

TRO-26-2023 A23 Active Travel Phase 1 - TRO Comments Analysis

Object/Support	Comment
Object	object to some elements of the changes to parking within the TRO. The main objection is that parking would be allowed too close to the pedestrian/toucan crossing at Springfield Road. The point of the zig zag marking the "crossing controlled area" is that no vehicles can park here as it prevents visibility of the crossing, and therefor impacts on safety. Yet in this order it is proposed to allow parking adjacent to the zig zags along the entire length of the crossing controlled area, which isn't allowed. The zig zags could be shortened to a single set (4m), but the proposed arrangement is not acceptable. Ultimately there should not be any parking allowed along the A23 as it is a critical route in the city for all road users, plus parked vehicles can get in the way of emergency vehicles passing congested areas. Also the new parking bays along Dyke Road Drive will impact of traffic flow, so I also object to those.
Support	think I support all these proposals, but particularly those that add more DYLS. However, the enforcement of loading bays in B&H is absolutely parlous. Look at any 'Loading only' bay in Brighton and 90% of the time it has a range rover in it with the driver nowhere to be seen and zero loading going on. You can also often find 7 or 8 vehicles parked on DYLS and blocking the (unprotected) cycle lane, and drivers aren't even nervous about getting a ticket because they know how little enforcement there is. As for the pavement parking on Madeira drive, the law is an absolute joke. :(
Object	I strongly support the "beefing up" of this cycle lane which I use pretty well every day. There are many places where the current arrangements are dangerous, but sadly at two of these, the Dyke Road Drive and Argyle Road junctions, the new proposal is still really inadequate and will still be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, because the priority is not clear and, whilst it's fine to have "shared spaces" the lack of space here, and the complexity of the junctions (eg so many cars exiting Springfield Road and jinking right then left into Dyke Road Drive. There should be clear priority for cycles and pedestrians at these junctions and then we would all know what to look out for.
Object	While I support the above scheme in general and would not like it to be delayed there are some flaws, including at the junctions with Argyle Road and Dyke Road Drive where the plans show the lane being interrupted.
Object	Although I am in overall support of the A23 Phase 1 London Road cycle lane in general, and do not wish to see a delay in implementation, I am very concerned about the interrupted junctions at Argyle Road and Dyke Road Drive. These are extremely dangerous points on this cycle lane, and need to be clear and uninterrupted for the safety of all. I hope these amendments can be implemented.
Object	In general I support phase 1 of the A23 cycle lane and don't want it to be delayed. However, TRO-26-2023 seems to show a number of changes that I don't think are safe for cyclists. Firstly, the new positioning of parking in dyke road drive would force eastbound cyclists towards the centre of the road where westbound motorists tend to drive. Secondly, the plan suggests that the cycle lane would be interrupted at the junctions with argyle road and dyke road drive. The cycle lane should instead be continuous as this would improve cyclist safety.
Withdrawn	I oppose the TRO-26-2023, but support the A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane in general, and so I do not want it to be delayed at all. As currently configured the details in the TRO threatens to undermine safe, easy cycling on the new protected lane. The new protected lane should be continuous, like the adjacent carriageway, but TRO-26-2023 makes it look like it would be interrupted at junctions with Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive. The interruptions would increase collision risks and significantly reduce ease of cycling.
Object	While I fully support the overall scheme (A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane) there a number of issues with this TRO. The route should be continuous but the interruptions for junctions - Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive - will increase collision risk and make the scheme less safe. The parking bays on Dyke road drive would make the scheme less safe for cyclists - forcing east bound cyclists into the centre of the road.
Object	It threatens to undermine safe, easy cycling on the new protected lane. The new protected lane should be continuous, like the adjacent carriageway, but TRO-26-2023 makes it look like it would be interrupted at junctions with Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive. The interruptions would increase collision risks and significantly reduce ease of cycling. The TRO plans also show changes to parking bays on Dyke Rd Drive and they'd force eastbound cyclists towards the centre of the road, where westbound motorists tend to drive. It's not safe.

Support	3
Object	22
Total	25

TRO-26-2023 A23 Active Travel Phase 1 - TRO Comments Analysis

Object	<p>I support the A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane in general and would like to see it proceed. However I request a review of the following as I think it threatens to undermine safe, cycling on the new protected lane.</p> <p>The new protected lane should be continuous, but TRO-26-2023 makes it look like it would be interrupted at junctions with Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive. The interruptions increase collision risk and significantly reduce ease of cycling. Existing cycle schemes have these discontinuities which increases danger to cyclists and makes them less likely to be used. We should seek to avoid repetition of these mistakes.</p> <p>The TRO plans also show changes to parking bays on Dyke Rd Drive which will push eastbound cyclists towards the centre of the road, where westbound motorists tend to drive. It's not safe. There must be a better solution.</p>
Object	<p>Whilst I support the A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane and do not wish it to be delayed, I object to this TRO as it will break the cycle lane and the parking spaces planned will force cycling residents out into traffic. If you are going to do a cycle lane, then please do it properly and completely.</p>
Object	<p>Zone Q</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dyke Road Drive – Removal of double yellow lines and the installation of 2 shared parking bays on the north side near the junction with Preston Road <p>Though I support the rest of the proposal, I object to this part because it creates danger for cyclists. In this proposal, no account is taken of the heavy usage of Dyke Road Drive by cyclists. Dyke Road Drive is one of the most popular east-west routes for cycling in this part of the city, though no provision is made for it. Though it is a street in which a great deal of anti-social driving takes place due to the parking design, it remains the least steep incline for cyclists to travel west on and so is heavily used - more than many of the routes where cycle provision has been made.</p> <p>When descending Dyke Road Drive and trying to turn south, cyclists have to compete with vehicles speeding to the junction at Preston Road. Having to negotiate parked cars at the junction makes the route more hazardous.</p>
Object	<p>I support the improvements in printiple but:</p> <p>The new protected lane should be continuous, like the adjacent carriageway, but TRO-26-2023 makes it look like it would be interrupted at junctions with Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive. The interruptions would increase collision risks and significantly reduce ease of cycling.</p>
Object	<p>I support the A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane in general but feel the Argyle Rd and Dyke road Drive interruption to cycle flow could lead to more accidents.</p>
Support	<p>I support this proposal in general and want it to be implemented as soon as possible, so that I, my family and neighbours can finally cycle safely on a route that I use every day and always worries me. BUT: PLEASE DO NOT FORCE CYCLISTS GOING STRAIGHT ON, ON THE NEW CYCLE PATH BESIDE PRESTON ROAD, TO GIVE WAY TO ROAD USERS TURNING INTO OR OUT OF ARGYLE ROAD AND DYKE ROAD DRIVE. This is contrary to the Highway Code, LTN 1/20 and common sense, and it's extremely dangerous. Please also do not move car parking spaces on Dyke Road Drive into areas that force cyclists out into fast moving motor traffic coming in the opposite direction. Dyke Road Drive has had a speeding car problem for as long as I've lived in this area (30 years) despite it having an effectively blind corner. Rather than moving parking places, how about removing some and adding speed controlled traffic lights? It could default to green for all vehicles travelling at or below 20mph, but go red when it senses traffic going faster. Put one at the top of the hill and one at the bottom.</p>
Object	<p>I support the A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane in general and do not want it to be delayed at all. However this TRO needs to be re-worked.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The new protected lane should be continuous, like the adjacent carriageway, but TRO-26-2023 makes it look like it would be interrupted at junctions with Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive. The interruptions would increase collision risks and significantly reduce ease of cycling. 2) The linkage from the contra flow cycle lane on Ditchling Rise to the main cycle lane is still poorly designed - it doesn't extend properly around the parking and it should all join up in clearly-marked lanes. 3) Generally, this whole "shared space" idea at Argyle Rd/Ditchling Rise is a mess. 4)Permit parking is in short supply on Ditchling Rise and it is very difficult to park NOW. I object to making the bays shared pay and display.

TRO-26-2023 A23 Active Travel Phase 1 - TRO Comments Analysis

Object	<p>Cycling and walking first. Amsterdam, London and potentially Brighton.</p> <p>even where there is an uninterrupted bike lane @ Coombe Road on A27, it just allows cars to double park. Enforced bike lanes to ensure cyclists safely.</p> <p>I am a car owner too.</p>
Object	<p>These proposals are not in line with current design standards set out by Gear Change strategy. Cycle lanes should be continuous with priority for cyclists. This TRO will make cycling on London Road more dangerous and increase the chances of collisions, therefore I strongly object to these changes.</p>
Object	<p>Not safe to cycle</p>
Support	<p>I support the A23 Phase 1 London Road cycle lane and I am keen to see it completed. However, the parking bays changes proposed in Ditchling Rise and Dyke Road Drive are likely to send cyclists to the middle of the road, risking collisions with cars.</p>
Object	<p>I support the A23 Phase 1 London Road cycle lane in general, but oppose the TRO 26 for the following reasons: The Argyle Road and Dyke road Drive junctions appear to interrupt the cycle lanes. This could cause confusion and increase the potential of accidents especially as the new Highway Code guidelines suggest that cyclists AND pedestrians have right of way when crossing a junction along a main road. Any pinch points in cycling infrastructure serves to put off unconfident cyclists rather than encourage them. The changes to the parking bays under the viaduct and on Ditchling Rise would also encourage more visitor parking and further endanger cyclists by forcing them into the centre of the road in conflict with cars.</p>
Object	<p>I do support the A23 Phase 1 London Rd cycle lane in general and do not want it to be delayed at all. However there are safety flaws with the TRO. The new protected lane should be continuous, like the adjacent carriageway, but TRO-26-2023 makes it look like it would be interrupted at junctions with Argyle Rd and Dyke Rd Drive. The interruptions would increase collision risks and significantly reduce ease of cycling. The TRO plans also show changes to parking bays on Dyke Rd Drive and they'd force eastbound cyclists towards the centre of the road, where westbound motorists tend to drive. This is not safe.</p>
Object	<p>Overall I welcome the proposed new A23 London Road Phase 1 cycle lane, as any provision to make cycling safer is much appreciated. However, I am concerned about the interruptions to the cycle lane at Argyle Road and Dyke Road Drive which means the cycle lane would not be continuous. I think this would be a danger for cyclists using the lane. I am also concerned about the proposed parking bays on Dyke Road Drive, which would result in cyclists having to pull out into the road. If these amendments could be implemented, it would complete an otherwise excellent scheme.</p>
Object	<p>It appears to interrupt junctions at Argyle Road and Dyke Road Drive I fully support the bicycle lane on the London Road and look forward to using a safe, secure route</p>
Object	<p>The location of the new bus stop on the plans has been put in front of the dental surgery as possibly you feel there is more space as our boundary is not correctly marked on the maps (we will contest this) The space for the walk way adjacent to the bus stop when the residential bins are put out will be very minimal, and we feel will be dangerous for pedestrians. We can see no reason the Bus stop could not be a further 10m up Preston road towards the park as its current location will have a massive impact on the junction especially people turning left out of Dyke road drive. The loss of the dental practice parking we feel will have a large impact on the elderly community receiving treatment as we specialize in dentures. Patient care is our priority and we feel that this removing our current amount of disabled parking bays will reduce the amount of care we can offer. We are a referral practice receiving elderly pts from Eastbourne to Worthing for treatment.</p>

TRO-26-2023 A23 Active Travel Phase 1 - TRO Comments Analysis

Object

I am strongly in support of the aim of improved active travel infrastructure. The whole A23 route is in urgent need of re-design. I DO NOT object to controlled parking, no parking or double yellow lines. My points are about using junctions as a cyclist.

The TRO isn't properly dealing with cycling to/from and at side roads off Preston Road i.e. Dyke Road Drive and Ditchling Rise.

The Statement of Reasons should have included reference to LTN1/20 design standards.

People cycling need to have priority over motor vehicles, and this needs to be more clearly reflected in the design e.g. with the cycle lane going across the bottom of Dyke Road Drive.

Dyke Road Drive is also used by people cycling up and down (and it avoids the unpleasant and congested New England Road). However, the proposed new parking spaces at the bottom of Dyke Road Drive combined with drivers' going too fast and taking a path regardless of people cycling, will cause cyclists to be squeezed into inadequate space and increase the risk of collisions. There are several other safety issues i.e. the increased risk of dooring, drivers manoeuvring in and out of parking spaces causing a hazard, cyclists facing oncoming traffic and the pre-existing unhelpful camber of the road.

The proposal for the western end of Ditchling Rise also has parking in the wrong places making it awkward for cycling, as people are supposed to go round parked cars and face oncoming vehicles. The arrangement is not good at present either, of course, but we are hoping to see greater improvements. People won't necessarily want to come off the road into shared space if they're aiming to turn right or go across to Argyle Road, but it looks like this is expected in the proposal.

The junction of Argyle Road and Ditchling Rise junction needs to be better aligned for people to cycle across.

Springfield Road needs to be made two way for cycling so that the toucan at the junction with the A23 has greater value i.e. permits onward eastbound journeys.

In general, I am in support of the changes to Preston Road and the A23 otherwise.