

This document is available in Welsh / Mae'r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg.

Post Consultation Report

Hamadryad – Clarence Road Zebra Upgrade

Project No: CO17119

A consultation was held on the above scheme proposals between 23rd March and 27th April 2018 with the purpose of obtaining information from the local community, in order to improve the scheme and if possible address any local concerns. Six individual responses were received from members of the public and these have been summarised as follows:

- 1 Against the proposed scheme
- 1 In Support of the Scheme
- 5 of the individuals also raised additional comments for which are outlined below

The comments and Cardiff Councils responses are summarised below. For data protection reasons, the full comments are not shown with only the main observations included. However, the response takes into consideration the full content of the comments received.

Recommendation

In view of the below it is proposed to **proceed** with the proposal subject to available funding. This will involve the upgrading of the existing tabled zebra crossing on Clarence Road Bridge by introducing a parallel cycle crossing along side the existing pedestrian crossing location.

Concerns / Comments Received:

The consultation comments are shown in *italics* with Cardiff Councils responses shown in normal print.

The below are comments received during the consultation period that are against the proposal:

Comment 1.1:

"it appears you have removed all parking at ferry road/hamadryad road which is the overspill area from pomeroy st/hunter st.

If this is removed and no zonal parking given to the whole area, we will be worse off overall. What are the proposals on resident parking increase?"

The reference to parking at the Ferry Road / Hamadryad Road junction has been assumed to be referring to parking at the Clarence Embankment / Clarence Road junction. This parking has been removed in order to ensure that this adopted footway area is safe for pedestrian use to access the school. This parking is not considered to be safe and legal parking. However, the scheme includes to revoke parking restrictions on Clarence Embankment which will create an additional approximately 4 spaces which will mitigate this loss. The loss of parking is considered necessary for the safety of vulnerable road users (in this instance particularly for school children)

The issue of resident parking is being dealt with separately and is not an element of this road safety scheme. These comments will be taken into consideration for any decisions made in relation to any resident parking provision in the area.

The below are comments received during the consultation period that are in favour of the proposal:

Comment 1.2:

"Eastern end of bridge

The proposed changes make sense and will certainly make crossing Clarence Embankment, coming from the west, much safer."

The below are additional comments that were received during the consultation period regarding other matters arising from the consultation:

Comment 1.3:

"The current arrangement at the zebra crossing is a catastrophe in waiting. Previously cyclists coming along the Taff trail had to dismount but that is no longer necessary following the recent changes. I have seen a number of close misses as many cyclists whizz along from the north and do not even reduce speed as they zoom over the crossing, often resulting in motorists having to emergency brake".

As a separate matter perhaps signage could encourage cyclists who are crossing the bridge to use the road rather than the pavements. I estimate that around 60 or 70% of cyclists use the pavements, sometimes causing pedestrians to step on to the road.

Currently there are no physical features on approach to the zebra crossing in either direction. On the south side, the sharp turn and slight upward slope of the path approaching the crossing provide will help to reduce speed of cyclists. On the north side, the path only deviates slightly on the approach but there is a slight gradient that can help to reduce speed. In view of these features, it is considered that the introduction of chicanes would represent an excessive measure which would unnecessarily inconvenience cyclists and pedestrians. However, it would be possible an appropriate number of bollards on either side of the crossing, allowing sufficient space for mobility scooters, adapted bikes and cargo bikes, in line with relevant design guidance.

The Parallel cycle zebra crossing is permitted under the revised TSRGD (Traffic Signs and Regulation General Design) and is also a standard design feature in the Welsh Government Active Travel Design Guidance. Cyclists do not have to dismount to use the crossing. However, a cyclist has to use the zebra crossing the same way as a pedestrian and should only cross the road when it is safe to do so. It is for the pedestrians or cyclists to cross the road when any vehicles approaching have come to a stop; again this is a decision for the individual user.

Where there are shared use cycle footways there must be clear signage instructing cyclists the shared use cycle footway ends, this is achieved by the introduction of tactile hazard paving adjacent to a drop kerb to allow cyclists to cycle off the footway onto the adjacent carriageway. All existing and new cycle signage will be reviewed as part of the Detailed Design stage as part of this scheme.

Commented [PM(P1): We do not install cyclist dismount signs.

Comment 1.4:

Although the chicane/zigzags are 'wide' they are most likely to slow down cyclists so much that they stop and come off their bikes, especially the most inexperienced ones, or if there are two bikes, to come face to face with each other. This will therefore restrict cyclists from using the path freely. Specifically, this seems to contradict the recommendation in paragraph 10.10.3 of the Design Guide for Active Travel. Looking at the map, the fact that there's a bend in the path leading towards the highway (from both directions) is enough to make cyclists slow down - the chicane is a step too far.

How about introducing additional measures instead of the 'slow' road markings and signs for motor vehicles, and extend the table across the whole bridge and creating a road that gives priority to cycles - in the same way as that which is being developed on the Taff Embankment? The width of the road over the bridge is too narrow to overtake safely anyway if traffic is approaching from the opposite direction. Reducing the speed restriction to 20mph would also do much to make the road a friendlier place for pedestrians and cyclists,

especially the younger ones who will be keen to cycle from Grangetown to Ysgol Hamadryad.

The proposal to "consider the provision of wide chicanes on the approaches to the above crossing to slow cyclists down whilst accessing the facilities" will cause unnecessary conflict between cyclists and pedestrians by funnelling them into the same space.

Whilst I approve of much of this scheme I seriously hope that you reconsider installing these chicanes, as we should be removing barriers to active travel not creating more of them.

The design for the proposed new-tabled zebra crossing has passed through our Cycling Team, the design is in accordance with the Active Travel Design Guide and comments regarding chicanes were discussed with the Cycling team in the initial concept design for this scheme. As this scheme is being delivered as part of the development of the Hamadryad School there are only limited funds available to delivering this part of the project. Tabling the whole bridge would significantly increase the costs and there is not the budget to look at extending the table at this location.

As part of this proposed scheme we consulted on the basis of providing chicanes in order to reduce cyclist's speeds on approach to the zebra crossing. However, following comments which were received as part of this consultation process we are proposing to replace these chicanes with bollards which will be adequately spaced to ensure cyclists are slowed down on approach to the zebra crossing. The rationale behind replacing the chicanes with bollards was that this removes a potential "bottle neck" scenario which can occur but still ensure cyclists speeds are reduced. The introduction of bollards to control cyclists on footpaths / footways is in accordance with the Welsh Government Design Guidance as part of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013. There will also be a minimum width of 1.5 metres in between these bollards. This would ensure that cyclist speeds are reduced on approach to the crossing without the requirement to create a bottle neck for pedestrians along this route.

Regarding the request for a 20mph speed limit on this road I can confirm that our Transport Vision, Strategy & Policy Team have identified that Clarence Road has been identified as one of the roads which will be included in 20mph zone for the Grangetown Area. This is on a future programme list and will be delivered when funding is available.

Comment 1.5:

*There is a proposal to change the pedestrian only crossing on Clarence Road However it appears from the map that they intend to widen the zebra crossing to include bicycles without adding light controls, this appears to me to be problematic as the Highway Code rule 79 (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/the-highway-code/rules-for-cyclists-59-to-82>) states "**Do not ride across a pelican, puffin or zebra crossing. Dismount and wheel your cycle across**". Cyclists "**are permitted to ride across**" only at Toucan crossings (Rule 80) which are light controlled.*

This is an issue because there is already a cycle crossing on Clarence Road but no one uses it and instead cycles across the zebra crossing as if they have right of way, this will continue to be an issue on a widened zebra and could result in a collision.

*The document states a definition of a "**Parallel Zebra Crossing**" in which "**drivers must give way to both cyclists and pedestrians at the crossing**" however it does not state that cyclists can remain mounted.*

I don't see why a light controlled Toucan Crossing couldn't be installed here, the road is less

busy than Penarth Road which has light controlled Toucan Crossing's at the junction with the Ely Trail:

The Parallel cycle zebra is allowed under the revised TSRGD (Traffic Sign Regulations and General Directions) and is supported by the Welsh Government Active Travel Design Guidance. Cyclists do not have to dismount to use the crossing. A Toucan crossing in this location would require pedestrians and cyclists to wait longer to cross the road, and there is also a significant cost difference between a zebra crossing and a Toucan crossing and there is not sufficient funding to look to introduce a Toucan crossing at this location. Due to the requirement to widen to the proposed zebra crossing there will also be the requirement to remove a section of guardrail to accommodate this change, this will ensure that cyclists do not cross at the location of the proposed pedestrian crossing.

Comment 1.6:

The document does not make clear if the existing grey metal barriers will be removed, at present these make it difficult to see cyclists coming along the Taff Trail and at times leads them to appear at speed across the zebra crossing leading to the potential for a collision.

Due to the requirement to widen the proposed zebra a section of guardrail will be removed or upgraded to visirail to accommodate this change. A bollard chicane will be provided in order to reduce cyclists speeds on the approach to the zebra crossing

Comment 1.7:

The document appears to show tactile paving (marked in red) at the entry to the cyclist side of the Parallel Zebra Crossing, I think this is a mistake because visually impaired people require tactile paving to assist with crossing the road. If it is put by the cycle part it might create confusion for people on foot because at worse it could be leading some people into a collision with an oncoming cyclist.

The initial draft concept plan has been designed in accordance with the Cardiff Council design standards regarding Parallel Zebra Crossings, this design will be reviewed during the detailed design stage of this project.

Comment 1.8:

Avoid adding a further barrier to the paths.

As part of this proposed scheme we consulted on the basis of providing chicanes in order to reduce cyclist's speeds on approach to the zebra crossing. However, following comments which were received as part of this consultation process we are proposing to replace these chicanes with bollards which will be adequately spaced to ensure cyclists are slowed down on approach to the zebra crossing. The introduction of bollards to control cyclists on footpaths / footways is in accordance with the Welsh Government Design Guidance as part of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013. There will also be a minimum width of 1.5 metres in between these bollards. This would ensure that cyclist speeds are reduced on approach to the crossing without the requirement to create a bottle neck for pedestrians along this route.

Comment 1.9:

Adding a dedicated, one-way cycle lane which takes the cyclist down to the path on the south of the crossing where they are forced to cross the zebra crossing as usual. This would effectively be a filter lane, rather than the current layout which would require the cyclist to make a sudden, sharp 90 degree left, then a full 180 degree turn. This idea is based on similar approaches in London.

The introduction of a dedicated one-way cycle lane will be reviewed during the detailed design stage and this would be subject to there being sufficient carriageway width at this location.

Comment 1.10:

Alternatively, if a right turn onto the crossing is valid, then a cycle-only road marking to highlight this would better inform both drivers and cyclists that this manoeuvre is to be expected. This could be a T-junction marking with the proposed additional cycle lane making which runs along the side of the zebra crossing. As it is connected to this lane, and has a bicycle symbol, it would be clear this right turn is only for cyclists (to avoid a situation where a driver thinks they can drive along the shared path).

There are no provisions within the "Traffic Signs Manual 2003" which allows additional road markings to be placed within the extents of the zebra crossing. Item 15.26 of that document states that "No other markings may be used within the controlled area, except hatched and chevron markings in the circumstances described in para 15.26."