

We are glad to see the originally proposed puffin crossings have been changed to toucan crossings, as requested in our consultation response. We now support this scheme, but have a few concerns and some suggestions as to improvements. (The diagrams provided are low quality and zoomed out too far for key details to be ascertainable.)

At both crossings, and indeed at all toucan crossings, it is important to have the call-buttons set back far enough from the carriageway that they can safely be used by people riding larger cycles that extend forwards - most cargo cycles and some tandems - without having to stick onto the road. See <https://cityinfinity.co.uk/2024/05/19/better-toucan-crossings/>

At the A4130 crossing (Annex 1) it is unclear exactly where the "proposed staggered pedestrian guard railing" is proposed to go or what purpose it would serve, but in general we are sceptical about barriers on cycle routes. The resident response e5 seems well informed about the specific problems this might create.

We suggest that bollards be put in to prevent motor vehicle access to the "stub" area of Halse Way in between the carriageway and the existing bollards. This would stop motor vehicles being parked so as to obstruct the route, and would protect people walking and cycling from traffic. If this were done, the crossing could then be angled slightly to keep people walking and cycling on the desire line (which they are likely to stay on anyway).

This shows the space in question: some kind of place-making might also be possible.

At the B4016 / Lady Grove crossing (Annex 2), the "stub" of Cow Lane should similarly be protected from motor traffic using bollards. And the crossing could again be angled slightly to keep it closer to the desire line for people walking and cycling.

An alternative to angling these crossings would be to make them wider. On the plans they look like they are about 4 metres wide, but toucan crossings can be up to 10 metres wide. This would make trips along the route more direct, allowing people walking and cycling to stay closer to the desire line, and would reduce potential conflicts on the shared space area by avoiding sharp and awkward cycle turns.

The shared paths throughout are shown at 3 metres width. While this is consistent with LTN 1/20 "Cycle Infrastructure Design", that assumes no vertical obstacles higher than 60mm on either side of the path and no vegetation encroach. If possible, it would be good to build these paths to 3.5m, to allow for the full width of the path not necessarily being usable. (It is probably outside the scope of this scheme, but the shared path shown at the Lady Grove crossing has fairly abrupt right-angle turns that don't appear to follow the geometric design guidance in LTN 1/20.)

We would be happy to participate in co-production to discuss the detailed design and implementation of these crossings.