Gmail

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Fwd: Comment on Planning Application Number AWDM/0748/24

1 message

Democratic Services <democratic.services@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 29 August 2024 at 12:53
To: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Shoreham-By-Cycle** <info@shorehambycycle.org.uk>
Date: Thu, 29 Aug 2024 at 12:33
Subject: Comment on Planning Application Number AWDM/0748/24
To: [redacted]<democratic.services@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Cc: Joshua Baxendale [redacted]

Dear Katy and other Democratic Services officers,

Please accept our apologies that this public query is late into you - we hope that it will be accepted in any event.

We write on behalf of Shoreham-By-Cycle to comment on Application Number AWDM/0748/24 to deal with a change to the Yacht Club's plans for the A259 and the provision for the cycle lane.

It's good news to hear that the provision for the bike lane will be widened to 3m. We note that according to the application also, it will be directly next to a wall and railings who have a height of 2.2m or 2200mm.

LTN 1/20 - the Government Guidance on cycle route design confirms at 5.5.4 (screenshot below) that where there is a vertical feature over 600mm high, the cycle needs additional width of 500mm or 0.5m to maintain the effective width of the cycle track.

Table 5-3: Additional width at fixed objects

Type of edge constraint	Additional width required to maintain effective width of cycle track (mm)
Flush or near-flush surface including low and splayed kerbs up to 60mm high	No additional width needed
Kerbs 61mm to 150mm high	200
Vertical feature from 151mm to 600 mm high	250
Vertical feature above 600 mm high	500

Additional width at fixed objects

5.5.4 Where a cycle track is bounded by a vertical feature, people will not be able to use the entire width as they will naturally be wary of riding immediately next to walls and kerbs. Designers should provide additional width as shown in Table 5-3.

equestrian traffic to avoid conflict and allow cyclists to travel at a comfortable speed (see Chapter 6). Where cycling is on-carriageway, it is assumed that the geometry provided for motor traffic will be adequate to cater for all types of cycle.

Table 5-4: Design Speed for off-carriageway cycle routes

On this basis, the plans as they are do not allow for the plans and design to be compliant with LTN 1/20. Of course this will risk having a cycle design programme that doesn't comply with the design standards that bodies like Active Travel England will expect schemes to comply with in order to fund.

WSCC Highways Agency appear not to have appreciated this in their reply to the application.

All of the above may be moot if there is going to be a buffer of some sort between the end of the cycle track and wall, but it's not clear on the application that this is going to be the case or not, so the Applicant could confirm the position if so.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Joshua Baxendale
Shoreham-by-Cycle

--
--
Shoreham-By-Cycle
shorehambycycle.org.uk

THIS IS OUR NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: info@shorehambycycle.org.uk
Please update any contacts or records you have for us.

Twitter: @ShorehamByCycle
Facebook: /ShorehamByCycle
Instagram: @shorehambycycle

--
Democratic Services - Adur & Worthing Councils

Email: democratic.services@adur-worthing.gov.uk Website: www.adur-worthing.gov.uk Address: Democratic Services, Worthing Town Hall, Chapel Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1HA