



## **Liffey Cycle Route Consultation Submission June 2019**

### 1.0 Introduction

Dublin Cycling Campaign is a registered charity that advocates for better cycling conditions in Dublin. Dublin Cycling Campaign is the leading member of Cyclist.ie, the Irish Cycling Advocacy Network (ICAN). Our mission is to build a more liveable city where people of all ages and abilities can cycle.

We are delighted to see progress at last on the proposed design for this core traffic corridor and iconic cycle route, after such a long wait, and overall we welcome the braos thrust of the proposal. This is already a heavily cycled route, even before any major design improvements are implemented, as can be seen from the photo below.



Morning Peak Cycle Traffic at Four Courts

But, we have some comments to make, which we feel could help to improve the design, or at the least raise potential considerations in the future iteration of this design. We list them generally below in Section 2 and then address particular issues and queries in Section 3.

We look forward to future engagement with Dublin City Council on this.

## 2.0 General Comments

2.1 A Number of Positives and Some Negatives There are a large number of positive things to complement within this proposed design, in relation to cycle infrastructure, pedestrian issues, and also actual bus facilities. We highlight these general positive issues below, but also address some areas where we feel improvements are required

2.2 Bus Stop Bypasses and Locations We note the relocation of many of the bus stops along the proposed eastward and westward routes in such a way as to optimise the stops, along with the added feature of these all being full bus stop bypasses for bicycles, thus avoiding conflict between buses and cyclists. And by locating the new cycle track on the riverside of the roadway for much of its length this conflict is avoided totally.

2.3 Pedestrian Facilities The inclusion of extra boardwalks along certain sections of the river to facilitate pedestrian movement, while costly, will greatly enhance the river for the average pedestrian and overall will lead to increased usage and safety. We also note and commend the number of new additional pedestrian crossing areas, which will enhance the walking experience. However we note a number of negative issues arising along the proposed corridor for pedestrians in a number of areas, which we will outline in detail in Section 3

- Some sections of riverside path for pedestrians are removed on a number of quays. This breaks a major desire line, particularly for visitors to the City
- There are a number of crossings not facilitated for pedestrians, despite being led to the location along proposed or existing paths

It is not clear that pedestrian needs have been fully taken into account in the design.

2.4 Segregated Cycle Path The facility of having a virtually fully 100% segregated cycle track along the spine of the Liffey is a major positive, which will encourage more users. But, the general adherence to a 2 metre (and sometimes narrower) cycle track throughout the one way route sections is at best sufficient for present

cycling levels in the City. Where possible, and there are a number of locations, the one way route width should be increased in line with the best recommendations of the National Cycle Manual - <https://www.cyclemanual.ie/manual/thebasics/width/>

2.5 Cycling Right Turns and Road Crossings At a number of junctions it is not clear how a cyclist will make a right turn, usually to cross a bridge. The design also needs to clearly indicate if all marked crossing points are Toucan crossings, or simply pedestrian crossings thus enabling cyclists to legally use these crossings.

2.6 Cycling Facilities on Bridge Crossings We note the inconsistency of the provision of excellent cycling lanes on some bridges but none on others. The reasoning for this needs to be made clear. And in reality cyclists will still continue to use those without facilities, but should receive some level of protection..

2.7 Traffic Signal Activators We presume that all junctions will include cycling activators for traffic lights, to ensure that cyclists are recognised. We would also wish to see some advance green lights being used at a number of locations in this design, for what is a very heavily trafficked corridor. These features should be indicated in the design

2.8 Tree Retention and Planting We are delighted to see so many of the existing trees along the Liffey Corridor, retained in this proposal, other than those on Bachelor's Walk and part of Eden Quay. A proposed planting regime will also help to enhance any final scheme.

## 3.0 Specific Comments

3.1 Parkgate St Area The link of the City Streets with the Phoenix Park is critical and there is much to commend in the design of this junction.

- Clarity is required on the cycle crossing of Conyngham Road - we assume it is a Toucan crossing, but this needs to be made clear, as applies to all other suggested crossings? The stacking area for right turning cyclists also needs to be made clearer.
- The section of cycle track directly outside the Criminal Courts needs to have some form of increased protection from drop-off vehicles, which is prevalent in this area.
- We wonder about the need for a right hand outbound general traffic turning lane at the Infirmary Road junction. Does this volume need to be accommodated? Are there alternative routes? This would free up potential road space.
- We note and welcome the continuation of the outbound segregated cycle track through the Infirmary Road junction, but query how outbound right turning cyclists

are facilitated here?

- We note, and welcome, the addition of a pedestrian (Toucan?) crossing on the west arm of the Infirmary Road junction on Parkgate St. This is a regularly busy pedestrian area.
- At present there is great demand for vehicle parking and delivery facilities along the north side of Parkgate St outside the shops, restaurants and businesses. This will not disappear with this new design. Some facility needs to be designed into the scheme to avoid vehicles clamming up the bus lane and cycle track.

3.2 Heuston/Frank Sherwin Bridge Complex This is an area of multi complex movements by all transport modes

- We note, and welcome, the addition of pedestrian (Toucan?) crossings in this area north of the river, but also note the lack of crossings for any pedestrian coming along the riverside either northside or southside of the river, on Frank Sherwin Bridge itself. We would have expected that movement along the river banks, in both directions, is common, and thus should be catered for?

- We question the need for the proposed boardwalks in this area on Sean Sherwin Bridge and Parkgate St. The main pedestrian movement in this area is to and from the main Heuston Station, and most of it is on Heuston Bridge, and back along the spine of the Liffey. A combination of clear signage and proper links will solve this issue. Elimination of these boardwalks would also remove the need for the large shared space on the north western corner of Sherwin Bridge, and facilitate a simpler crossing manoeuvre for cyclists.

- We are unhappy with the designed cycle crossings on both sides of Sean Sherwin Bridge, and the large curves on the bridge corners, which could be reduced.

We suggest that cycle crossing on south side for cyclists heading for Heuston Station needs to be more directly aligned with the path of travel. This facility could be achieved by stopping outbound traffic slightly further back than shown. It would also be useful to know what the proposed traffic light sequence is. Will cyclists get a full green phase?

The cycle crossing of Parkgate St in the northwest corner of Sherwin Bridge needs to be redesigned to cater clearly for cyclists heading inwards, in other words turning right. The large corner radius should be reduced, to facilitate a more direct link on and off the Bridge. It would also be useful to know what the proposed traffic light sequence is. Will cyclists get a full green phase?

- What appears to be some form of bollard protection is indicated on the drawings outside the cycle track on Sean Sherwin Bridge, but is not referenced in the Legend. Clarification is required?

- We welcome the new signalised entrance on the south bank to Guinness Brewery. This will increase safety for all vulnerable road users.

- We are unclear as to the status of entry into Temple St West on the north side, as this is shown as footpath colour on the drawings. Does this mean it is a raised

crossing entrance? If this is so then the cycle path should also remain segregated? Clarification is required on this, which also occurs at other junctions along.

### 3.3 Rory O More Bridge Area

- We note the proposed change on Watling St to a 2 way general traffic route, and have no objection, but query the reasoning, and also how this will affect signalling at the Victoria Quay/Usher's Island junction?
- No cycle facilities are provided on this bridge crossing, despite the desire line for cyclists heading to the Thomas St and Dublin 8 area?
- We are unclear as to the status of entries into Liffey St West and Ellis St on the north side, as this is shown as footpath colour on the drawings. Does this mean it is a raised crossing entrance? If this is so then the cycle path should also remain segregated? Clarification is required on this, which also occurs at other junctions along.
- No pedestrian crossing feature is provided on the northside of the Bridge along the spine of the river?

### 3.4 Beckett and Mellowes Bridge Sections

- No right turn provision for outbound cyclists from Usher's Island on to Beckett Bridge
- No pedestrian crossing on south side of Beckett Bridge, but footpaths leading pedestrians into bridge on riverside
- What appears to be some form of bollard protection is indicated on the drawings outside the cycle track on Usher's Quay, on the approach to Beckett Bridge, but is not referenced in the Legend. Clarification is required?
- We note and welcome the banning of the left hand turn from Queen St on to Arran Quay
- We propose that removing the footpath from the west side of Mellowes Bridge and having the cycle track and footpath run along the east side of this bridge makes greater sense as the footpath then aligns with the pedestrian crossing on Usher's Quay.
- We welcome the contraflow proposals on Bridgefoot St, Mellowes Bridge, and query those proposed on Queen St? Is this an error in the drawing? The Bridgefoot St south to north link is important for cyclists connecting into the eastbound river route. Please clarify cyclist use of Queen St north to south?
- We note that the Bus Connects proposals for this junction differ?
- Ellis Quay section GG shows cycle track at 1.5metre. This should be increased to at least 2 metres and riverside footpath reduced in size, as proposed boardwalk is provided. This will facilitate all modes.
- Entrance detail at John St North. Is it correct?
- We are unclear as to the status of all side road entries off Aran Quay and Usher's Quay, as these are shown as footpath colour on the drawings. Does this mean they

are raised crossing entrances? If this is so then the cycle path should also remain segregated? Clarification is required on this, which also occurs at other junctions along.

3.5 Father Matthew and O Donovan Rossa Area This area is characterised by extremely heavy traffic levels and the particular design proposal to switch the cycle route from the building side to the riverside in both directions.

- At Father Matthew Bridge no cross bridge facilities are provided for cyclists, despite this busy traffic route being heavily used by cyclists. This is not a proposal that will encourage novice or nervous cyclists to use, despite the logic of it being an important cross city route. And the same comments apply to the streets leading in from both sides.
- Right turns for cyclists on to Father Matthew Bridge appear to be proposed to be made in a double manoeuvre, rather than trying to provide any advance cycling lights to enable this to happen. Clarification is sought?
- No pedestrian crossing on south side of Bridge on riverside. This is an intensely busy pedestrian area and full wraparound crossing is required. But we broadly welcome the improved pedestrian crossings and the removal of the left turn slip lane on to Bridge St.
- The switch of the cycle route from the building side to riverside on both sides of the river is of itself bound to be difficult. The design needs to be fully right, readable, and negotiable on the ground. It is important that traffic light phasing is got right and priority given to bikes.
- We commend the greater space given to pedestrians in the area of Four Courts and on Merchants Quay
- We question the need for 3 lanes of general traffic on O Donovan Rossa Bridge and on approaching and exiting streets. There is a major opportunity to review desired traffic levels on this bridge, which has become a release valve rat run to the main cross river Bridge St - Church St route. A reduction of traffic lanes in this area would enable significant public realm opportunities.

### 3.6 Capel St to O'Connell Bridge

- We welcome the general proposed arrangements in the Capel St area, as the riverside route on both sides allows good right turning conditions, and the new boardwalk on Wellington Quay helps to provide badly needed road space for all modes.
- While not strictly part of this design brief, we suggest that the proposal on the restriction of through traffic along Bachelor's Walk and on to Eden Quay needs to be revisited, in order to improve general public transport and cycling and pedestrian paths. It could also help to save the trees proposed to be removed?
- We understand that the proposed closure of Liffey St to through traffic has been

agreed. This is not shown on the drawings. Clarification required

- The improved path widths on the building side of Bachelor's Walk and Aston Quay ensure that greater space is available at bus stops for queuing and alighting from buses
- The mechanism for cycling left turns at O Connell Bridge from the in both directions need to be clarified? What is a cyclist expected to do if turning from Bachelor's Walk into O Connell St or from Burgh Quay into D'Olier St?

### 3.7 O Connell Bridge to Talbot Memorial Bridge

- The long term links from the Liffey Cycle Route on to the developing North Strand/Amiens St Cycle Route need to be clearly defined, in particular from both Butt Bridge and Memorial Bridge
- There is no obvious cycle link from the Liffey cycle route into and from Tara St station, which of course will eventually become an even bigger transport hub. This needs to be factored in, even under present circumstances.
- The east to west crossing at the south of Memorial Bridge needs to be redesigned to ensure that cyclists heading westwards from City Quay are not discommoded as much as is indicated in these plans. For a start the curve radii need to be tightened, to generally slow southbound traffic making the turns on to the south quays, and the cycle route needs to have a more direct connection

## 4.0 Summary/Conclusion

Dublin Cycling Campaign broadly welcomes this step forward in the planning of the Liffey Cycle Route. Increased consideration has been given to pedestrians and cyclists, and to public transport users, which is a major positive for the City, and some new public realm features are added in the form of river boardwalks.

As stated above there are many positive aspects to the scheme, but also some aspects that raise queries and problems which we hope will be rectified in any future design iteration. We understand the problems that limited street widths and building lines can make for public realm designers, but overall this proposed solution should work reasonably well.

We have raised some points above related to the clarity of the drawings, and the Legend not including all features used throughout. We hope that these can be easily clarified. We have also sought clarification on other points throughout. We trust that these will be forthcoming?

We are of course at the disposal of the City Council to discuss any of the issues raised in this submission at any time.

Yours