

Stillorgan Road Cycle Improvements (UCD Accessibility) Scheme

Public Consultation Report

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

07 June 2018

Notice

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely as information for Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council and use in relation to the above scheme

WS Atkins Ireland Limited assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of or arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

This document has 30 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Origin-ated	Checked	Reviewed	Author-ised	Date
Rev 0	Draft	HM	NG	DM	DM	18 May 18
Rev 1	Draft – GDPR data removed	DM	NG	DM	DM	24 May 18
Rev 2	Draft – GDPR data removed	NG	NG	MF	MF	29 May 18
Rev 3	Draft	NG	NG	SW	MF	31 May 18
Rev 4	Draft	NG	NG	SW	MF	06 June 18
Rev 5	Draft	NG	NG	SW	MF	07 June 18

Client signoff

Client	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Project	Stillorgan Road Cycle Improvements (UCD Accessibility) Scheme
Job number	5158634
Client signature / date	

Table of contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	5
1.1. Context	5
1.2. Public Consultation	5
1.3. Public Submissions	5
2. Main Themes / Summary	6
3. Submission Sheet Responses	7
4. Conclusion	29
5. Next Steps	29
Tables	
Table 3-1 - Public Consultation Comments and Responses	7

Public Consultation Report

1. Introduction

1.1. Context

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, in conjunction with the National Transport Authority, is currently preparing plans to carry out pedestrian and cycle safety improvements on Stillorgan Road near UCD from the Rise to the footbridge midway between the Fosters Avenue junction and Belfield flyover at the pedestrian footbridge. The project will also seek to provide a new safe crossing facility on the R138 Stillorgan Road Dual Carriageway, providing a link to the existing outbound cycle infrastructure along the Stillorgan Road carriageway.

Further safety enhancements are also proposed at Fosters Avenue, in particular, measures to improve safety for cyclists where currently there are conflicts between inbound cyclists on the R138 and motorists turning left onto Fosters Avenue.

1.2. Public Consultation

The scheme was presented on the 28th May 2018 to council members at County Hall, Marine Road, Dún Laoghaire. The scheme was also presented to council members at Dundrum Area Office Dundrum on the 6th June 2018.

The Council sought views from the public to help inform the scheme design. This Scheme was placed on public display in the offices of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council from April 10th to May 15th, 2018 and was also available for viewing on the Council's website. Submissions were invited from the public on the draft outline proposals. This report summarises the pertinent issues raised by the public and offers comment on each.

1.3. Public Submissions

Following a 4-week consultation period, a total of 54 submissions were received.

The following percentages are the proportion of Public feedback submissions that mentioned that issue outlined below:

- Fosters Ave Junction safety issue, i.e. left turning traffic conflict **(13%)**
- Proposed Cycle Track Layout between Fosters Ave and new UCD entrance **(13%)**
- Toucan Crossing of R138 / Stillorgan Road / Staggered arrangement **(20%)**
- Buffers between cyclists and traffic / total segregation **(35%)**
- Additional / alternative crossing location **(9%)**
- Deficiencies in the current cycle infrastructure outside of scheme limits **(10%)**

2. Main Themes / Summary

Of the 54 submissions received the majority have expressed that they welcome the safety enhancement scheme. It is noted that these are not made without some concerns. The most prominent and recurring of these concerns are summarised below.

The review of the submissions received has highlighted a number of recurring issues as follows:

- i. There is concern that the proposals presented do not address the safety issue identified with vehicles turning left onto Fosters Avenue and cyclists continuing inbound along the R138. There are many calls for fully segregated cycle facilities at this location.
- ii. The Contra-flow cycle track between Fosters Avenue and the proposed UCD Access was frequently raised with comments on its apparent anti-intuitive layout.
- iii. There were several requests to provide a single stage crossing as opposed to the proposed staggered crossing of the R138 at Fosters Ave junction.
- iv. There were a number of submissions suggesting that further longitudinal buffer spaces are provided between the cycle tracks and adjacent bus lanes.
- v. There have been requests to provide a crossing of the R138 at the same location of the existing footbridge at The Rise. Such requests are made on the back of elderly and/or mobility impaired road users consider it too difficult to negotiate the steps and feeder ramps of the footbridge.
- vi. Many observations related to other sections of the Stillorgan Road cycle facilities outside the extents of the scheme, calling for their improvement.

It is considered that the majority of these concerns are fundamental design considerations which have already been addressed in the early stages of the design development of this project.

The remainder are detail items that can be adequately addressed at the detailed design stage. This is reflected in the detailed response comments provided within this document.

This report will be reviewed by Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council and the comments therein will be given further consideration.

3. Submission Sheet Responses

Details of individual comments from all submissions received have been summarised below in Table 3-1 where a written response is also provided.

Table 3-1 - Public Consultation Comments and Responses

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
P001	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What move are you doing to the BUS stop on Stillorgan road between The Rise and Foster Avenue It's not clear on the plans. You are moving the Cycle shelter to below the cycle path in increasing the number of cycle stands. But can't make out what you're doing with the bus stop. 2. Are UCD going to give you some room to make a Cycle path on the Foster Avenue??? You have no room currently and If there is a new junction into Foster avenue at the north Ave lights, there should be a cycle path at least from there to Stillorgan Road. 3. You refer to pedestrians crossing roads unsafely YES they don't want to walk up and over the bridges yet they are 20m away from them. Just don't understand. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The bus stop will be relocated further south by approx. 12m. This is not a material change. 2. The scheme brief currently does not extend to provision of cycle facilities on Fosters Ave. 3. The scheme will now provide a safe location to cross the R138 dual carriageway.
P002	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am a resident of Stillorgan who regularly cycles into UCD and town along the N11 across Foster's Avenue. While I am pleased that consideration is being given to improving safety at this extremely dangerous junction, where cyclists are commonly not noticed by drivers turning left into Foster's Avenue, I do not believe that the current design offers sufficiently improved safety for cyclists and submit that it should be rejected. 2. A new design should keep cycling completely separate from motorised traffic through the junction with Foster's Avenue. Two-way cycling sections should not to be on the opposite side of the N11. I also understand that the proposal for a 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further consideration will be given to providing more segregation between the left turn and the cyclists during the detailed design stage. A short two-way section of off-road cycle track is required to effectively link the proposed UCD entrance to the crossing facility at Foster's Ave. The proposed layout (i.e. cycling on the right) avoids unnecessary conflict with inbound cyclists along the Stillorgan Road, thus not interfering with their journey. The staggered crossing is required to satisfy traffic conditions. Crossing all traffic and bus lanes of the dual carriageway with a single stage crossing would require extensive green time for pedestrians – this would have a major negative impact on the junction capacity and would lead to unacceptable traffic delays at the junction. Additionally a long single stage crossing could result in

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>staggered crossing is contrary to national guidelines, and therefore submit that it should not form part of the design.</p>	<p>unsafe behaviours by all users with the possibility of vulnerable road users being left stranded on the R138 carriageway. The staggered arrangement will safely accommodate a two-stage crossing.</p>
P003	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep cyclists separate through the junction with Fosters Ave 2. Don't put counter intuitive opposite side cycling 3. Not a staggered crossing, this is ample time to cross the full extent. 4. Remove the confusing counter intuitive cycling outbound too. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to P002 above. 2. Refer to P002 above. 3. Refer to P002 above. 4. The outbound cycling arrangement does not form part of this brief.
P004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed layout of the scheme leaves a lot to be desired. There are many faults with the plan, too many to list individually. I suggest the plan goes back to the drawing board completely, consults with designs previously completed in cycling-dominant countries (i.e. Netherlands, Denmark), and hopefully a better, fully thought-out design will come into fruition. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All options to improve pedestrian and cyclist facilities were examined in line with the NCM. The current layout is optimised taking into account scheme objectives and established pedestrian desire lines.
P005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dublin Bus wish to make some brief observations on the proposals presented in relation to this scheme. The bus stop between Fosters Avenue and St Thomas' Road is a particularly busy stop. Dimensions are not provided but we cannot afford a reduction in bus bay space at this location. 2. At the same location, bus egress from the stop can be difficult due to queuing left turning traffic into Fosters Avenue. This impacts journey times and reliability. No yellow box markings or bus priority measures have been provided in the proposal. 3. The two-way cycle path between Fosters Avenue and UCD is arranged in the opposite direction to normal traffic flows. This raises a potential for cyclist/cyclist collision due to confusion. The proximity of the cycle track to the bus lane 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reduction in bus bay capacity will occur. 2. The provision of yellow box markings shall be included at the detailed design stage. The provision of bus priority measures will also be considered and provided where feasible. 3. The arrangement of the cycle tracks at this location is designed to avoid potential conflict between inbound cyclists and outbound cyclists emerging from the new UCD access. The layout will

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>means that any uncertainty between cyclists may cause a cyclist to swerve too close to or possibly into the cycle lane.</p> <p>4. Dublin Bus are available to review proposals as they develop.</p>	<p>ensure inbound cyclists can progress beyond UCD per the current arrangement, unhindered and unobstructed. This arrangement is as recommended in the NCM. Is safer due to relative speeds between cyclists and cars/buses and reduces conflict at junctions.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p>
P006	<p>1. I support any initiative to increase the segregation of vulnerable road users from traffic, and the enhancement of cyclist safety.</p> <p>2. However, I feel that the proposed design could be made safer and less confusing.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. All options to improve cycling layout were examined. The current layout is optimised taking into account scheme objectives and established pedestrian desire lines.</p>
P007	<p>1. I approve particularly of YIELD SIGN for cycles joining the N11 cycle lane as city bound cyclists often travel at unsafe speeds and collisions are inevitable.</p> <p>2. Please let me know what parts of the Rise are intended to have a cycle lane. As a local resident I am concerned about further pressures on parking.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. The provision of cycle lanes at The Rise will be limited to the immediate approach to the R138 junction. No impact on parking provision is anticipated.</p>
P008	<p>1. I would like to see a pedestrian crossing at the bridge on the Stillorgan Road linking Fosterbrook and the Radisson with the bus stop on the other side. The students of the schools (Coláiste Eoin and Coláiste Íosagáin) use the bridge but there are elderly residents and those with mobility problems who find this difficult. I also see a number of pedestrians literally 'taking risks' walking through traffic that is slow or at a standstill in rush hour traffic in the morning going into town. I really believe that a pedestrian crossing is a necessity.</p> <p>2. There is some confusion among motorists and cyclists regarding filter lanes turning right onto The Rise and Foster's</p>	<p>1. To provide a crossing at this junction would require significant works and changes to this junction and these are outside of the scope of this project.</p> <p>2. Traffic signal sequencing will be examined further and optimised where possible during the detailed design phase of the project.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>Avenue off the N11. If a filter light indicates turning left there is quite often a cyclist at high speed going in the direction of town. I would welcome some kind of signage or other scheme that would lessen this confusion.</p> <p>3. I attended a meeting in the Dundrum office earlier this year where key Council staff and the consultant engineers presented this proposal. I was informed that this scheme would not have any adverse effect on traffic in the Mount Merrion area and would like assurances that this is still the case.</p>	<p>3. For avoidance of doubt, it would not be possible to insert a signalised crossing and have no impact on traffic. Various options were assessed and the proposed option had the least impact. The current proposal will have a minor negative impact on traffic – however, this impact is marginal and is unlikely to be noticeable to motorists.</p>
P009	<p>1. Please give serious thought to a "Pedestrian Crossing" at Fosters Ave. I have serious disability issues and was awarded disability benefit by the Department of Social Protection in 2005. I use the bus service no. 46a both to go to the city centre and Dunlaoighre. Currently a large number of bus users cross the N11 by trying to predict the traffic lights which is highly dangerous. It is only a matter of time before someone is badly injured or killed.</p>	<p>1. The scheme proposals will address this issue by having pedestrian crossings on both fosters avenue and the R138.</p>
P010	<p>1. It would be of great help if a pedestrian crossing could be arranged at the end of the Rise to facilitate us old people.</p>	<p>1. Refer to item P008 above.</p>
P011	<p>1. I believe that the proposal to provide a new pedestrian/cycle entrance to UCD between Foster Avenue and the Belfield Flyover is a sensible one.</p> <p>2. I am relieved to note that the scheme does not reintroduce any element of the ill-judged and badly-designed cycle lane scheme for Foster Avenue which was proposed some years ago.</p> <p>3. I am pleased to note the recognition of "the safety concern" at the inbound cycle track where it meets Foster Avenue.</p> <p>4. As a motorist who has occasion to turn from the inbound lanes of Stillorgan Road into Foster Avenue, daily, I find it extremely difficult, even with the benefit of a good wing</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>mirror, to detect a cyclist approaching at speed from behind the bus shelter and determined - regardless of the phasing of the traffic lights - to go on towards UCD or the city. I am amused therefore to note that your objective now is to enhance the safety for users of the cycle lane, disregarding the problems for motorists who are attempting to turn safely and reasonably quickly into Foster Avenue.</p> <p>5. The proposed solution will certainly improve the situation but will do nothing to prevent cyclists approaching the junction at speed (with the benefit of the gradient) and pressing on across Foster Avenue without regard to the setting of the lights. Would it be out of the question to consider introducing some kind of chicane on the cycle track which would at least at least force cyclists to slow down?</p>	<p>5. Design guidance in the form of the National Cycle Manual require measures to promote cycling as the preferred method of travel and require the designers to provide facilities which permit good cycle progression, minimal time delays and which are inherently safe. The detailed design stage may examine further potential to provide the cyclist with priority over traffic turning left onto Fosters Avenue in a safe and efficient manner. Further consideration will be given to providing more segregation between the left turn and the cyclists during the detailed design stage</p>
P012	<p>1. I'm not sure the cycle track needs to go in to UCD at fosters avenue and disrupt the walking/running track that is there. It will also affect the trees that are there.</p>	<p>1. Established pedestrian and cyclist desire lines have informed the development of an internal UCD cycle network, part of which requires this new entrance. The running tracks will not be disturbed. Note the proposed entrance and any modifications to the internal footpaths at UCD will be subject to a separate planning application and do not form part of this project.</p>
P013	<p>1. Need to ensure that the new surface does not become pitted and bumpy like the current red stone surface up to the main UCD entrance.</p> <p>2. It's a pity you're not including the stretch of cycle path between Oatlands College and Foster's Avenue, as there are a few bus stops that still don't have the bike lanes routed behind them.</p>	<p>1. Noted. This will be considered further at detailed design stage.</p> <p>2. Noted. This is currently outside the scope of this particular scheme.</p>
P014	<p>1. Extended to the DCC boundary. Over all condition of majority cycle track on N11 is poor.</p>	<p>1. Noted. This is currently outside the scope of this particular scheme.</p>
P015	<p>1. I don't cycle because I'm afraid of getting hit by cars/buses near campus. It's busy and pedestrians and cars do not always obey traffic signals, making it a dangerous place to cycle</p>	<p>1. Noted. This scheme will remove a proportion of pedestrians and cyclists from the main UCD access at the Belfield flyover (i.e. those accessing UCD from the south).</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
P016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would really love to see better cycle lane from Belfield flyover to donnybrook. 2. The traffic lights on Belfield flyover should have an advanced stop line as well as cyclist orange light when there is pedestrian green light. Also, cyclist priority and cycle lane elevation at those traffic lights, as cars can encroach often. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. This is currently outside the scope of this particular scheme. 2. Noted. This is currently outside the scope of this particular scheme.
P017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The surface is atrocious in parts to the point where cyclists just don't use the lane provided and cycle in the bus lane. 2. The cycle lane is merged in and out with pedestrian paths and bus stops with absolutely no markings or consideration for the safety of any users. 3. There are a significant number of drains and man holes in the cycle lanes that have to be swerved to be avoided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. The proposed scheme will provide a refreshed high-quality cycling surface. 2. The interface with bus stops and signalised crossing points is considered and the proposed layout design is developed such that inter-visibility between all users, particularly at bus stops, is increased. The design of signage, markings and grade separation will be a matter for the detailed design phase. 3. These will be a matter for the detailed design phase. The design will seek to minimise the location of any such hazards in the cycle lanes / tracks.
P018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For a start, scrap all the pedestrian reductions (like converting the longer convenient footpaths to cycle tracks) and the anti-pedestrian measures (like getting rid of left slips thereby forcing pedestrians to wait - after all, that's the real reason for getting rid of slips - come on guys, admit it - it doesn't really have all that big of an effect on cars, does it?). 2. In fact, road reductions hit the big vehicles like buses (and the passengers thereon) hardest - you don't need to be Einstein to figure that one out. That's why I'm all for rail and light rail - the uncompromising nature of tramways renders them cycle lobby proof! 3. Also, it's time that motor tax was scrapped (as motorists, we already pay that in fuel excise) and replaced with Road Tax so that all road users (bar pedestrians) pay their fair share proportionately. Cyclists should also hold insurance - again, it's only fair. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scheme does not include any "pedestrian reductions" or "anti-pedestrian measures". 2. Rail and light rail alternatives are not possible / feasible for this scheme. 3. Motor Taxation policy and cyclist insurance is outside the scope of this project.
P019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access from Fosters Avenue to this redevelopment of cycle lane on Stillorgan road should be looked at. While probably outside the scope of this review, consideration should be 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. This is currently outside the scope of this particular project.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>given to a grade separated cycle lane (similar to that in Churchtown) that would run from under the Luas bridge in Dundrum to Goatstown, Mount Anville Road, Foster's Ave. The road is sufficiently wide along this entire stretch to facilitate this (bar existing Goatstown crossroad layout). This would further open safe cycling routes to those accessing UCD with an almost complete off-road cycle route stretching as far as Templeogue.</p>	
P020	<p>1. Better traffic lanes for the motorist on the road leading in to Donnybrook would be better to ease congestion which is bad seven days a week.</p>	<p>1. Noted. This is currently outside the scope of this particular project.</p>
P021	<p>1. The width of the cycle lanes - some bus operators e.g. Executive Express travel too close and too fast. 2. Condition of lanes - cycle lanes need to be smoother (rough but not bumpy), swept regularly, especially after storms, ice/snow, technically maintained (lines painted, red surfaces not patchy).</p>	<p>1. Cycle lanes will be widened in accordance with current design guidance. These measures are included in the current proposals. 2. The proposed scheme will provide refreshed high-quality cycling surfaces. The ongoing maintenance issues are currently outside the scope of this particular project.</p>
P022	<p>1. Conflict with Bus Stop, and alighting passengers especially at The Rise and Donnybrook. 2. Having to yield at multiple points along the route. 3. Getting cut off by left turning traffic at Trees Road, Fosters, UCD, Donnybrook and Eglington Roads</p>	<p>1. The interface with bus stops and signalised crossing points is considered and the proposed layout design is developed such that inter-visibility between all users, particularly at bus stops, is increased. 2. Noted. The detailed design stage may examine further cycle priority measures, but unlikely that all requirements for cyclists to YIELD could be removed. 3. The detailed design stage may examine further potential to provide the cyclist with priority over traffic turning left onto Fosters Avenue. . Further consideration will be given to providing more segregation between the left turn and the cyclists during the detailed design stage. Other areas mentioned are currently outside the scope of this particular project.</p>
P023	<p>1. Stillorgan Road Cycle Improvements Scheme - 5158634_HTR_DR_0101 2. The existing footbridge should be upgraded to accommodate cyclists -allowing a smooth transition from</p>	<p>1. Noted. 2. An upgrade to the existing footbridge is considered unfeasible and would not adequately address the project objectives.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>cycle track to bridge ramp which will provide a safe crossing point for cyclists. According to the background analysis to the scheme, “Pedestrian and cyclist behaviour has been observed and users tend to cross the dual carriageway on foot in an uncontrolled unsafe manner”. This would alleviate the need to take unnecessary risk crossing the Stillorgan Road Carriageway.</p> <p>3. No segregated cycle track to accommodate cyclists looking to turn left from Fosters Avenue onto the Stillorgan Road inbound. Requires a segregated cycle track which will filter left joining up with the Stillorgan Road inbound cycle track.</p> <p>4. No segregated cycle track to accommodate cyclists looking to turn left from Stillorgan Road inbound onto Fosters Avenue. Requires segregated cycle track which will filter running adjacent to the church at Fosters Avenue.</p> <p>5. No plans to replace the tree which is located next to the proposed relocated bus shelter and proposed relocated bicycle stands. The tree needs to be replaced. The large green area around the proposed relocated cycle stands is devoid of trees and landscaping. Additional tree planting would be welcome.</p> <p>6. Poor junction layout which requires cyclists to mix with the motor traffic – too much emphasis on the prioritization of motor traffic and does not incorporate the Dutch style design layout which is deployed to segregate motor traffic from pedestrian and cyclist traffic.</p> <p>7. Prioritise pedestrian/cycling traffic by introducing an elevated road surface to match the footpath/cycle track height running along the Stillorgan Road inbound, allowing for continuity of the footpath/cycle track along the Stillorgan Road at the junction of Fosters Avenue.</p> <p>8. It will create an additional awareness for motorists turning left onto Fosters Avenue that cyclists maybe proceeding straight.</p>	<p>Disagree. The footbridge is not having any impact on the unsafe pedestrian and cyclist behaviour. Upgrades are unlikely to address this issue and may even give rise to other issues, e.g. conflicts between cycle traffic and mobility impaired users, insufficient deck width, etc.</p> <p>3. Further consideration will be given to providing more segregation between the left turn and the cyclists during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>4. Further consideration will be given to providing more segregation between the left turn and the cyclists during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>5. The inclusion of replacement planting of trees will be considered further at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>6. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.</p> <p>7. The provision of an elevated table crossing of the junction would not be appropriate at this location. Other cycle priority measures may be examined in further detail at the detailed design stage i.e. through traffic signalling, subject to detailed traffic assessment.</p> <p>8. Noted</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>9. Prioritise pedestrian/cycling traffic crossing from Stillorgan Road Outbound footpath/cycle track to the Stillorgan Road inbound footpath/cycle track (vice versa) by matching the footpath/cycle track height running along the Stillorgan Road allowing for continuity of the footpath/cycle track.</p> <p>10. It will create traffic calming measures at the junction and prioritise pedestrian/cyclist safety.</p> <p>11. Poor junction layout which requires cyclists to mix with motor traffic at The Rise - too much emphasis on the prioritization of motor traffic and does not incorporate the Dutch style design layout which is deployed to segregate motor traffic from pedestrian and cyclist traffic.</p> <p>12. No segregated cycle track to accommodate cyclists looking to turn left from Stillorgan Road Inbound into the Rise.</p> <p>13. The existing footbridge at The Rise junction should be upgraded to accommodate cyclists -allowing a smooth transition from cycle track to bridge ramp which will provide a safe crossing point for cyclists, introducing this infrastructure will eliminate the need to have an "on-road" cycle track between 2 motor lanes which mixes cyclists with motorists - prioritize cyclist safety.</p> <p>14. Prioritize pedestrian/cycling traffic by introducing an elevated road surface to match the footpath/cycle track height running along the Stillorgan Road Inbound, allowing for continuity of the footpath/cycle track along the Stillorgan Road Inbound at the junction with The Rise.</p>	<p>9. A safe crossing facility is provided as part of the scheme proposals. It would not be appropriate to provide a raised table crossing of the dual carriageway.</p> <p>10. Noted. See item 10 above.</p> <p>11. The complete upgrade of the junction at The Rise / Stillorgan Road falls outside of the scheme brief. However, measures to provide a junction bypass for cyclists travelling from The Rise to Stillorgan Rd inbound are included in the scheme layout.</p> <p>12. An existing facility addressed this issue. However, this area falls outside the scope of this particular project.</p> <p>13. This falls outside the scope of this particular scheme.</p> <p>14. This falls outside the scope of this particular scheme.</p>
P024	<p>1. I'm not convinced that the wide loop behind the bus shelter between Fosters Avenue and The Rise should be preserved. It leads to cyclists suddenly appearing back on the N11 just before Fosters Avenue. I think if the cycle lane continued alongside the N11 in FRONT of the bush shelter, motorists would be more aware of the cyclists.</p>	<p>1. This bus stop is particularly busy, services by many Dublin Bus routes as well as private operators. The provision of an on-road cycle lane in this area would introduce cyclists to an area where there are already conflicting traffic movements, i.e. left turning vehicles vs departing buses. It is also noted that a previous scheme to improve cycle safety in this area removed the on-road arrangement in favour of the current 'loop' arrangement. This scheme seeks to enhance the safety of cyclists further by providing wider cycle facilities and making cyclists more visible and conspicuous to approaching motorists turning left onto Fosters</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
		Ave and also increasing separation between cyclist traffic and pedestrians accessing the bus facilities.
P025	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "In line with the requirements of the National Cycle Manual" appears to be a polite way to say one is aware of the NCM but the actual design as planned shows contempt for it and anyone who has to cycle in the area. Let me count the ways: 2. Right of way for people who cycle is given up at every possible intersection. 3. Slip-turns have not been removed, but have actually been added. These are a hazard to anyone who walks or cycles as they encourage fast left turns by vehicles. 4. "Shared" areas benefit neither the pedestrians nor the people who have to cycle in these areas, especially as they appear to be a quick and dirty workaround at all junctions. Please design the junctions with equal priority. 5. The interchange 'inner ring' - nothing shows that cars are the only priority here by encircling all non-car users by roads. Is this a stopgap until a pedestrian bridge is built across this intersection? 6. This area is a gateway for cyclists (both commuter and tourists) to the mountains and they are expected to navigate up to twelve crossing points in less than a mile without priority. This will produce either frustrated users who will give up, or force them back onto the road to get back some sort of flow and priority. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The Stillorgan Road Dual Carriageway is one of the primary arterial traffic routes into Dublin City centre and is therefore of strategic importance. The detailed design stage seeks to maximise advantage on more sustainable transport modes (bus, cycling, walking), but taking due account of other road users. 3. The design has removed left turn slips at Fosters Ave and The Rise. Junction radii have been reduced to encourage reduced vehicle speeds. 4. Shared areas are an 'equal priority' measures introduced on either side of the toucan crossings. Toucan crossing are also 'shared' crossing facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. 5. It is assumed this comment relates to the staggered crossing and the area with the median. The staggered toucan crossing facility is provided to address the established pedestrian / cyclist desire line. A footbridge would not address the desire line as efficiently as the crossing route would not be as direct. 6. The traffic signalling sequence at this location is arrange such that the greater green time is provided to the greater traffic flows. This also provides greater green time for cyclists travelling with the same direction as the traffic, i.e. inbound and outbound along the dual carriageway. Hence, cyclists on these routes will also gain priority through the Fosters Ave junction. Other junctions have not been assessed as they fall outside the scope of this particular project.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
P026	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the procedure for turning right onto Foster's Avenue? For cyclists on the bidirectional track, their lane seems to end abruptly with no designated lane to turn right onto Foster's Avenue, or to get across to the N11 pedestrian crossing. For southbound cyclists on the far side of the N11 trying to turn onto Foster's Avenue, will the pedestrian lights on both carriageways go green together to facilitate swift crossing, and would it be possible to add a cycle crossing to the north of the pedestrian crossing to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians? 2. Why is the cycle crossing at the Rise being replaced with a regular cycle lane? The cycle crossing is not widely used because it is poorly maintained and full of pot holes, but in principle, it is very well located. It's a safe place to cross on a bike without having to look behind at speed, and there is ample room between the crossing and the N11 for left turning drivers to yield to straight moving cyclists. Would it be possible to keep the current cycle crossing, but widen the lane, and replace the signal crossing with a Dutch style zebra and cycle crossing? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cyclists intending to turn right on to Fosters Ave would be accommodated by the proposed toucan crossing facility at Fosters Ave – on receiving a green signal, cyclists can cross the Fosters Ave carriageway and then proceed along their intended route. Cyclists on the outbound side of the Stillorgan Road would be accommodated by using the proposed staggered crossing facility. This facility would not have synchronised green signals as this would result in an unacceptable impact on traffic. The proposed crossing is designed as a toucan crossing, meaning it is shared between pedestrians and cyclists. It would typically be 4m wide, but this can be increased where heavy usage is expected to avoid pedestrian / cyclist conflict. 2. It is not proposed to remove the existing toucan crossing. The area discussed falls outside the scope of this particular project.
P027	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Fosters Avenue / N11 junction design - the junction is incredibly dangerous. 2. Suggest reviewing the staggered crossing - current design goes against national guidance 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current proposals seek to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cycle traffic at this junction. 2. A two-stage crossing is required at this location. It is considered unsafe to provide a straight through crossing at this location as users may assume it is a one-stage crossing and walk into the path of approaching vehicles where traffic has not stopped.
P028	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am at a loss to understand why there is not a segregated cycle lane being created at the junction. I would ask that the scheme be redesigned to keep cyclists and vehicles separate through the junction of Fosters Ave and N11. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.
P029	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On map 3 of the proposed scheme the outbound contra flow lane ends abruptly at Fosters avenue. Not sure what the idea of that is, looks confusing. Unless there is also a 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cyclists travelling 'outbound' will use the proposed crossings to get to the far side of the R138 to access existing outbound cycle facilities.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>planned contra flow lane leading directly into UCD (I'm not seeing it in the current maps).</p> <p>2. Could new trees be planted in the vicinity to offset the ones that would have to be cut down?</p>	<p>2. The removal of trees and constriction of the proposed UCD access will be subject of a separate planning application by UCD Estates. The issue of replacement planting will be raised with UCD.</p>
P030	<p>1. Better cycle lane infrastructure, it seems mostly designed for the benefit of cars</p>	<p>1. The scheme provides enhanced facilities and safer route for cyclists in line with the NCM.</p>
P031	<p>1. If it is not good enough for people of less ability, children or elderly to use it, then it is not right and needs to be revisited. There is plenty space to distance the cycle tracks from motor traffic, so why not do it?</p> <p>2. There seems to be an implied belief in DLR that people on bikes belong with motor traffic. Well, they don't. That is what kills people.</p>	<p>1. The scheme design is developed taking cognisance of current space constraints.</p> <p>2. The Cycle track is segregated along the R138 and comes on road to cross the Rise and Fosters avenue junction.. Further consideration will be given to providing more segregation between the left turn and the cyclists during the detailed design stage</p>
P032	<p>1. We need to rethink the junction design. effectively staggering the crossing point s for walkers and essentially nothing for cyclist will render this money not well spent</p>	<p>1. The staggered crossing arrangement is required for safety reasons as a one-stage crossing is not possible. It is a 2-stage toucan crossing which is a shared pedestrian and cyclist facility.</p>
P033	<p>1. Fosters avenue is a serious flaw in this scheme. I note from the report that the designers recognised the danger of cyclists being left hooked by traffic turning into fosters avenue which is a good start. However, the solution (to remove protection I.e. Safe segregated cycle tracks for a section before and after the junction) is mind boggling.</p> <p>2. If I understand the logic it goes like this, cyclists may be driven into by car drivers who do not look/see them when turning...we will ensure that the cyclists mix with the unaware drivers for a longer period of time thereby reducing the likelihood they will be knocked over at the junction as they may be knocked over prior to the junction making the junction relatively safer.</p>	<p>1. The safety issue identified is that motorists appear not aware of the presence of approaching cyclists. This is due in part to the fact that cyclists are emerging from behind the bus stop and therefore are not visible to vehicles approaching in the left turn lane. The proposals seek to address this issue by providing larger cycle lanes and bringing cyclists alongside traffic sooner thereby making them more visible to approaching traffic.</p> <p>2. See item 1 above.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	3. Such an approach is not in keeping with the spirit of national cycle design guidance and will not make cycling accessible to all. 4. Cycling will not be made safer by removing protection. 5. Relying on coloured paint to get drivers to pay attention at junctions where you have recognised there is a significant risk is not responsible. I will (regrettably) republish this letter after the first fatality.	3. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138. 4. See item 1 above. 5. See item 1 above. The detailed design stage may seek to provide further cycle priority measures as the design develops.
P034	1. All cycle lanes need to be physically segregated and double lane if possible. If a 6-year-old can safely use it then it meets my standard.	1. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. The Cycle track is segregated along the R138 and comes on road to cross the Rise and Fosters avenue junction. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.
P035	1. The scheme does not meet the national guidelines for safe cycle tracks, let alone meet international best practices	1. The scheme design addresses the project objectives and provides enhanced safety for cyclists. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.
P036	1. Staggered crossings are against national guidelines, why are they being used here. The layout is very confusing, I am unsure how I would use this junction without getting into conflict with other road users.	1. Crossing all traffic and bus lanes of the dual carriageway with a single stage crossing would require extensive green time for pedestrians – this would have a major negative impact on the junction capacity and would lead to unacceptable traffic delays at the junction. The staggered arrangement will safely accommodate a two-stage crossing.
P037	1. A staggered crossing is a joke.	1. Crossing all traffic and bus lanes of the dual carriageway with a single stage crossing would require extensive green time for pedestrians – this would have a major negative impact on the junction capacity and would lead to unacceptable traffic delays at the junction. The staggered arrangement will safely accommodate a two-stage crossing.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
P038	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is not an adequate improvement for cycling that suits people well. This design should be rejected and a redesign sought. There's too much money being spent on this scheme to justify the result. 2. Keep cyclists separate through the junction with Fosters Ave similar to the Monkstown Ave junction from Temple Hill / Frascati Road. 3. Don't put a 2-way cycling track with counter intuitive opposite side cycling, i.e. designing for cyclist to stay right in a lengthy 2-way section when it is normal to stay left. We need a better buffer from the road way to have safer segregation. 4. Don't design and phase a staggered crossing at Fosters Avenue. There is ample time to cross the full extent for both pedestrians and cyclists 5. Remove the confusing counter intuitive cycling outbound in front of the Radisson Hotel section. There's opportunity to address this in the scheme. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138. 3. A short two-way section of off-road cycle track is required to effectively link the proposed UCD entrance to the crossing facility at Foster's Ave. The existing cycle track is adjacent to the bus lane which offers lateral clearance from general traffic. There is lower relative speed between cyclists and bus with the proposed cycle track layout. The proposed layout will result in less pedestrian / cyclist conflict near the proposed UCD entrance than if it was the other way around. 4. Crossing all traffic and bus lanes of the dual carriageway with a single stage crossing would require extensive green time for pedestrians – this would have a major negative impact on the junction capacity and would lead to unacceptable traffic delays at the junction. The staggered arrangement will safely accommodate a two-stage crossing. 5. This is currently outside the scope of this particular scheme.
P039	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stillorgan road traveling inbound: Creates a conflict point of dumping cyclists inside left filter lane for motoring traffic while cyclists are travelling straight ahead. This is similar to the fatal incident near the Nutley Avenue junction last month that was mainly down to poor road design. 2. The staggered crossing is unnecessary and unfair on pedestrians. It will lead to unsafe crossing of a high-speed road as people will not wait for the lights to change twice to cross. This is also in contradiction to the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scheme design addresses the project objectives and provides enhanced safety for cyclists. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138. 2. Crossing all traffic and bus lanes of the dual carriageway with a single stage crossing would require extensive green time for pedestrians – this would have a major negative impact on the junction capacity and would lead to unacceptable traffic delays at the junction. The staggered arrangement will safely accommodate a two-stage crossing.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. As it is a high-speed road (with high levels of speeding) a fully segregated cycle lane is badly needed. 4. This project is 1 million out of the walking and cycling budget and has been designed to clearly prioritise motoring traffic and disadvantage both types of VRU. It is deeply unfair to use so much of a limited budget to be spent to disadvantage the groups who are meant to benefit from this scheme. 5. More care is needed to slow down motorists turning left into Foster Av (maybe a 90 degree turn here?) and show that cyclists have priority if continuing straight ahead. Removal of that conflict point is a critical safety issue here 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. See item 1 above. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138. 4. Noted 5. The scheme includes modifications to the junction radii, encouraging lower vehicle speeds for turning traffic. Further cycle priority measures may be examined during the detailed design stage.
P040	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no reference to whether scheme complies with DMURS in the technical report. There appear to be staggered crossings which goes against DMURS 2. Ref Drawing 3 - The contraflow ending at Fosters Ave junction seems very confusing. What do cyclist do at the end of this? 3. Painted surfaces do not qualify as cycling infrastructure. Proper separation needed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crossing all traffic and bus lanes of the dual carriageway with a single stage crossing would require extensive green time for pedestrians – this would have a major negative impact on the junction capacity and would lead to unacceptable traffic delays at the junction. While the staggered arrangement is discouraged in DMURS, this road is a strategic transport corridor and arterial route for Dublin City. Hence other factors must also be considered. The staggered arrangement is necessary to safely accommodate a two-stage crossing. 2. Cyclists intending to turn right on to Fosters Ave would be accommodated by the proposed toucan crossing facility at Fosters Ave – on receiving a green signal, cyclists can cross the Fosters Ave carriageway and then proceed along their intended route. For those intending to continue southbound along the R138, the proposed toucan crossing will provide a safe route to cross the dual carriageway and access the existing outbound cycle facilities. 3. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.
P041	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entire cycle infrastructure on the entire Stillorgan /N11 road 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incomplete submission – no response provided.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
P042	<p>1. Cyclists should be segregated when they cross Fosters Avenue preventing lazy or inadvertent contact with vehicular traffic, and have separate signalling. People travelling in the direction of the city should be permitted to turn left up Foster's Avenue at all times (with segregated lane). Similarly, people cycling down Fosters Avenue should equally be able to turn left in a segregated lane yielding to oncoming cycle traffic.</p>	<p>1. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.</p>
P043	<p>1. Could be safer</p>	<p>1. The scheme design addresses the project objectives and provides enhanced safety for cyclists.</p>
P044	<p>1. Further segregation of the cycling lane is needed - I would prefer to see it redesigned.</p>	<p>1. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.</p>
P045	<p>1. Any interaction between a cyclist and a bus stop. Major Junctions- e.g. Booterstown Ave</p>	<p>1. The scheme design addresses the project objectives and provides enhanced safety for cyclists.</p>
P046	<p>1. Cycle track on lead up to Donnybrook.</p>	<p>1. This is currently outside the scope of this particular scheme.</p>
P047	<p>1. I would like to see a pedestrian crossing at the bridge on the Stillorgan Road linking Fosterbrook and the Radisson with the bus stop on the other side. The students of the schools (Coláiste Eoin and Coláiste Íosagáin) use the bridge but there are elderly residents and those with mobility problems who find this difficult. I also see a number of pedestrians literally 'taking risks' walking through traffic that is slow or at a standstill in rush hour traffic in the morning going into town. I really believe that a pedestrian crossing is a necessity.</p> <p>2. There is some confusion among motorists and cyclists regarding filter lanes turning right onto The Rise and Foster's Avenue off the N11. If a filter light indicates turning left there is quite often a cyclist at high speed going in the direction of</p>	<p>1. Refer to P008 above.</p> <p>2. Noted. To be re-examined at detailed design phase.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	town. I would welcome some kind of signage or other scheme that would lessen this confusion.	
P048	1. Cyclists should be fully segregated at junctions on a major road like this. A verge is required between a cycle track and a lane of fast-moving buses or general traffic. Cycle facilities should be easy to understand for users following standard rules of the road such as ride on the left.	1. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138. A short two-way section of off-road cycle track is required to effectively link the proposed UCD entrance to the crossing facility at Foster's Ave. The existing cycle track is adjacent to the bus lane which offers lateral clearance from general traffic. There is lower relative speed between cyclists and bus with the proposed cycle track layout. The proposed layout will result in less pedestrian / cyclist conflict near the proposed UCD entrance than if it was the other way around.
P049	1. Cycle lane bus stop at Booterstown Avenue-disaster. 2. Make the current proposal more intuitive for cyclists.	1. This is currently outside the scope of this particular project. 2. The proposal is considered intuitive. Perhaps the writer refers to the short two-way section of off-road cycle track that is required to effectively link the proposed UCD entrance to the crossing facility at Foster's Ave. The existing cycle track is adjacent to the bus lane which offers lateral clearance from general traffic. There is lower relative speed between cyclists and bus with the proposed cycle track layout. The proposed layout will result in less pedestrian / cyclist conflict near the proposed UCD entrance than if it was the other way around.
P050	1. Segregating bicycles from cars entirely along entire route.	1. On road cycle lanes have been provided in line with the NCM. A toucan crossing has also been provided for pedestrians / cyclists across Fosters avenue and the R138.
P051	1. No 2-way cycle tracks - they will be difficult to use and not be joined up with other sections of track	1. A short two-way section of off-road cycle track is required to effectively link the proposed UCD entrance to the crossing facility at Foster's Ave. The existing cycle track is adjacent to the bus lane which offers lateral clearance from general traffic. There is lower relative speed between cyclists and bus with the proposed cycle

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Cyclists should have equal priority with motorised traffic at junctions - should not always have to cede priority to turning cars 3. Cycle lanes should be wide enough to allow safe overtakes of slower cyclists 4. Cycle lanes should be clearly differentiated from pedestrian areas to make pedestrian safety easier to guarantee 	<p>track layout. The proposed layout will result in less pedestrian / cyclist conflict near the proposed UCD entrance than if it was the other way around.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Agreed. The scheme does not remove priority from cyclist traffic. 3. The scheme provides widened lanes in accordance with NCM. 4. Agreed. In areas where pedestrian / cyclist conflicts are likely to be greater, clear segregation will be provided using contracting surface materials and grade separation in more critical areas.
P052	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I live at the bottom of the Rise and frequently use the bus stops on the main road. I welcome your proposed introduction of pedestrian traffic lights there. I would however suggest that a better location for the pedestrian lights would be at the junction of the Rise/St. Helens (rather than at the bottom of Fosters Avenue). This is where most of the pedestrians actually cross (people from the Radisson Hotel, from Mount Merrion and from the apartments and houses in St. Helens and the schools Coláiste Eoin and Coláiste Íosagáin and St. Andrews. 2. There is a footbridge nearby but it is very high (42 steps) and so is not much use to "oldies" like myself. The people who use it most are the pupils from Co. Eoin & Iosagan (on pain of expulsion if they don't) and young mums with prams. The rest of use duck across between the bus stops if the traffic is light, or at the Rise if it is heavy (though there is no "pedestrian" facility there). 3. Some oldies who can't manage the bridge or the traffic lights travel on to the Booterstown Avenue bus stop (where there are pedestrian lights), cross there and walk back. 4. My suggestion to you is that you would get one on your staff to spend some time at the junction, preferably at busy times (3-4 or 5-7) and see if they agree with my concerns. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. The proposed crossing is located at the most efficient location to link in with traffic signals. This location is a 3-arm junction and hence more efficient to integrate with respect to signal staging. Providing the crossing at The Rise junction will take away from the cyclist desire line and introduce further potential for pedestrian / cyclist conflict in the vicinity of the bus stop. There is also an existing footbridge at this location. 2. The proposed signalised crossing will address the desire line to cross the Stillorgan Road in the vicinity of the outbound bus stop. 3. Noted. 4. Site visits have been carried out to observe pedestrian and cyclist behaviour and the designs developed accordingly.

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
P053	<p>1. I am a senior citizen and now together with a number of my neighbours we cannot negotiate the many steps of the footbridge, for this reason I request sincerely and humbly a pedestrian crossing to be returned to this area, most of the residents come down and cross at The Rise.</p>	<p>1. The proposed location of the signalised crossing has been optimised to meet project objectives and address established pedestrian and cyclist desire lines. To provide a further crossing at the location suggested would have serious impacts on traffic due to the junction configuration. Such a proposal would make the current footbridge redundant. The full separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic at this location, particularly considering the proximity of both schools, provides the safest possible means of crossing the dual carriageway.</p>
P054	<p>1. However, overall, we are unhappy with elements of the design that fail to provide real priority for cycling and walking, as prioritised in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development plan. It falls short of an 'A' standard cycle route, and we are unclear as to the status of the proposed new entrance/exit to UCD close to Foster Avenue.</p> <p>Key points - What is Good about the Proposed Scheme?</p> <p>2. A new Toucan crossing at Foster Avenue Junction with a wider crossing area for both cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>3. A new Toucan crossing facility across the R138 Stillorgan Road</p> <p>4. Clear separation of cyclists from pedestrians, particularly at the new bus shelter locations</p> <p>5. The removal of the slip lanes and wide splays from Fosters Avenue and The Rise onto the R138 Stillorgan Road</p> <p>6. The improved cycle access from the St Thomas Road/The Rise onto northbound R138</p> <p>7. Increased Bike Parking close to bus stop at The Rise / Stillorgan Road inbound</p>	<p>1. Noted. The project improves pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and safety and is in accordance with the NCM.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>Key points - What is Not Good about the Proposed Scheme?</p> <p>8. The possibility of introducing a full pedestrian/cycling crossing phase on the new lighting sequence at the Foster Avenue and Stillorgan Road to give real priority to active travel modes has not been taken up. Our key concern is having pedestrians and cyclists waiting for up to 3 full cycle of the signals to change before being able to cross the full extent of the crossings. Failing to allow people to cross all stages at the same time will result in people taking unnecessary risks to cross which this scheme is trying to solve.</p> <p>9. The use of a staggered crossing across Stillorgan Road should not be used in this scheme. This is in accordance with the key recommendations from DMURS.</p> <p>10. Unstaggering the pedestrian crossing would allow the inbound cycle track to be segregated from the Stillorgan Road for longer. It would also provide a space for cyclists ahead of any left-turning vehicles, and also allow the Stop line to be brought forward, providing more queueing space for vehicles. This would also place cyclists in full view of any turning motorist and avoids potential 'left-hook' collisions. This is particularly important to consider as we recently saw a HGV cycling fatality closer to Dublin City at a junction not far from this junction.</p> <p>11. The use of an inverted two-way cycle track for far too long of a section from UCD to Fosters Ave. We see this as counter intuitive and will not be used as intended. It would be better to design for cyclists to use the cycle track in a normal way by staying to the left.</p>	<p>8. The possibility of introducing single stage crossing of the R138 dual carriageway in particular was examined and the resulting delays to traffic were significant and unacceptable. It should be noted the R138 dual carriageway is a major arterial route for traffic access to Dublin City and is of strategic importance.</p> <p>9. The staggered crossing is required for safety reasons as a single stage crossing cannot be provided. An in-line crossing may result in cyclists incorrectly assuming / reading the signals and entering a 'live' carriageway.</p> <p>10. Noted. Refer to item 11 above.</p> <p>11. A short two-way section of off-road cycle track is required to effectively link the proposed UCD entrance to the crossing facility at Foster's Ave. The existing cycle track is adjacent to the bus lane which offers lateral clearance from general traffic. There is lower relative speed between cyclists and bus with the proposed cycle track layout. The proposed layout will result in less pedestrian / cyclist conflict near the proposed UCD entrance than if it was the other way around.</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>12. Cycle facility next to R138 should have a sizeable buffer with the main R138, in line with National Cycle Manual recommendations, in particular as this is still being classified as a 60kph zone.</p> <p>13. A chance to consider the introduction of a lower speed limit on this section of road has not been availed of.</p> <p>14. No clarity on how south travelling cyclists can be facilitated to turn right from R138 on to St Thomas Road/The Rise?</p> <p>15. No cycling facilities on Foster Avenue of any description, despite high traffic volumes. A rationalisation of the three turning lanes (one left and two right) should take place. The space could be reallocated to provide for a mandatory cycle lane.</p> <p>16. No ASL on Foster Avenue to enable cyclists turning right on to R138 to place themselves in full view of drivers at the head of the junction.</p> <p>17. Foster Avenue Junction should have a raised crossing at the new Toucan crossing to give full priority to pedestrians and cyclists and disabled and pram users, and similarly on St Thomas Road/The Rise.</p> <p>18. Why was the potential continuation of northbound contra flow cycle track to link in with Montrose side road further north not availed of?</p> <p>19. It is not clear if extra bike parking close to St Thomas Road/The Rise will be covered. This requires clarification</p> <p>20. A cycle connection to The Rise and Mount Merrion should be made to the Toucan crossing of Stillorgan Road to enable outbound cyclists to use this crossing to make a right turn rather than trying to turn right at the Radisson Hotel / The Rise junction. This would also facilitate a safe route to the lower inbound cycle track past the Old Montrose Hotel</p> <p>21. The crossing at St Thomas Road/The Rise needs to be directly connected to the R138 pathway connection.</p>	<p>12. This is not possible due to space constraints. However, larger / wider cycle facilities in line with the NCM have been provided.</p> <p>13. The examination of reduced speed limits is currently outside of the scope of this particular project.</p> <p>14. This is currently outside of the scope of this particular project.</p> <p>15. This is currently outside of the scope of this particular project.</p> <p>16. This will be considered further as part of the detail design stage.</p> <p>17. Due to the strategic nature of the Stillorgan Road and the associated high traffic volumes, the provision of raised tables at crossings is not considered appropriate here.</p> <p>18. This is currently outside of the scope of this particular project.</p> <p>19. The provision of additional bike parking is provided in the design. Whether or not this is covered will be considered further at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>20. The area and cycle movement queried falls outside the scope of this particular project. However, this is a valid observation and shall be examined further as part of the detailed design of the scheme.</p> <p>21. This connection is provided in the design to the northern side of The Rise. To the south is also connected with an existing cycle</p>

ID	Public Submission / Comment	Response
	<p>22. The new advisory cycle lane at The Rise is substandard. It is painted infrastructure inside the car lane rather than being allocated in its own space. Without adequate space cyclists will not be able to access the ASL at the head of the junction. There is space for a mandatory cycle lane on The Rise.</p> <p>23. It is not clear how or when the new UCD access will form part of this proposed plan?</p> <p>Managing Pedestrians and Cyclists during the works.</p> <p>24. During the works it is vitally important that pedestrians and cyclists are managed well and that they are given a route through the works that enables them to keep walking or cycling. It is not acceptable to use cyclist dismount signs. If diverting to the bus lane it is important to calm the traffic in the bus lane and use a lower speed limit in the adjacent lanes of the works.</p>	<p>track which is subject to infrequent use. However, the latter is currently outside of the scope of this particular project.</p> <p>22. Agreed. The layout here will be revised as part of the design development at detailed design phase.</p> <p>23. Noted. This will be subject to a separate planning application by UCD Estates.</p> <p>24. Agreed. A Temporary Traffic Management Plan will be put in place while the works progress and shall ensure all users are catered for.</p>

4. Conclusion

Of the 54 submissions received the majority have expressed that they welcome the safety enhancement scheme.

The review of the submissions received has highlighted a number of recurring issues which will be noted and taken into consideration as the scheme progresses to the detailed design phase.

This report will be reviewed by Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council and the comments therein will be given further consideration.

5. Next Steps

- Ground Investigation.
- Progress to Detailed Design phase.
- Tender Documents.
- Construction and Supervision of the Scheme.
- Close out.

Darragh Malone
WS Atkins Ireland Limited
Atkins House
150-155 Airside Business Park
Swords
Co. Dublin

Tel: +353 1 810 8000
Fax: +353 1 810 8001
Mobile: +353 86 833 1282
darragh.malone@atkinsglobal.com

© WS Atkins Ireland Limited except where stated otherwise