

KILDARE COUNTY COUNCIL



Road Traffic Act 1994

Report on Section 38

National Cycle Network (NCN) Road Space Re-allocation Pilot Scheme (R448) Moone to Timolin.
Report on Submissions

URN	Body	From	Response
KCC-C275-1	Regarding the proposed NCN upgrade of the R448 as outlined here, considering this is classified as a National upgrade, it beggars believe that the planners would recommend the scheme with its current design. The entire intent of the NCN plan should be to encourage a modal shift away from Motorised transport to self-propelled transport- hence the investment in (what should be safe) Cycle Lanes. This is the core premise of the NCN, and its alignment with our National Climate plan. This proposal does the absolute opposite to this - and treats the cyclist as a second class citizen, akin to a pedestrian, forcing any cyclist travelling on the main route (R448) to: Stop, Dismount, Check, Walk across, Remount. Continue journey to the next yield point.At least 8 times in the road section mapped for upgrade. The output of this proposal will be: To reduce the road space / hard shoulder available for all traffic. Force cyclists to remain on the now narrowed R448 (and not use the cycle lane) of the 4 secondary roads intersecting with R448, if they choose to use the proposed but virtually useless cycle lane. To encounter danger from frustrated motorists if they choose to remain on the main carriageway of R448, which is, unfortunately, probably the safest option, and the one that most cyclists will choose. The alternatives to this proposal to consider include Leave the route as it is today, it will likely be safer than the proposed design. Prioritise the cyclist movement on the R448, by simply adding STOP Line and STOP sign before the Cycle Lane of the R448 transverses the minor arterial routes. Other considerations :Has the council studied the current cycling use on this road? What is the volume? Is it generally single cyclists or groups of cyclists? The design proposed is dreadful for individual cyclists, but completely unusable for groups of cyclists (likely the main volume of cyclists on this route)	Submitted 05.06.2024 - 12:33	This is a pilot scheme, being trialled by KCC on behalf of the Department for Transport (DoT) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII). The pilot seeks to provide safe cycle facilities for use by all abilities of cyclist through re-allocation of existing road space with limited or no widening. It will inform rollout of similar schemes across the NCN. As no speed reduction will be implemented on the R448 prior to operation of this pilot, gateway treatments in accordance with DN-GEO-03084 are proposed to narrow the cross section and achieve a "psychological" speed reduction. A similar arrangement has been successfully implemented at Carroll's Cross on the N25. This does not preclude reduction of the speed limit at a future date, once permissible by KCC. Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM. It should be noted that at private and field accesses, where traffic volume is expected to be significantly lower, cyclists are given priority. On traffic volumes, cycle counts along the R448 were undertaken between Tuesday 16th April and Monday 22nd April. 47 cyclists were observed using the route over this period; 35 were travelling individually, 6 as two separate groups of three and 6 as 3 separate groups of 2. Notwithstanding the above, we would re-iterate that this is a pilot scheme and we welcome all feedback on its operation, during and post-operation and appreciate the engagement to date
	CONTD ... ? Has the proposal been reviewed with Cycling Ireland, or any other cycling body? What cycling body or cycling safety engineering consultancy has proposed the route design? I am raising these concerns as a 'Commuter Cyclist' who cycles approximately 10,000km per annum. I make a personal choice to cycle to work most days (70km round trip) for a combination of health and contribution to our climate battle. While the comments and thoughts here are my own, I am also a member of Naas Cycling Club, and the Safeguarding Officer for this club. We have c.175 active cycling members, many of whom use this route periodically. This issue has been raised by multiple members as a concern also. Other thoughts / questions		

KCC-C279-2	Hi In follow up to an earlier submission, and following review of the Cycle Design Manual, I would like to request that the junction s ^t ve chosen in all junctions on this route be altered from TL404 (motorist priority) to TL401 (which gives the cyclist travelling on the main road priority through the secondary road junction)	05.06.2024 - 17:19	Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM
KCC-C279-3	1. Introduction The Irish Cycling Campaign (formerly Cyclist.ie, the Irish Cycling Advocacy Network-ICAN), is the national cycling advocacy body with membership from cycling advocacy groups, greenway groups and bike festivals on the island of Ireland. We are the Irish member of the European Cyclists' Federation. Our vision is for an Ireland with a cycle and pedestrian friendly culture, where everyone has a real choice to cycle and move about safely, and is encouraged to experience the joy, convenience, health and environmental benefits of cycling and walking. The Irish Cycling Campaign is happy to see this project being advanced under a Section 38 process, ideally allowing a rapid turnover to this trial construction. However, we are nevertheless disappointed at the shoddy presentation of this important pilot scheme for space reallocation on a 3.8 km section of regional road R448. In the assumed context of the long term development of a National Cycle Network (NCN), any proposed developments along these lines need to be clearly signposted, explained, and contextualised. While the presented material provides food for thought, there is not enough background explanation of why different systems have been chosen or different junction types proposed. We elaborate on our criticisms below. Public consultation should be about clarity and ease of access overall. This is not the case here. General Comments 2.1 Poor Information on Consultation- The proposals on this nearly 3.8km section of the R448 route, a former N route, to trial various pilot designs, is presented without any proper context, and thus difficult to understand. There is no background explanation of why the various different forms of carriageway cross section have been chosen, or any outline of why the 4 different proposals were chosen above others? The consultation documentation requires a clear concise explanation of the context, the choice of site, and the chosen length of the trial section? We can only assume that this trial is related to the envisaged national NCN proposals, and proposing possible solutions for the application on old N road? This is not good enough from Kildare CC and TII. We also deplore the lack of clearly identifying each map/drawing for context rather than Map B, Map C etc. 2.2 Carriageway Cross Section & Cycle Lane Width -We note the overall 'typical' carriageway width of 14 metres presented, and its division into 7 (2x3.5) metres of main carriageway, 2x1.5 metre hard shoulders, 2x1 metre separation areas, and 2x1.5 metres cycle lane. It is not made clear if this 14 metres is a rigid dimension for all or most old N routes, or what level of variation exists? As a cycling advocacy organisation we are particularly interested in the cycle lane details and overall comfort and safety. The proposed width of 1.5 metres is in the 'absolute minimum' category acceptable width for a one way cycle lane, as outlined in Table 2.2 of the National Cycle Design Manual(CDM). This proposed width does not allow for comfortable overtaking or cycling two abreast. If this pilot is geared towards a national NCN design it needs to factor in the allowance of side by side cycling of friends, and the use of these routes by groups of cyclists from clubs around the country, as well as individuals, otherwise cycling groups will continue to use the main carriageway. In the above context we recommend that ideally a cycle lane width of 2 metres be chosen where feasible, which is the 'desirable minimum width' of a one way cycle lane as outlined in the COM. However, a lower width may be acceptable over short distances. A reduction in the hard shoulder width may also be a possibility, to ensure a workable cycle lane width?	Submitted 07.06.2024 - 12:34	In response to section 2.1: This is a pilot scheme, being trialled by KCC on behalf of the Department for Transport (DoT) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII). The pilot seeks to provide safe cycle facilities for use by all abilities of cyclist through re-allocation of existing road space with limited or no widening. Several different segregation types are proposed along the length of the route, considering the various differing cross section profiles that will exist across the NCN. The aim is to seek feedback on the use of each segregation type (and the pilot as a whole) to inform rollout of similar projects in the future. In response to section 2.2 The cross section of 14m is not a rigid dimension for the NCN at this stage, rather a representation of the cross section of the R448. A range of differing cross sections will be needed to ensure that interventions can be applied across the NCN. This pilot seeks to test these interventions to determine what works best and where. A cycle lane of 1.5m has been deliberately chosen to test the absolute minimum for application to the NCN. Various sections of the R448 will have surplus space available between the marked 1.5m cycle lane and existing kerb / edge of pavement. In response to section 2.3

	CONTD... 2.3 Junction Treatment -We note the varying forms of junction treatment outlined at different side road junctions. In general cycle traffic is downgraded and not given priority along the main route at the larger junctions, having to give way to traffic coming off or exiting on to the R448. This is not acceptable. It is incumbent on the designers, in the light of national policy and ambitions, and in the context of climate change, to treat cycle traffic as a main element of vehicle movement. In this light traffic coming off or into the side road must give way to mainline cycle traffic and the junctions should be designed accordingly. 2.4 Junction Radii -We note the proposed variation in junction radii at different junctions, which we feel needs re-examination. For junctions such as the 50kph speed limit routes (Moone Road & Timolin) The proposals on this nearly 3.8km section of the R448 route, a former N route, to trial various pilot designs, is presented without any proper context, and thus difficult to understand. There is no background explanation of why the various different forms of carriageway cross section have been chosen, or any outline of why the 4 different proposals were chosen above others? The consultation documentation requires a clear concise explanation of the context, the choice of site, and the chosen length of the trial section? We can only assume that this trial is related to the envisaged national NCN proposals, and proposing possible solutions for the application on old N road? This is not good enough from Kildare CC and TII. We also deplore the lack of clearly identifying each map/drawing for context rather than Map B, Map C etc. 2.2 Carriageway Cross Section & Cycle Lane Width -We note the overall 'typical' carriageway width of 14 metres presented, and its division into 7 (2x3.5) metres of main carriageway, 2x1 metre hard shoulders, 2x1 metre separation areas, and 2x1.5 metres cycle lane. It is not made clear if this 14 metres is a rigid dimension for all or most old N routes, or what level of variation exists? As a cycling advocacy organisation we are particularly interested in the cycle lane details and overall comfort and safety. The proposed width of 1.5 metres is in the 'absolute minimum' category acceptable width for a one way cycle lane, as outlined in Table 2.2 of the National Cycle Design Manual(CDM). This proposed width does not allow for comfortable overtaking or cycling two abreast. If this pilot is geared towards a national NCN design it needs to factor in the allowance of side by side cycling of friends, and the use of these routes by groups of cyclists from clubs around the country, as well as individuals, otherwise cycling groups will continue to use the main carriageway. In the above context we recommend that ideally a cycle lane width of 2 metres be chosen where feasible, which is the 'desirable minimum width' of a one way cycle lane as outlined in the COM. However, a lower width may be acceptable over short distances. A reduction in the hard shoulder width may also be a possibility, to ensure a workable cycle lane width? 2.3 Junction Treatment -We note the varying forms of junction treatment outlined at different side road junctions. In general cycle traffic is downgraded and not given priority along the main route at the larger junctions, having to give way to traffic coming off or exiting on to the R448. This is not acceptable. It is incumbent on the designers, in the light of national policy and ambitions, and in the context of climate change, to treat cycle traffic as a main element of vehicle movement. In this light traffic coming off or into the side road must give way to mainline cycle traffic and the junctions should be designed accordingly.	Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM. In response to section 2.4 Junction radii have been selected in accordance with TII standard DN-GE0-03060. On the 13m radii specifically, for vehicles entering the major road from the minor road, and vice versa, and where ghost islands are present, the corner radii should be 13m as per the proposed design. In response to section 2.5 A yield marking through the refuge islands on the R747 has been incorporated within the Detailed Design to facilitate a 2 stage crossing. In response to section 2.6 The modular island will include bollards. We note your preference for this segregation type. In response to section 2.7 As no speed reduction will be implemented on the R448 prior to operation of this pilot, gateway treatments in accordance with TII standard DN-GE0-03084 are proposed to narrow the cross section and achieve a "psychological" speed reduction. A similar arrangement has been successfully implemented at Carroll's Cross on the N25. This does not preclude reduction of the speed limit at a future date, once permissible by KCC. Notwithstanding the above, we would re-iterate that this is a pilot scheme and we welcome all feedback on its operation, during and post-operation and appreciate the engagement to date.			
KCC-C279-4	CONTD... 2.4 Junction Radii -We note the proposed variation in junction radii at different junctions, which we feel needs re-examination. For junctions such as the 50kph speed limit routes (Moone Road & Timolin Terrace) and the various small cul de sacs, a 13 metre radius is excessive and unlikely to encourage vehicles to negotiate the junctions more slowly. The design context for these smaller local junctions needs to be factored in, including the prioritisation of mainline cycle traffic over turning vehicles. Reducing the junction radii will also simplify the junction design for cyclists and pedestrians. 2.5 Maio Road cross-junctions -We endorse the proposals to include a 2 stage crossing of the main (R448) route close to sizeable side road junctions. We fail to understand why this should not also apply to the R747 junction? This type of decision requires background and clarity. Layout, Material Variations -We note the 4 different proposals for carriageway layout, and assume that the 'modular is/and' design shown in Inset B includes either a continuous fence or series of bollards on the elevated modular is/and? If this is the case, it would be our preferred design choice, providing overall greater protection for cyclists. We are happy to see a clear kerb/upstand provided in each proposal, which provides extra protection for the cyclist. 2.7 Speed Limits -We wonder if the issue of varying speed limits along the R448 or other main routes might be considered on approaches to major junctions? This would encourage slower speeds of vehicles in general, but also enable safer turning and exiting manoeuvres for vehicles using the side roads. 3. Summary/Conclusion- In summary, the Irish Cycling Campaign is generally disappointed at the poor quality of the consultation material presented and the dearth of background context. We urge Kildare County Council and TII to revisit the consultation material and the general proposed designs, to give the general public and interested parties, such as ourselves, a clear idea of why this trial is being proposed and where this design proposal fits into the national context. The other comments above in Section 2 remain germane	As has been pointed out in previous submissions, while the allocation of road space for cycling is welcome, having cyclists cede priority at junctions where they are continuing on the road seems like poor planning. Surely bicycles, like all other vehicles should maintain right of way while travelling along the road.	Submitted 08.06.2024 - 20.21		Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM

KCC-C279-5	As has been pointed out in previous submissions, while the allocation of road space for cycling is welcome, having cyclists cede priority at junctions where they are continuing on the road seems like poor planning. Surely bicycles, like all other vehicles should maintain right of way while travelling along the road.	Submitted 08.06.2024 - 20:30	Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM.
KCC-C279-6	I note the proposed design of a cycle track requires cyclists at junctions to yield to roads joining the R448. This is completely impractical and will result in the majority of cyclists not using the cycle lane. I note a green (grass) barrier between the main road and cycle track. In my experience of these, dirt and debris often gathers in these cycle tracks. If implemented, Kildare Co Co should have a regular cleaning regime of these cycle lanes.	Submitted 08.06.2024 - 21:43	Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM. We have provided sufficient width for a maintenance vehicle to access the cycle lane for cleaning, when necessary
KCC-C279-7	The Following observation were made in relation to the Proposed Cycle Lane 1. The Community very much Welcome any investment in the Area and are appreciative that Funding has been made available. We are extremely anxious and willing to work collaboratively with the Council on this and any other issue. 2. Access Points to the Cycle Lane seem to start and End in the middle of Nowhere. It is felt that the plan would be better if the Cycle Lane were to connect communities/ villages. The Plan as proposed does not connect anything. 3. Access Points to the proposed scheme seem to be hidden to oncoming traffic and are at points that will "appear" very quickly to motorists. Better points should be chosen. In Particular there is Grave concern for Safety particularly at the Balinglass/Athy Junction which is known locally as a very dangerous junction. The Cycle lane passing through this Junction will only add to those concerns and fears and not allay them. 4. The Scheme has no provision for Pedestrians. The "Loop" through Moone, Timolin and out onto this road is a 5km loop that is well used by Joggers and Pedestrians alike. This Scheme as proposed may exclude this cohort from this Loop. 5. Moone Celtic which is a fantastic Local Facility, with a wide Hinterland thus necessitating driving and catering for Many Age Groups will be negatively impacted by this cycle lane unless off Road Parking is addressed. It is a very well attended facility, especially at weekends, and this scheme will deprive the club of Parking Space. 6. The Reduction of Speed on this Road would be greatly welcomed by the community. 7. Ideas that would be enthusiastically welcomed by the community would be: Better Lighting, Parking in Moone Village, Better Footpaths, Road Marking, Ponding issue in Moone Village addressed, Walking trails eg. To the High Cross from the Village. 8. The Community feel that we should be directing cyclists/ tourists/visitors into our lovely villages rather than around them. 9. We would like to know what the Purpose of the Lanes are. Is it to encourage Families to cycle? If so will Parking be provided for these families so they can safely access the cycle Lanes and if so where will this be situated. 10. Both Hauliers and Farmers have expressed concern about Access to and Egress from both Moone and Timolin as the loss of Hard Shoulders at the access points to the villages will be detrimental to everyone's safety unless well thought through.	Submitted 12.06.2024 - 13:15	In response to item 1: KCC welcome comment on the proposed pilot and thank the Community for their input. In response to item 2: The extents of the scheme were defined at an early stage to enable efficient construction of a pilot scheme, at pace, to help inform roll out of similar schemes across the National Cycle Network (NCN). The scheme passes both Moone and Timolin and facilitates movement of cyclists from the side roads into the northbound or southbound cycle lanes. While this is a pilot, if successful, opportunities to extend the scheme further could be explored but will be subject to available funding. In response to item 3: Forward sight visibility has been checked at all junctions and complies with TII standard DN-GEO-03031. Gateway treatments are provided at either end of the scheme to signpost the beginning and end of the scheme. The proposed design at the Balinglass / Athy junction complies with TL404 in the Cycle Design Manual, were cyclists cede priority to oncoming traffic. A two stage crossing is provided, with safe refuge provided in central islands so no more than a single lane requires crossing at any one time. Cyclist warning signs will also be erected in advance of crossing points to further warn drivers of

CONTD...

11. If such a scheme is to progress it is vital the Kildare County Council understand that we as a community wish to be consulted and do not wish the Scheme to go ahead without proper consultation as has happened on developments previously.
The meeting was well attended by a cross section of the community including cyclists, Hauliers Farmers, Walkers, Joggers and Homeowners. As reiterated before we would like the council to know that we extend the hand of friendship in relation to this scheme and any others in the future. We are anxious to work collaboratively with the council.

potential cyclists.

In response to item 4:

Pedestrian use of the loop was identified at design stage. While the scheme is advertised as a cycle pilot, the scheme aims not to preclude use by pedestrians. A decision has been taken not to

provide sign plate RUS 009: Pedal Cycles Only at entry points to the cycle lane. At minimum, available width between the proposed segregation and existing kerb / edge of pavement is 1.5m but there are various areas along the scheme extents where available width increases above 1.5m.

In response to item 5:

Consideration has been given to the proposed cross section at Moore Celtic and KCC have met with representatives to discuss. Consideration has been given to the type of segregation proposed here; kerbs and road hatching with a minimum width of 2.1m between the edge of carriageway and proposed kerb. Discussions around off-road parking fall outside the scope of this pilot.

In response to item 6:

No speed reduction will be implemented on the R448 prior to operation of this pilot, gateway treatments in accordance with DN-GEO-03084 are proposed to narrow the cross section and achieve a "psychological" speed reduction. A similar arrangement has been successfully implemented at Carroll's Cross on the N25. This does not preclude reduction of the speed limit at a future date, once permissible by KCC.

In response to item 7:

The points in the submission are noted but fall outside the scope of this pilot.

In response to item 8:

The pilot should attract more cyclists into the villages of Moore and Timolin by running in proximity. Permeability to both can be considered at a later date, depending on the success of the pilot and availability of funding.

In response to item 9:

This is a pilot scheme, being trialled by KCC on behalf of the Department for Transport (DoT) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII). The pilot seeks to provide safe cycle facilities for use by all abilities of cyclist through re-allocation of existing road space with limited or no widening. It will inform rollout of similar schemes across the NCN.

In response to item 10:

Vehicle tracking to and from side roads to the R448 has been completed for a large combine and 16-axle heavy good vehicle and demonstrates these movements can be safely accommodated within the proposals. The tightening of side road junctions and narrowing of the mainline cross section will

KCC-C279-8	<u>1. Context.</u> NCN Pilot Scheme, the documents should include an overall brief for the scheme, the rationale behind it, why this location was chosen and what type of cyclists it is hoped will use the scheme. When the scheme was first advertised under a Section 38, no site location map was included. These issues reflect a poor presentation to the public and do not encourage public engagement with this consultation. What is the process for reviewing the Section 38 submissions on this project and taking them on board in terms of the design or delivery of the scheme? How do TII & KCC demonstrate to the public that this is a real consultation and not just a box ticking exercise? As this is called a Pilot scheme, feedback on both the design and implementation should be one of the aims of the project. <u>2. Connectivity</u> The scheme provides no connectivity, it simply starts and ends on a former National Road. The most likely cyclist on this type of road is a leisure or commuter cyclist capable of cycling a significant distance. Under the National Cycle Design (CDM) Manual 2023, Coherence is one of the five main requirements for Cycle Friendly Infrastructure. <u>3. Width of cycle lane and use of separation</u> The absolute minimum width of 1.5m has been selected for the cycle lane from Table 2.2 of CDM 2023. This is disappointing for a Pilot scheme. It pushes cyclists to the edge of the carriageway and does not allow for overtaking or cycling two abreast or create a sense of a comfortable space for cyclists. This road is regularly used by cycling groups and clubs cycling in a 2 by 2 formation. The design of this scheme will force them to still use the carriageway. Is the use of a separation appropriate in this design and would that space not be better served to allow for a wider cycle lane or a narrower separation? What maintenance requirements are there for these separations and who will carry out the maintenance? If it is the local authority, have they been consulted on this aspect of the project? <u>4. Junctions - Priority for cyclists</u> In this design, the cycle lane is on the main road and should be given priority at junctions with side roads. The use of TL 404 (Motorist priority) will make for unacceptable stopping at each side road along the scheme for the cyclist. I would suggest using TL 401 (cyclist priority) at these junctions is more appropriate and supports the Pilot scheme implementing a cyclist priority scheme. <u>5. A Pilot Scheme – tracking the results.</u> How do TII/KCC propose to measure the outcomes of this project? Will they seek feedback from users of the scheme? What will be the measure of success or otherwise of the scheme if implemented? <u>6. Conclusions</u> I hope that TII and KCC will revisit this scheme in light of the submissions received and the points I have raised above. I am a cyclist, a member of Kildare Cycling Club and Naas Triathlon Club but this submission reflects my own thoughts on this scheme.	Submitted 13.06.2024 - 11:23	encourage lower speeds through the route. In response to item 11: We appreciate the engagement to date and welcome all feedback on its operation, during and post-operation of this pilot. A consultation period was held between 7th May 2024 and 14th June 2024 following which all submissions have been considered by the design team. Further feedback will be sought following the completion and operation of the works In response to item 1: This is a pilot scheme, being trialled by KCC on behalf of the Department for Transport (DoT) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII). The pilot seeks to provide safe cycle facilities for use by all abilities of cyclist through re-allocation of existing road space with limited or no widening. It will inform rollout of similar schemes across the NCN. A consultation period was held between 7th May 2024 and 14th June 2024 following which all submissions have been considered by the design team. Further feedback will be sought following the completion and operation of the works. In response to item 2: The proposed scheme passes Moone and Timolin and is on the "loop" between villages. Side road treatments and two stage crossing points are provided to enable permeability across the R448. The extents of the scheme were defined at an early stage to enable efficient construction of a pilot scheme, at pace, to help inform roll out of similar schemes across the National Cycle Network (NCN). While this is a pilot, if successful, opportunities to extend the scheme further could be explored but will be subject to available funding. In response to item 3:
------------	--	---------------------------------	---

KCC-C275-9	Dear Kildare Co Co Naas Triathlon Club would like to make a submission with respect to the planned re-allocation of road space on the R448 Moone to Timolin road as part of a plan to have a segregated cycle lane. Firstly, Naas Triathlon club welcomes any development of our road network that promotes cycling and provides a safer environment for all who are interested in cycling to participate. This stretch of road is a popular route for many clubs who have group cycles, group cycling is a great way to encourage more people to participate in cycling as it is sociable and also safer. Group cycling often visit various cafes along their routes which brings valuable business to small cafes, shops or restaurants. The current proposed reallocation of space proposes to reduce the cycle path to the minimum standard width of 1.5M. This will be only wide enough for single file cycling and so will not permit group cycling and would actually force a cycling group in a 2 X 2 formation to actually use the main carriageway making it less safe for group cycling as motorised vehicles will be required to pass a group in a very tight road space. We would urge Kildare Co Co to reconsider options which maximise the cycle way width to permit a 2X2 group formation safely use the cycle path. Perhaps rethinking the Hatched Separation or Grass Strip or modular island of 1M and the Hard Strip of 1M would allow for some innovation design that would segregate motorised traffic but would also facilitate a cycle path that would allow group cycling in a 2X2 formation We appreciate your consideration of our points Naas Triathlon Club	Submitted 13.06.2024 - 23:56	A cycle lane of 1.5m has been deliberately chosen to test the absolute minimum for application to the NCN. Various sections of the R448 will have surplus space available between the marked 1.5m cycle lane and existing kerb / edge of pavement. A minimum segregation / separation width of 2m is required as per TII standard DN-GEO-03047. The grass separation will be planted with low maintenance wildflower mix and the remaining segregation types require little to no routine maintenance. KCC have consulted with the wider project team re. maintenance. In response to item 4: Design guidance within TII standards and the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) has been used as reference. As cycle facilities are to be implemented on a regional road in a rural location, higher vehicle speeds and a larger proportion of agricultural vehicles are expected. To ensure all abilities of cyclists are protected, detail TL404 from the CDM where cyclists cede priority is proposed. This is in line with Table 4.19 of the CDM. Response to item 5: Intercept surveys were undertaken at the roadside on the R448 in April 2024. 14 responses were received. The project team plans to undertake further intercept surveys during operation. Response to item 6: Notwithstanding the above, we would re-iterate that this is a pilot scheme and we welcome all feedback during and post-operation and appreciate the engagement to date A cycle lane of 1.5m has been deliberately chosen to test the absolute minimum for application to the NCN. Various sections of the R448 will have surplus space available between the marked 1.5m cycle lane and existing kerb / edge of pavement. A minimum segregation / separation width of 2m is required as per TII standard DN-GEO-03047
--------------------------	--	---	--