



Unique Reference Number: FIN-C464-132

Submission:

A valuable improvement to local infrastructure; let's make it as good as possible.

Author: David Healy

Date Created: 09.05.2022 - 10:37pm

Consultation:

Sutton to Malahide Pedestrian and Cycle Scheme: Non-Statutory Public Consultation

Status: Submitted

Date Submitted: 09.05.2022 - 11:42pm

---

## Observations:

**Theme:** General Comments

### General

This infrastructure will be a vital addition to the area, facilitating a big increase in local trips by active travel modes. To do so most effectively, the details of the design have to be gotten right, including

- ensuring the design caters for people of all ages and abilities, both cycling and walking;
- maximising connectivity to local houses and destinations; and
- maximising connectivity to existing and future routes for cycling and walking which connect to this route.

The use of bevelled kerbs throughout the design is very welcome.

### **Malahide 1/ Malahide Site Layout 1.**

The details of the tie in to the Broadmeadow Greenway should be shown. In addition, this project highlights the need for an active travel route from Malahide to Swords, which was part of the original specifications for this route in 2014.

If I understand correctly the street layout proposed here is similar to the Dutch cycle street (V13 in the CROW Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic). It looks like a good proposal.

### **Malahide 2/ Malahide Site Layout 2.**

Cycling between the Townyard Lane junction and the New St. Junction should not require encroachment on pedestrian areas. It seems logical to continue the cycle track between the traffic lights and the tennis club and to specifically provide for east-west cycle movements at the lights.

### **Malahide 3**

From the New Street junction to Coast Road via behind the Tennis Club should be a segregated link not shared space.

### **Malahide 4**

As there is plenty of space here, the bus stop probably doesn't need to be moved. However the design should provide for segregation between cycling and walking, with a bus stop island or similar.

The design needs to consider the importance of the route for local people. So at every location where the Coast Road has a junction, the design needs to consider how people leaving their houses on the land side of the Coast Road can access the cycle route, for example, at Old Golf Links Road. This applies to subsequent maps also.

#### **Malahide 5**

Why would the design transition to shared space on both sides of the zebra crossing?

As with Old Golf Links Road, how will Seapark residents access the coastal route?

#### **Malahide 6**

It is welcome to see a buffer between the cycle track and carriageway. It should be a minimum of 1m wide and should be a vegetated verge except where people will be walking across it. This applies to subsequent maps also.

#### **Malahide 7**

At the Biscayne entrance, the proposed traffic lights should be designed to facilitate access to and from the cycle track without cyclists having to act like pedestrians.

#### **Robswall 1**

The southbound bus stop, presumably originally located to serve the old cluster of houses here, should be moved to where there is space to allow full segregation. Whether that is further north or south depends on analysis of where passengers are going to/coming from.

#### **Robswall 3**

With a 60km/h speed limit the grass verge between carriageway and cycle track should be a minimum 1.5m. This applies to subsequent maps also.

#### **Portmarnock 1**

An inline bus stop is probably the best solution here given the space constraints and the likely low use of this particular stop. However it's important that the bus stop pole is not in the path of people cycling.

#### **Portmarnock 3**

At the Wendell Ave. junction shared space should not be used. A segregated cycle route should continue along the coast side of the road with one or more zebra crossings across the cycle track at appropriate locations. Segregated cycle routes should be provided through the junction to link with Wendell Ave.

#### **Portmarnock 5 to 10, also two options reports**

The proposed route here needs to switch between a two-way route to the east of the carriageway for the entire stretch north of Portmarnock beach to a two-way route to the west of the carriageway to cross the Sluice River and continue to Baldoyle. That is clear. The challenge is how to provide a quality cycle route between these points. This is considered in two separate options reports. The ideal solution would be for this crossing to happen only once in any trip north or south. Instead, the combination of routes proposed has southbound cyclists switching back and

forward, crossing the carriageway 3 times rather than once. The options reports don't seem to recognise the degree to which this is undesirable for a number of reasons. My comments on the drawings in this section are subject to an overall view that the options need to be better weighed against each other taking this into account.

### **Portmarnock 5**

There is no bus stop at the location shown. Bus Stop 3594 is further south, across from Burrow Court. That location needs to be reconsidered as part of this design to put it appropriately close to the pedestrian crossing and to enable segregation of walking from cycling.

### **Portmarnock 8**

The proposed shared space section here is bounded by a large but little used and minimally landscaped open space. There's a clear opportunity to take a bit of the grass to continue the cycle track to the new crossing, provide an island bus stop, a bus shelter and nice landscaping of the open space for a net improvement all around.

### **Portmarnock 9 and 10, and options report**

The drawings in the options report don't show the bus stops. How to deal with bus stops is a central question in this location and it doesn't make sense to ignore it when choosing the best options (starting with the fact that a two-way route only has to find space for half as many bus stops as two one-way routes.)

### **Portmarnock 9**

There's room at the Carrickhill Junction for a Dutch style of junction with kerb protection for people cycling. This option should be drawn for consideration.

It's unacceptable to direct through cycling traffic onto narrow footpaths at bus stops in a busy local shopping area. Island bus stops should be used. The bus stops haven't been studied and they need to be moved to locations where island bus stops can be fitted in. The existing northbound bus stop is at a particularly congested location. The street frontage here is very varied and it should be possible to find locations which could provide island bus stops, including considering using the locations where it is proposed to retain on-street parking.

### **Portmarnock 11**

The cycle route should be segregated through the proposed new traffic lights north of the bridge, along the length of the new link to Station road and around to the existing Greenway, including over the new bridge and the new boardwalk.

### **Baldoyle 1**

The angle of approach for cyclists crossing Red Arches road needs to be correct to ensure visibility between bicycles and vehicles on the carriageway, and to ensure northbound and southbound cyclists are not brought into conflict with each other. This needs to be addressed on both sides of Red Arches road.

### **Baldoyle 2**

Given the space constraints from the location of the thatched cottage, and the value of the open space north of the Community Hall, the cycle route should cross the road to the north of the coastal cottages and go behind them.

### **Baldoyle 2 to 5**

While the area behind the Church probably has to be shared space, there is room from the pumping station southwards for segregation of walking and cycling, with people walking on the coastal side and a verge in between walking and cycling space to be used for planting, seating looking out to sea, etc.

Between bus stops 951 and 952 there is a 270m gap and between stops 952 and 953 there is a 160m gap. From stop 953 to the terminus 4381 there is a 300m gap. Clearly this can be rationalised.

### **Sutton 1 and 2 and options report**

While it is welcome to have an options report, there are some significant flaws in the assessment of the “alternative route along the coast”.

1. There are a few possible variants here. One is land take from the back gardens of the four houses being bypassed, essentially taking back the land which was transferred to them when it was created by the installation of the sewer which underlies the promenade. This variant should be considered, as should an intermediate variant (partial land take, partial cantilevered boardwalk). Additionally the appropriate height for the route should be considered with a view to protecting privacy etc. Whether this would be preferable to the residents to the loss of space at the front of their properties I don't know.

2. The assessment of the ecological impact needs to be based on correct knowledge of the existing situation. The report says:

“It should be noted that this area has not ever been subject to human disturbance/ activities and waterbirds utilise this area of the bay for that reason.”

This isn't correct. People walk on this exact route at low tide, in part to avoid the wait at the two level crossings. A number of other submissions refer to this walking route. Providing a boardwalk or similar could potentially remove or reduce this impact, especially if, as it should, it includes screening so people and dogs aren't visible to the birds.

A solution which reduced the existing impact on the conservation objectives of the estuary would be worth pursuing.

3. There's the question of where people are going. There seems to have been an assumption earlier in the design process that all of the users are travelling between Bissett's Strand in Malahide and Sutton Cross. It is very welcome that the link to the S2S has now been included in the design following previous feedback.

However, there needs to be recognition that a lot of people on the route, especially recreational users, but also local residents, will want to continue to Howth. A route north of Sutton Station would be an important link enabling people to make use of Burrow Road as a pleasant and safe route to Howth and to Burrow Beach.

Note that it would not be necessary to use Lauder's Lane to get to Sutton Station or Station Road from this route behind the houses. You could reach the station directly from the route and it would be possible to link to Station Road by the level crossing proposed in the drawing.

### **Sutton 1**

The design should show the cycle route from Strand Road safely through Sutton Station Car Park to the station bicycle parking (ideally to be expanded as we improve the safety of the access to the station.) The current situation is not ideal: buses are turning into the station, turning around and turning out, and it would be best to segregate cyclists from these movements.

## **Sutton 2**

The design shows cycling starting and ending on the footpath without any route to continue through Sutton Cross to either Howth or Sutton.

What is the purpose of the left slip lane at the Sutton Cross junction? Very few cars coming from the Dublin direction use it.

There is no existing bus stop on Station Road (shown to be retained), nor is there a bus route on the road.

While two-way cycle routes definitely have their place, especially along the coast, I don't think there's any design reason to provide a two-way route on one side of the carriageway here.

## **Conclusion**

I welcome the design work that has been done on this route, and the significant improvements from previous designs. As discussed above, I think there are some elements which need to be changed, and others which need further consideration. Overall this is a very welcome proposal and will make a big difference to the opportunity for people of all ages and abilities to get around the areas it will serve.

---

**Documents Attached:** No

**Boundaries Captured on Map:** No