 20mph limit.

		<p>* Considerations of "street clutter" should be lower down the pecking order of importance than safety issues that could and would seriously disadvantage the mobility of people with visual disabilities moving freely about the North Lane area.</p> <p>* There was a discussion about how what is proposed conforms to international standards which may well be the case but just because a standard is set internationally does not make it right, acceptable and helpful to all parts of society, or suitable for local conditions in the North Lane.</p>
Resident	Support	<p>As a regular daily cyclist and pedestrian using this area I feel that this measure will make the area a safer and better place to cycle to and through</p> <p>submit:</p> <p>As a regular daily cyclist and pedestrian user of the North Lane area I fully support this measure as it will increase the safety of cyclists and the permeability of the area making a more attractive and useful route</p> <p>submit:</p>
Resident	Support	<p>Please use the Laines as a cycling heaven as the rest of Brighton cycle ways either stop short of a journey or disappear into thin air. Church Street is the same. If you start at the top of church Street wanting to go to the Pavilion you nearly get killed outside Carluccios as the path suddenly stops and there is no clue as to what to do!</p> <p>submit</p>
Resident	Support	<p>This will make cycling in Brighton much easier and improve safety for both cyclists and pedestrians. My 15 year old daughter said "Great! now I will be able to cycle to town". Providing a good network of safe and legal cycling routes is the best (and cheapest) way to encourage new cyclists of all ages and improve the environment for everyone.</p> <p>submit:</p>
Resident	Support	<p>I support this proposal as it will make the North Laine area more cycle friendly, and reduce the amount of car traffic as more people take up cycling in the city</p>
Resident	Support	<p>This is a great idea and long overdue. I fully support all the proposed contraflows. The reason that these one way systems were introduced in the first place was to stop motorists using them as rat-runs and because some streets are narrow for two-way motor traffic, with no thought about the negative impact on cycling. Many cyclists ignore the one-way rules anyway, as they make it ridiculously difficult to navigate a sensible route through North Laine, which otherwise lends itself well to cycling. These contraflows will enable cyclists to move through North Laine in a much more sensible way and stop them being cast as law breakers for doing so. It will also make it safer for cyclists, as motorists will be more likely to anticipate cyclists coming the opposite way than at present. Such a change will provide a positive encouragement for people of all ages to cycle through North Laine. I cycle regularly through North Lane as my normal route to the city centre (North St/Western Rd), the seafront and Brighton Station) and look forward to being able to legally.</p>
		<p>Cyclists' mobility in Brighton is impaired by one way streets. For cycling to be a viable mode of transport in the city centre, one way streets need to be converted to 2-way cycling so that there is full permeability. This is one of Bricycles'</p>

Resident	Support	key aims for the city. This will be safer for pedestrians because there will be an expectation that a cyclist may approach. It will reduce conflict with pedestrians and motorists because cyclists will no longer be cycling illegally. This essential missing link is long overdue. Completion of the contraflow will hugely improve mobility for cyclists and prevent conflict with pedestrians and motor traffic.
Resident	Support	As a resident in the North Laine, I support the plans to make it easier for people who are cycling to travel through the area. The current one-way system can be confusing, and lead to long-winded, circuitious, disorientating and disheartening routes up and down hilly streets - which is always far more of a problem for those cycling than those in motorised vehicles. My flatmates have said they would consider cycling to work if the local area was more intuitive to navigate. My main concern is sufficient driver awareness. For instance I regularly use the fully-marked contraflow cycle lane on Jubilee St. I have encountered a number of 'close shaves' as I pull up to the junction with Church Street. Drivers coming westwards along Church St often take very tight right turns into Jubilee Street without noticing the lane, nor leaving space for cyclists. Where similar situations will arise under the new proposals (e.g. cyclists cycling contraflow along Foundry St and arriving at the junction with North Rd) demarcation needs to be clear so that cyclists know where in the road they should be for their own safety, and cars are aware that there will be cyclists coming 'the wrong way'. Finally, one other comment on the proposals - if cyclists are going to be able to cycle contraflow along Church St, pedestrians crossing Church St will probably need signage to alert them to look both ways – many, including me, will be used to only looking one way for oncoming traffic! On a side note, contraflow is a great idea where it can be incorporated safely into the road layout, and it would be fantastic to see contraflow or other options implemented to link up the seafront cycle route with the North Laine area in a clearer more intuitive way. (It's simple to get to the seafront from the North Laine, but not vice versa. This is because there are few pedestrian/cycle crossings on Kings Rd that actually join up with quieter streets in the Lanes on which it's possible to cycle north.)
Resident	Support	As highlighted cyclists are already using these streets in both directions. However I would be interested to know about signage both at street level and actually on the road so that it will be clear to care drivers that the contraflow is in place.
Resident	Support	Finally I can cycle into town! Any decent cycle-friendly proposal is great, and all of these roads could really do with a 2-way-for-bikes-only system. No matter what the businesses say it WILL be good for them, (much more slow-moving passing trade, etc.), and I think you should just go ahead with it anyway. Especially the Trafalgar Street one, I've never understood why that was one-way. I've never understood why any of these are one-way really... but then again, I am not a town/street/traffic planner. But I am a cyclist, who would cycle much more if I could get safely to Churchill Square. Thank-you.
Resident	Support	This is an excellent proposal and I wish it to be enacted asap
		I'm a resident and strongly in favour of both of these. 1. As noted in the plans cyclists regularly go the wrong way down all of the one way roads anyway: if it's made "official" the roads will become safer as drivers and pedestrians will no what

Resident	Support	to expect. 2. As a cyclist myself, I make a point of not going the wrong way, which forces me to make strange diversions round the area when making short journeys. Many thanks for your attention.
Resident	Support	It will make cycling in Brighton a more attractive proposition
Resident	Support	While I support this proposal, I do not think that the reason for making contra-flow cycling legal should be that many cyclists have been illegally cycling the wrong way down a one-way street anyway. I would also want assurance that the signage for both cyclists and pedestrians is VERY CLEAR in order to avoid accidents or misunderstanding. If the idea is to reduce the amount of cycle traffic in twittens, etc., there needs to be proper 'policing' of this in place as well.
Resident	Support	As a cyclist and resident in the North Laine, I applaud this move. I live on Tidy Street close to Trafalgar Street and often go north on the road as it is safer for pedestrians than using the footpath, and every morning feel bad about it but I am not going to go around the block when it is only 15-20 meters to the end of the road. I do not own a car as we are so close to much of the city, however, I find that the traffic regulations which make sense for cars do not make sense for cycles, so the contraflow measures seem very sensible to me.
Resident	Support	There is no sensible route through North Laine area at present which both reduces the likelihood of more cycle trips in the centre and encourages illegal cycling. This type of cycle contraflow works perfectly well in Holland and Denmark and is a very sensible measure.
Resident	Support	This proposal would encourage and support cycling in this area. The current illogical ban encourages rule breaking and puts such cyclists in danger
Resident	Support	In the process of achieving an 80% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions we need to reduce car use by, say, 80%. Helping people get about better on bikes, and reducing road space for cars both help in this aim. Therefore I favour the plan submit: More space for cycles will reduce space for cars. More complexity in road layout will slow cars and make driving less appealing, More options for cycling will make it more attractive. All these things will help reduce car use thus reduce CO2 emissions and so move progress in the environmentally sound direction.
Resident	Support	I do support the extension/consolidation of the contraflow cycle lane in the section of Church Street through North Laine. I would like to make two points about this proposal however. (1) The Statement of Reason document says "In July 2011 the City Council produced a report which assessed the feasibility of contraflow facilities in all one-way streets in the North Laine area. An initial fourteen streets have been identified which would require minor changes to become suitable for facilities; these streets would form the basis of the first cycle contraflow network in the city." Fourteen streets are referred to here, but only a single street appears to be covered in the TRO. What happened to the other thirteen? (2) The new Church Street contraflow lane passes the northern end of New Road. National Cycle Route NCR20 is currently signed as involving a right turn from New Road into Church Street at this junction: however "No Right Turn" signage is also present

		here! This is a contradiction, as as the No Right Turn sign has force of law, it is actually illegal for cyclists to follow NCR20 as signed. This is clearly absurd :) I suggest that a modification of the No Right Turn designation be added to this TRO, to enable cyclists to turn right at the northern end of New Road and follow NCR20 legally
Resident	Support	I cycle
Resident	Support	The cycle lanes available in the London Road area are pretty limited for particularly north travel. Opening up easier movement through North Laines will mean cyclists can avoid London Road more easily. Plus any action that makes movement around town on bike is good. Will increase ease of movement through North Laines area on cycle in conjunction with TRO 10b - 2012.
Resident	Support	I support both of these proposals. Providing easier and safer routes for cyclists will make Brighton a much pleasanter place to visit. I frequently cycle along the seafront cycle route (often with children) but currently I rarely cycle into Brighton itself because there are too few accessible cycle routes. By making it easier and safer to cycle in the town it is much more likely that I will visit Brighton itself.
Resident	Support	This is an excellent idea and very overdue.
Resident	Support	This will encourage more use of shared cars, less use of private parking and less short car journeys. The position will be little or no loss to local provision for loading parking which is sufficient without this section.
Resident	Support	Cycling is a viable and healthy alternative to cars in Brighton. One-way streets have been necessitated by excessive car use, not cycle use, and cyclists should not have to pay the price. Oner-way streets are an impediment and a discouragement for cyclists: Contraflows are an encouragement to cycling. Contraflows for bicycles have been proved effective and manageable in Strasbourg and other cities across Europe. Cycling is a viable and healthy alternative to cars in Brighton. One-way streets have been necessitated by excessive car use, not cycle use, and cyclists should not have to pay the price. One-way streets are an impediment and a discouragement for cyclists: Contraflows are an encouragement to cycling. Contraflows for bicycles have been proved effective and manageable in Strasbourg and other cities across Europe. Extending the contraflow in Church Street will enable existing cycle lanes to join up, creating a more comprehensive and accessible cycle network in the city.
Resident	Support	I support these proposals as I am a keen cyclist and want to encourage more cyclists on to the roads. I think it would encourage cyclists to feel there are more cycling routes in the City.
Resident	Support	I fully support the proposal to exempt cyclists from the one way restriction on various roads within the North Laine area. Anything which makes it easier to cycle in the City should be welcomed. This specific plan will make it easier to get around by bike in the North Laine, and will improve safety for cyclists as well.
		I live in Cheltenham Place. I have to use a car to get to my place of work because it is not served by public transport and is a 10 mile trip along the A27. The only access by car to Cheltenham Place is from Gloucester Road.

Resident	Object	<p>In the 17 years I have lived here, cyclists have always ignored the one way rule and ridden contraflow. Given that there is a downward gradient in the eastern direction they usually travel at some speed, and frequently take the corner wide so as to sweep round the corners leading to the lights at the London Road. There are two blind corners before those lights: I have been assured by a lawyer that should a cyclist riding recklessly round one of those corners come up against my car, in which case the rider would almost certainly fly off the bike, over my car and land injured in the road behind me, I would not be considered to be at fault. I am not convinced of this, especially as there might well be no witnesses. I always drive that stretch of road at walking pace because I am so conscious of the possible risks.</p> <p>The Council's proposal appears to suggest there would be no marked cycle lane. Even if there were, there would be nobody there to enforce cyclists' use of it. I am deeply concerned that the legalisation of what is currently an illegal practice and which would be no less risky for the legalising of it would put the innocent car driver in an impossible position. What assurances can you give me?</p>
Resident	Object	<p>This sends out all the wrong signals to cyclists who already cycle the wrong way down one-way streets. The reason given for proposing the change - that illegal contraflow cycling is already common in the North Laine - only supports my objection and more should be done to enforce the existing laws. Your proposal will surely cause confusion to other road users and be dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians alike.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>This action will lead to accidents which motorists will be deemed responsible - which is unfair. Cyclists regularly ignore the one-way systems in this town and a cyclist actually hit my vehicle a year ago when he was travelling down (in the wrong direction) the lower part of St James's street at some speed. This city seems to bend over backwards for cyclists who flaunt the rules of the road and pavements (without paying anything towards either and largely being students don't even pay Council Tax, let alone Road Tax) and they should be made to adhere to current rules and regulations like the motorists have to do. We, as motorists, who live and work in this city get very poor support, even if we drive low emission vehicles - give us a break and come down heavily on the cyclists who need to be more responsible and learn to be more sympathetic to pedestrians and motorists alike.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>Firstly I believe the roads concerned are too narrow, and generally drivers drive too fast, and without due care and attention. I foresee numerous accidents, of which cyclists will come off worse. I have already had numerous encounters with cyclists riding the wrong way down these streets, and I am a careful driver but these incidents still cause me have to stop which suggests I am right to object to this. One possible option if you are still determined to push this through is to reduce the speed limit to 20mph or less but it would need to be actually enforced. Alternatively just allow 1 north/south route not all the proposed roads to provide a compromise</p>

Resident	Support	Enforcement of the one way system works and is necessary for cars in the narrow streets of North Laine, but is inconvenient and potentially discouraging for cyclists. Cyclists should be permitted to ride contraflow to motor traffic to encourage ease of access and promote patronage to local businesses.
Resident	Support	Because at present cycling through the North Laine in a law-abiding way is extremely difficult and requires me to take a very circuitous route. I have often wondered why there were not provisions for cyclists to go in either direction given that we don't take up much road space. I have also often wondered why more of North Laine is not pedestrianised except for deliveries, like Sydney St, Gardener St and Bond St.
Resident	Support	I wholeheartedly support this proposed TRO. It will allow cyclists to have greater access to the North Laine area.

