Kingsley Drive, 12th October 2020

Notes for site meeting with Tim Simpson (NYCC) about Kingsley Drive & Wreaks Road TRO

1) Foreword to Cycle Infrastructure Design (CID) by the Minister of State with responsibility for cycling

'Cycling **must no longer be treated as marginal, or an afterthought**. It must not be seen as mainly part of the leisure industry, but as a means of everyday transport. It must be **placed at the heart of the transport network**, with capital spending, road space and **traffic planners' attention** befitting that role.'

Good quality cycle infrastructure should be delivered alongside new developments and highway improvement schemes (Chapter 14). This includes enhancing provision when making alterations to existing links and junctions (para 14.1.4).

2) Core Design Principles (Chapter 1)

The five Core Design Principles are that cycle routes should be Coherent, Direct, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive.

Coherent: this means that people should be able to reach their day-to-day destinations on cycle routes that connect and are of consistent high quality. The developer's proposal represents a threat to sever a network. Letting them go ahead with their proposal and saying 'you can always raise formal objections afterwards' is not acceptable.

Direct: there is an opportunity to make the cycling route more direct than the driving route, and it should be taken.

Safe: if you cut this route, you're effectively forcing people onto the A59, which is not safe.

3) Summary Principles (Chapter 1)

Principle 6 states that any future highway schemes will deliver or improve cycling infrastructure to CID standards. Principle 8 underlines the importance of a holistic network.

Principle 20: '**All designers of cycle schemes must experience the roads as a cyclist**...in every case, **those who design schemes should travel through the area on a cycle to understand how it feels** – and experience some of the failings...The most effective way to gain this understanding is to get out and cycle the route and observe users' behaviour.'

4) Cycle lane and track widths, para 5.5 p42 (Chapter 5)

Table 5-2: Cycle lane and track widths

Cycle Route Type	Direction	Peak hour cycle flow (either one way or two-way depending on cycle route type)	Desirable minimum width* (m)	Absolute minimum at constraints (m)
Protected space for cycling (including light segregation, stepped cycle track, kerbed cycle track)	1 way	<200	2.0	1.5
		200-800	2.2	2.0
		>800	2.5	2.0
	2 way	<300	3.0	2.0
		>300-1000	3.0	2.5
		>1000	4.0	3.0
Cycle lane	1 way	All – cyclists able to use carriageway to overtake	2.0	1.5

*based on a saturation flow of 1 cyclist per second per metre of space. For user comfort a lower density is generally desirable.

Table 5-2 sets out the widths of protected space for cycling. The Desirable Minimum is 2.0m; the reasons for reducing that to the Absolute Minimum do not apply in this case. You must add 20cm where the cycle facility is next to a kerb (Table 5-3). Therefore a (protected) cycle entry lane into a one way Kingsley Drive should be 2m20 minimum wide.

5) Quiet mixed traffic streets (Chapter 7)
Cyclists can cycle on-carriageway in mixed traffic on quiet streets like Kingsley Drive. The upper limits for inclusive cycling are (para 7.1.1, p74):

- 2,500 vehicles per day, and
- 20mph

Therefore the speed limit should be reduced to 20mph.

6) Permitted contraflow cycling (Chapter 7)


Figure 7.4: Contraflow cycling in a narrow street with no marked lane, Brighton

This should always be considered (para 7.3.4, p78). Contraflow cycling provides a more direct route for cyclists. On quiet low speed streets, there may be no need for a cycle lane. 'Where there is good visibility cyclists and on-coming drivers should be able to negotiate passage safely.'

Para 7.3.5 has minimum carriageway widths:

- 2.6m with no car parking
- 4.6m with car parking on one side of the road
- 6.6m with car parking on both sides of the road

We should discuss and agree parking arrangements – one side only, which side?

HDCA, 12th October 2020