

**A38 Derby Junctions**  
**TR010022**  
**8.29(a) Statement of Common Ground**  
**with**  
**Sustrans and Derby Cycling Group**

Planning Act 2008

Rule 8 (1)(e)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 8

April 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning  
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

**A38 Derby Junctions**  
Development Consent Order 202[ ]

---

**Statement of Common Ground**  
**Sustrans and Derby Cycling Group**

---

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Regulation Number</b>                      | Rule 8 (1)(e)   |
| <b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b> | TR010022  |
| <b>Application Document Reference</b>         | TR010022/APP/8.29(a)  |
| <b>Author</b>                                 | Highways England (A38 Derby Junctions Project Team), Sustrans and Derby Cycling Group |

| <b>Version</b> | <b>Date</b>  | <b>Status of Version</b> |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| FINAL          | 2 April 2020 | Deadline 10 Submission   |

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

**This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Sustrans and Derby Cycling Group.**

Signed.....

[name]

[position], on behalf of Highways England

Date: [date]

Signed.....

[name]

[position], on behalf of Sustrans

Date: [date]

Signed.....

[name]

[position], on behalf of Derby Cycling Group

Date: [date]

## Table of contents

| Chapter   | Pages    |
|---|----------|
| <b>1 Introduction</b> .....                                     | <b>1</b> |
| 1.1 Purpose of this Document .....                              | 1        |
| 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground .....            | 1        |
| 1.3 Terminology .....   | 1        |
| <b>2 Record of Engagement</b> .....                             | <b>3</b> |
| <b>3 Issues</b> .....   | <b>5</b> |
| 3.1 General Principles .....                                    | 5        |
| 3.2 Issues related to the Non-Motorised User Provision .....    | 6        |
| 3.3 Issues relating to Construction Impacts on NMU Routes ..... | 23       |

### List of Appendices:

Appendix A: Derby Cycling Group's Consultation Response submitted on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018

Appendix B: Sustrans' Consultation Response submitted on the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of the proposed A38 Derby Junctions ('the Application') made by Highways England Company Limited ('Highways England') to the Secretary of State for Transport ('Secretary of State') for a Development Consent Order ('the Order') under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ('PA 2008').
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/ or the Planning Inspectorate's website<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.1.3 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

## 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by Highways England as the Applicant, Sustrans and Derby Cycling Group (DCG). This SoCG has been prepared jointly as both parties have interests in ensuring that appropriate Non-Motorised User (NMU) provision is provided for within the Scheme.
- 1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.
- 1.2.3 Sustrans is a charity that is campaigning for better cycling and walking facilities throughout the United Kingdom.
- 1.2.4 Derby Cycling Group campaigns on behalf of cyclists in and around Derby, has been in existence since 1979 and currently has around 400 members. DCG want a city where people of all ages and abilities have the freedom to get around by bike and their aim is to 'make cycling normal' by advocating for improvements to Derby's cycling infrastructure.

## 1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues chapter (Section 3) of this SoCG, "Not Agreed" indicates a final position, and "Under discussion" is where points will be the subject of on-going discussion

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/east-midlands/a38-derby-junctions/>

wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.  
“Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved.

- 1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Sustrans and DCG, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to Sustrans and DCG.

## 2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of key meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England, SUSTRANS and DCG in relation to the Application is outlined in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1: Record of engagement**

| Date     | Form of Correspondence                                   | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|----------|--|--|
| 11.12.15 | Email from DCG   | Provided response to the public consultation and request for further meetings.   |
| 27.01.16 | Email to DCG   | Response to above and asking for dates for meeting.  |
| 17.05.16 | Email  | Plans were issued to all NMU interest groups (including DCG and Sustrans) inviting comments on scheme's NMU proposals  |
| 18.06.16 | Email from DCG   | Providing DCG's responses to the above request for comments.   |
| 30.08.17 | Email from DCG to Highways England                       | Email requesting meeting. A later reply from Highways England states that meetings with stakeholders are likely to be arranged in March 2018.  |
| 25.09.17 | Email from Sustrans to Highways England                  | Sustrans registered their interest in the Scheme and would like to comment on the Scheme design. Highways England states that the Scheme design is still being amended and that there will be further formal consultation in 2018. |
| 31.01.18 | Preferred Route Announcement                             | This followed a 13-month delay with a suspension of stakeholder engagement.  |
| 25.04.18 | Meeting between DCG, Sustrans and Highways England       | Meeting to discuss cycling and other non-motorised user provision.   |
| 15.10.18 | DCG response to the A38 Derby junction consultation      | Letter received from DCG in regard to consultation period. The letter covers principles for local travel, proposals for Kingsway, Markeaton and Little Eaton junction.   |
| 18.10.18 | Sustrans response to the A38 Derby junction consultation | Email setting out Sustrans position on the Scheme design as provided at the consultation in 2018.  |
| 04.08.19 | Relevant Representation made by DCG                      | DCG submitted a relevant representation and states that they are interested in " <i>active travel, and the provision and quality of walking and cycling routes along and across and near to the Scheme</i> ".                      |
| 22.10.19 | Email from Sustrans to Highways England                  | Email provided initial comments raised by Sustrans in relation to a draft version of this Statement of Common Ground.  |
| 23.10.19 | Email from Derby Cycling Group to Highways England       | Email provided comments raised by Derby Cycling Group in relation to a draft version of this Statement of Common Ground.   |

- 2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between Highways England, Sustrans and DCG in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.



## 3 Issues

### 3.1 General Principles

- 3.1.1 Fundamentally Sustrans do not support the Scheme and in an email sent to Highways England on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December 2019, they stated that:

*“Sustrans do not support the A38 junctions scheme and it should be cancelled... We believe the money should be invested in active and sustainable travel options to reduce local traffic and so free up capacity if it is needed.*

*We further note that if we are to meet our carbon reduction targets as a country we need to reduce motorised road transport and not increase road capacity. By making it easier to travel this scheme will see an increase in usage. This will add to the UK’s carbon emissions. Other local authorities have now cancelled road schemes on the back of declaring a climate emergency. That is what should happen with this scheme.*

*We also believe that the impact on congestion and worsening air quality both on the A38 and in the city of Derby makes this scheme unviable. We believe there will be a net worsening in air quality over the next ten years when those impacts are factored in...*

*The works will significantly increase congestion and reduce air quality in the city during construction.”*

- 3.1.2 Sustrans are also concerned about mitigation measures related to the impact of the A38 works on the city of Derby.

### 3.2 Issues related to the Non-Motorised User Provision

| Consultee | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response   | Status           |
|-----------|---|--|-------------|--|---|------------------|
| DCG       | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 2: Principles for Local Travel | -           | <p>DCG believes that the Scheme presents fantastic opportunities for active travel, priority for active travellers by creating direct, good quality, off-road cycle routes, with prioritised, quick response, signal controlled crossings alongside and across the A38.</p> <p>The Scheme will prioritise active travel, using state of the art infrastructure design standards including, segregated NMU routes; humidity and temperature-controlled crossings which give NMUs more priority in cold and wet weather; and corners with radii suitable for all standards of bicycle.</p> <p>The Scheme will contribute to creating better cycle routes which enable families to travel by bike from major residential areas such as Manor Kingsway, Mackworth, Mickleover, Allestree, New Zealand, Little Eaton, and Breadsall to major destinations such as Royal Derby Hospital, University of</p> | Highways England has worked hard to ensure that active travel is considered and provided for, particularly given the semi-urban location of the Scheme, and note the comments provided by DCG in relation to the principles for local travel. | Under discussion |

| Consultee       | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response  | Status     |
|-----------------|---|--|-------------|--|--|------------|
|                 |   |  |             | Derby, Derby city centre, Markeaton Park and many others. In addition, it will connect existing cycle routes together, formalising them better and making them more visible for everyone, so they will be used more.   |  |            |
| <b>DCG</b>      | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 3: Principles for Local Travel | 3.1         | We support the proposed NMU route over the new bridge, to link the Manor Kingsway development with Mackworth (Greenwich Drive South), but we object to the proposal for uncontrolled crossings over the slip roads. This is intended as a route to school and to enable that to happen these must be signal controlled crossings.        | The support for the new route over the proposed bridge is noted.   | Not Agreed |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B). | Kingsway Roundabout                    | -           | There must be user-controlled lights on all sections where users are crossing roads, in particular on slip roads. This is essential. This route above will link the new housing at Kingsway with Brackensdale Primary school. The safety of active travel users to a primary school must require signalised crossings on the slip roads. | The south facing slip roads at this junction have uncontrolled crossings as the forecast traffic flow is quite light. There is a safe route from the new housing at Kingsway to Brackensdale school – There will be a signalised crossing of the A5111 then the existing footway/cycleway on the east side of the A38 would be used and the A38 would be crossed using the Brackensdale road underbridges. |            |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response   | Status |
|------------|---|--|-------------|---|---|--------|
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 3: Principles for Local Travel | 3.2         | Cycle access from Brackensdale Avenue to Greenwich Drive North is needed, utilising the land to be vacated by the old A38 access road at this point. This will also give access to the new public open space which will be created here while providing access towards Markeaton Park on this side of the A38.  | The scheme does include a combined footway/cycleway from Brackensdale Ave to Greenwich Drive North by upgrading the existing footway facility that sits alongside the A38 link road. However,   | Agreed |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 3: Principles for Local Travel | 3.3         | The Brackensdale Avenue area has the potential for many improvements to enable more cycle travel, creating an off-road link between the existing NCN cycle path from Mackworth Park, along Greenwich Drive South to its junction with Brackensdale Avenue; parallel crossings over Brackensdale Avenue on both sides of the A38, to give better continuity of routes to school and shops (e.g. Kingsway Retail Park) through this critical and already well used, NMU junction; and an off-road connection along Brackensdale Avenue from opposite Greenwich Drive South to connect with Brackensdale Primary School. | It is proposed to provide an off-road link between the existing NCN cycle path from Mackworth Park, along Greenwich Drive South to its junction with Brackensdale Avenue. There will be a signal-controlled crossing of Brackensdale Avenue (on the south side of the A38) and there are proposals (separate from the scheme) to provide a link to the Brackensdale Primary School. | Agreed |

| Consultee       | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response   | Status     |
|-----------------|---|--|-------------|--|---|------------|
| <b>DCG</b>      | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 3: Principles for Local Travel | 3.4         | We support the proposal for NMU routes along Kingsway Park Close, but more details are needed about them. We recommend at least a parallel crossing on a raised platform where the existing cycle path will cross the new Kingsway Park Close link road and the side-section of Kingsway Park Close. The cycle paths must be of good quality and must connect back onto the carriageway safely (eg offset kerbs in a genuine parallel access arrangement). | <p>Following consultation, it is now proposed to provide a signalised crossing for the existing footway/cycleway where it crosses the Kingsway Park Close link.</p> <p>There are no cycleway provisions on Kingsway Park Close, the new link will have pedestrian facilities linking to the existing footways on Kingsway Park Close.</p> | Agreed     |
| <b>DCG</b>      | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 3: Principles for Local Travel | 3.5         | With regard to Kingsway, objects to the 2-lane exits from the new roundabouts onto the A38 slip road westbound and Kingsway Park Close. These will encourage aggressive driving styles and faster speeds which pose problems and risks for the proposed NMU crossings. We recommend single lane exits to be provided.  | Two-lane exits to slip roads from roundabouts are proposed where traffic flows require– only providing one lane in these locations could result in congestion. This will be revisited at detailed design stage.   | Not Agreed |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on   | General Concerns                       | -           | The plans show that some of the slips roads in the Scheme as two lanes, this is excessive, it  | Two-lane slip roads are proposed where traffic flows require.   |            |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response  | Status |
|------------|---|--|-------------|---|--|--------|
|            | the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B).   |  |             | encourages speeding and should be reduced to one lane.  |  |        |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.1         | We support the plan to retain the 'curly bridge' which links Markeaton Street and Queensway with Markeaton Park and welcome the upgrading which is planned to enable cyclists to be fully accessible to it. We recommend that the bridge width be at least 4m wide, which will give an effective width of 3m due to the necessary side railings.                  | The width of the bridge will accord with current standards for shared use footway/cycleway crossings.  | Agreed |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.2         | In relation to the configuration of the 'curly bridge', we suspect that most journeys over the bridge are to or from Markeaton Street, and if so would like the ramp access to be most easily accessible from that direction, and similarly on the Markeaton Park side. An analysis should be undertaken to understand the NMU journeys over the existing bridge. | Steps are proposed from the bridge towards Markeaton Street. Cyclists would be able to use the ramps as shown with little addition to journey times. | Agreed |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response   | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.3         | We also support the plan to retain the existing cycle access to Markeaton Park directly from  | Noted.   | Agreed |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response   | Status |
|------------|---|--|-------------|---|---|--------|
|            | provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A).                               |  |             | the new A38 slip road, adjacent to the cycle crossing, even though the adjacent motor traffic entrance will be closed.  |   |        |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.4         | <p>The signal-controlled junction on Ashbourne Road with Markeaton Park and the garage/McDonalds has several issues, the cycle routes are not continuous over the entrance to the garage/McDonalds or Markeaton Park, and they need to be. Full consideration of cyclists coming along the west (Mackworth) side of Ashbourne Road and wanting to access the park must be given and a direct route to the park is needed, with suitable, convenient, road crossings provided.</p> <p>A cycle route into the park from this junction is also needed; it is no good getting a young family to the park gates on their bikes and then just dropping them onto the access road with the cars. This path also needs to be on the plan.</p> | <p>The shared use footway/cycleway will be continuous across the McDonald's/filling station access and can utilise the signals and a refuge to aid crossing – a crossing of the A52 will be available at the signals.</p> <p>Cyclists will have the option to enter/exit the park using the new vehicular access or can use the pedestrian/cyclist only entrance 50m to the east.</p> <p>The 'roundabout' in the park is required to provide a safe</p> | Agreed |

| Consultee       | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response   | Status     |
|-----------------|---|--|-------------|--|---|------------|
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B). | Markeaton Island                       | -           | <p>We object to the creation of a roundabout within Markeaton Park; it would cause risks and issues for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>There are significant concerns over the junction for active travel users entering Markeaton Park from Ashbourne Road. There needs to be provision across the junction with the petrol station/ McDonalds entrance. The position of the crossing of Ashbourne Road could be the city side of the junction so avoiding crossing the entrance to the petrol station.</p> | turning facility for buses. This amendment to the park interior improves safety for drivers and pedestrians alike using the existing confusing wrong handed entrance to the carpark. There will be provision for pedestrian/cyclist phases included in the new signalised junction for the petrol filling station and Markeaton Park – also, the crossing of the petrol station access will be 2 stage with the inclusion of a central refuge island. |            |
| <b>DCG</b>      | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.5         | We are pleased to see a cycle facility being provided on Ashbourne Road, immediately prior to the Markeaton Junction,  | Noted.  | Agreed.    |
| <b>DCG</b>      | Written Consultation Response provided on   | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.6         | The design plans show “existing paths” from Kedleston Road to the start of the Scheme. These existing paths are far below  | These are outside the scheme limits so not in the scope of the scheme – the concerns will be  | Not Agreed |



| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response   | Status |
|------------|---|--|-------------|--|---|--------|
|            | the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A).   |  |             | <p>standard and need to be included in the project scope and upgraded accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossings at the top of the A38 Queensway entry sliproad, on Kedleston Road, are badly needed, and also a redesign of that junction.</li> <li>• The paths alongside both sliproads for Queensway/ Kedleston Road are far too narrow and the surface is very sub-standard and must be brought to national standard. Because of adjacent fencing, 3m would be too narrow here and we suggest a segregated path.</li> </ul> | passed on to Derby City Council for their consideration.  |        |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.7         | The direct NMU route from Greenwich Drive North, past the existing entrance to the garage/McDonalds to Markeaton Island must be retained and enhanced to make it safe for cyclists and pedestrians. We would prefer the only access to these businesses to be from Ashbourne Road, for the safety of cyclists and pedestrians travelling along this route.   | The footway in question will be retained but space limitations prevent upgrading it to a cycleway. Cyclists can use Enfield Road and Harringay Gardens to reach the A52 from Greenwich Drive North. | Agreed |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response   | Status  |
|------------|---|--|-------------|--|---|---------|
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.8         | The cycle path from Windmill Hill Lane, via Thurcroft Close to Raleigh Street is disjointed and is not direct. This needs to be streamlined and the brief on-road section removed. We propose a direct, continuous, off-road path alongside the A38, with links to Windmill Hill Lane, Thurcroft Close and the cut-off end of Raleigh Street; joining Raleigh Street part way down.  | The proposed alignment of this section of the footway/ cycleway rectifies the existing disjointed facility.   | Agreed  |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 4: Principles for Local Travel | 4.9         | The closing of the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing between Thurcroft Close and Greenwich Drive North is disappointing, however in general Derby Cycling Group regards the existing crossing as dangerous and it will only get worse following the implementation of this scheme. We understand that any safe crossing here would be expensive and would prefer that this money is spent on creating really good, state-of-the-art crossings at Brackensdale Avenue in particular, and Markeaton Island, to encourage and enable more journeys by bike, rather than being spent on a new crossing resulting in | The uncontrolled pedestrian crossing between Thurcroft Close and Greenwich Drive North cannot be retained for safety reasons – alternative crossings of the A38 will be available via Brackensdale Avenue and at the new signalised Markeaton junction. | Agreed. |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response   | Status |
|------------|---|--|-------------|---|---|--------|
|            |   |  |             | poorer quality crossings at other locations. We must emphasise that in agreeing to the closure of the Thurcroft Ave to Greenwich Drive North crossing, we do expect the Brackensdale Ave and Markeaton Island crossings to be very good and to fully consider the many, complex NMU journeys which go through them daily.   |   |        |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 5: Principles for Local Travel | 5.1         | <p>We are concerned that current plans are for the very narrow shared path which links Ford Lane over the railway to the Little Eaton island to remain unchanged. This path is severely sub-standard as any sort of NMU route, in particular it is far too narrow. We would suggest either of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the NMU route over the rail bridge between Little Eaton island and Ford Lane needs to be widened to allow a segregated cycle/pedestrian route to be constructed; this is a major NMU route and will become even more so with the future construction of the Derwent Valley Cycleway (DVC).</li> </ul> | <p>Due to space limitations across the railway bridge it may be necessary to have a short length of substandard footway/ cycleway. Beyond the railbridge, the route along the proposed stopped up section of Ford lane will be improved to a 3m wide shared facility to match that of the adjoining facilities on the A61 and the B6179.</p> <p>An alternative route on the south side of the A38 has been investigated and unfortunately it is not a feasible option – this is due to the limited distance between the railway bridge and the underpass, this together with the height of the embankment would require</p> | Agreed |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response  | Status |
|------------|---|--|-------------|--|--|--------|
|            |   |  |             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>if the existing path above is retained in its present form, a new, segregated cycle/pedestrian path should be created to the south of the A38, connecting the route of the Derwent Valley Cycleway with the A61 NCN54 route at Little Eaton Island. This would rise up from the DVC path adjacent to the NMU underpass beneath the A38 to cross over the railway, then descend to the new roundabout at Little Eaton junction. We emphasize that this would be an <b>additional path</b> to the existing route on the north side of the A38 and additional to the DVC route through the NMU underpass towards Ford Lane. It must be built to best practice cycle path standards.</li> </ul> | ramps that would be unacceptably steep.  |        |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 5: Principles for Local Travel | 5.2         | The route away from the Little Eaton junction, along the A61 towards Pektron Island, should be a segregated path.  | Derbyshire County Council has upgraded this route since the consultation response was written. | Agreed |

| Consultee | Document  | Paragraph Ref                          | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response   | Status |
|-----------|---|--|-------------|---|---|--------|
| DCG       | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 5: Principles for Local Travel | 5.3         | We support the intention that <b>signal controlled</b> NMU crossings are planned where the NMU path crosses the A38 slip-roads.   | Noted.  | Agreed |
| DCG       | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix A). | Section 5: Principles for Local Travel | 5.4         | <p>In our opinion, the A38 Derby Junctions scheme must include within its scope, the objective of reducing the number of car journeys by enabling more cycling and walking journeys. To this end, in the vicinity of the Little Eaton junction, we would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A segregated cycle path leading from Little Eaton junction to the Pektron Island, including purchase of land from Bookers to create the space for it.</li> <li>• A signal-controlled crossing over the A61 towards Breadsall to replace the existing dangerous uncontrolled crossing.</li> <li>• The construction of an off-road route connecting Ford Lane with Haslams Lane</li> </ul> | <p>Derbyshire County Council has upgraded this route since the consultation response was written.</p> <p>Highways England is pursuing this separately with DCC (it is not part of the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme).</p> <p>Highways England is pursuing this separately to the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme.</p> | Agreed |

| Consultee       | Document   | Paragraph Ref      | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response  | Status     |
|-----------------|--|--------------------|-------------|--|--|------------|
|                 |  |                    |             | along the riverside; i.e. this section of the Derwent Valley Cycleway.   |  |            |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B) | General Principles | -           | <p>Sustrans recommend the following general principles in relation to design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All crossings should have user operated lights to control traffic.</li> <li>There should be walking and cycling segregation.</li> <li>All active travel routes should meet the minimum accepted best practice design standard for shared use paths. This is usually 3m though can be 3.5m or more in certain situations.</li> </ul> | <p>Most of the proposed crossings are to be signal controlled – uncontrolled crossings will be provided only where traffic flow is low such as the south facing slip roads at Kingsway junction.</p> <p>Shared pedestrian/cycleway facilities are generally provided with a min width of 3m wherever possible.</p> | Not Agreed |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B) | General Concerns   | -           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not support the increase in the speed limit to 50 mph.</li> <li>We would like to know when the projected increase in numbers and speed of motorised vehicles means that the poor air quality returns to its current levels.</li> </ul>  | <p>Operating at 40mph would erode the scheme's economic benefits.</p> <p>With improvements to vehicle emissions it is anticipated that air quality will continue to improve after the opening of the Scheme.</p>   | Not Agreed |

| Consultee | Document   | Paragraph Ref        | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response  | Status |
|-----------|--|----------------------|-------------|---|--|--------|
| Sustrans  | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B) | Little Eaton Flyover | -           | <p>In relation to the proposed Little Eaton junction, Sustrans has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are pleased to see that there is provision of user activated lights at the toucans on the slip roads which form part of route 54 of the NCN.</li> <li>When the current tunnel under the A38 is moved we want to see this made into a walking cycling route linking Ford lane to Haslams lane.</li> <li>We want to see an active travel link between the tunnel and NCN R54 along the city/ southern side of the A38. This is essential as the northern side of the A38 will not be altered and it is too narrow for a shared use path by national standards.</li> <li>We would like to see improvements to the active travel links to Little Eaton.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>We are working with the Derwent Valley heritage Cycleway team regarding this potential new route. This is being considered separately to the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme.</p> <p>This has been investigated and unfortunately it is not a feasible option – this is due to the limited distance between the railway bridge and the underpass, this together with the height of the embankment would require ramps that would be unacceptably steep.</p> <p>This is remote from the junction so is beyond the scope of the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme –</p> | Agreed |

| Consultee       | Document   | Paragraph Ref    | Sub-section | Comment   | Highways England Response  | Status |
|-----------------|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|--------|
|                 |  |                  |             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delivery of user activated lights to provide a safe crossing across the A61 linking NCN R54 to Breadsall.</li> </ul>   | <p>Derbyshire County Council would need to provide this.</p> <p>This is beyond the scope of the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme, however, Highways England has secured funding separately and such a crossing is now planned.</p>                                 |        |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B) | Markeaton Island | -           | <p>In relation to the proposed Markeaton junction, Sustrans has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are pleased to see that Markeaton Roundabout will be fully signalised with toucan crossings on the roads approaching the roundabout.</li> <li>There should be user operated lights on the slip road leading onto the A38 from Kedleston Road. This is a heavily used route as it leads to The University of Derby and Markeaton Park. There is likely to be an increase in traffic on this slip road. This is essential.</li> <li>We would like to see a segregated cycle route along the whole of Ashbourne</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is outside the limits of the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme so is beyond the scope – Derby City Council would need to provide this.</p> <p>This is outside the limits of the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme so is beyond the scope – Derby</p> | Agreed |



| Consultee       | Document   | Paragraph Ref   | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response  | Status |
|-----------------|--|-----------------|-------------|--|--|--------|
|                 |  |                 |             | <p>Road on both sides of the roundabout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cycle routes alongside Queensway/ A38 need to be upgraded to segregated routes that meet national standards.</li> <li>The replacement spiral bridge needs to be 3.5m wide. We need to ensure that the positioning and angle is suitable to active travel users.</li> </ul>   | <p>City Council would need to provide this.</p> <p>Shared pedestrian/cycleway facilities are generally provided with a min width of 3m wherever possible.</p> <p>The width of the bridge will accord with current standards for shared use footway/cycleway crossings.</p>             |        |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (see Appendix B) | Kingsway Island | -           | <p>In relation to the proposed Kingsway Island, Sustrans has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We welcome the addition of a route the links Kingsway to NCN R54/68.</li> <li>We want to see a cycle route that links Kingsway and Markeaton Roundabout along the west side of the A38. The room could be found if the A38 was two lanes and not the proposed three lanes each way. Even if it is 3 lanes, it is important to</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>3 lanes between Markeaton and Kingsway are essential for the scheme. A dedicated cycleway can't be placed on Greenwich Drive North due to lack of space – it will be necessary for cyclists to ride on the road if they wish to stay on the west side of the A38.</p> | Agreed |

| Consultee | Document | Paragraph Ref | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response | Status |
|-----------|----------|---------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|--------|
|           |          |               |             | have a cycle route on the north side of the A38 where we currently have Greenwich Drive North. |                           |        |

### 3.3 Issues relating to Construction Impacts on NMU Routes

| Consultee       | Document   | Paragraph Ref                    | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response   | Status |
|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------|--|---|--------|
| <b>DCG</b>      | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> of October 2018 (see Appendix A)                | 2.2: Principles for Local Travel | 2.2.1       | All existing cycle routes must remain open at all times while the construction phase is underway. Where the physical path needs to be worked on, short, good quality, diversionary routes must be provided which are accessible to everyone (no steps for instance). | All existing NMU routes will remain open during construction where it is possible. As part of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP), the Contractor will produce a 'Workplace Transport Management Plan' which will cover the walking & access routes through the site and any interface with public crossings points. Direct interface with NMUs will be minimised wherever possible as segregation is preferred, but there will be isolated locations where NMUs will have to cross the site during the works. Crossing points will be manned during working hours to manage the interface and prevent unauthorised access to site. Priority will be given at these crossings to NMU users. Outside of working hours the site will be made secure. The surface of any crossings will be maintained to avoid trip hazards and remove any loose material from the works. Each Access / Egress point will be assessed to consider both NMU visibility by | Agreed |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> of October 2018 (see Appendix B), respectively. | General Principles               | -           | The quality of the provision for active travel i.e. walking and cycling should be maintained both during construction and significantly improved upon completion.  |   |        |

| Consultee  | Document  | Paragraph Ref                    | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response  | Status |
|------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--------|
|            |   |                                  |             |  | <p>site vehicles and for road users to ensure adequate signage and sight lines.</p> <p>There may be some occasions where it is necessary, for safety and operational reasons, to close NMU routes during construction, when this occurs appropriate alternative routing will be provided and clear signage will be provided. In addition, where closures do occur, these will be undertaken at periods designed to minimise disruption.</p>  |        |
| <b>DCG</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 11 <sup>th</sup> of October 2018 (see Appendix A) | 2.2: Principles for Local Travel | 2.2.2       | We would like that all contractors vehicles be required to be fitted with the latest cycle safety equipment and that all drivers be trained in cycle safety and awareness, as part of the contracts issued for the project, in a similar way to the Crossrail project in London, and for the project to enforce those standards for all vehicles coming on-site. HGVs are not only involved in a disproportionately high number of cyclist deaths and serious injury collisions compared to the number of these vehicles on the road, they are | <p>Highways England supports Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) and will tier this down to their supply chain. (Silver standard). This entails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom session as well as drivers travelling round city on a bike. Also, each driver completes e-training which includes safety of vulnerable road users</li> <li>• For vehicles over 3.5T:</li> <li>• Additional awareness markings to increase vehicles' visibility</li> <li>• Blind spot cameras</li> </ul> | Agreed |

| Consultee       | Document  | Paragraph Ref        | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response  | Status |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|-------------|--|--|--------|
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> of October 2018 (see Appendix B) | General Principles   | -           | <p>also a source of fear for many people which prevent them from getting on a bike in the first place. We need to know that every effort is being made to keep cyclists as safe as possible while the numbers of HGVs and other site traffic are unusually high during the construction of the new junction layouts.</p> <p>All contractor vehicles should have the latest available technology to ensure the safety of vulnerable road users.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Side proximity sensors</li> <li>• Audible warning alarm to alert cyclists (and others) that a vehicle is turning left.</li> </ul> <p>Highways England will commit to providing Trixi mirrors on the project where it is identified that their introduction would assist in supplementing other provisions for managing the interface between construction traffic and NMUs.</p> |        |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on the 18 <sup>th</sup> of October 2018 (see Appendix B) | Little Eaton Flyover | -           | We want assurances that during construction there will be no severance of NCN R54, and user lights will be retained.   | It is the intention that all routes are kept operational during the construction works – some local diversions could be required from time to time.  | Agreed |
| <b>Sustrans</b> | Written Consultation Response provided on   | Markeaton Island     | -           | There is concern as to how site traffic will access the site compound that has been identified at the top of Markeaton   | This potential location for a site compound is no longer being pursued.  | Agreed |

| Consultee | Document  | Paragraph Ref | Sub-section | Comment  | Highways England Response | Status |
|-----------|---|---------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|--------|
|           | the 18 <sup>th</sup> of October 2018 (see Appendix B) |               |             | Street, no solution seems ideal. Markeaton Street is too narrow, two of the three fields are protected by Village Green status and a link onto the A38 would have to cross a key walking and cycling route alongside Queensway. We suggest an alternative site is found. |                           |        |

## Appendix A: Derby Cycling Group's Consultation Response submitted on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018

### A38 Derby Junctions – Statutory Consultation: Response by Derby Cycling Group

11<sup>th</sup> October, 2018

#### 1. Submitter Details

1.1. This response is submitted by Derby Cycling Group, a member-based, voluntary organisation which represents about 400 members, living and working in and around Derby city and which promotes cycling as a healthy, sustainable and cost effective means of everyday transport. The A38 Derby Junctions scheme will affect our members who travel in the vicinity of the A38 both during the construction phase of the project as well as with the infrastructure created by the project.

1.2. We are therefore responding in relation to Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) with emphasis on cycle travel and we are not commenting on the motor vehicle transport issues which the scheme is trying to address or which arise from it.

#### 2. Principles for Local Travel

2.1. Derby Cycling Group believes that the A38 Derby Junctions scheme presents some fantastic opportunities for active travel:

2.1.1. Giving priority for active travellers by creating direct, good quality, off-road cycle routes. with prioritised, quick response, signal controlled crossings alongside and across the A38.

2.1.2. Creation of local transport infrastructure which prioritises active travel, using state of the art infrastructure design standards including:

2.1.2.1. Segregated NMu routes with plenty of space for cyclists and pedestrians each in their own space.

2.1.2.2. Humidity and temperature controlled crossings which give NMUs more priority in cold and wet weather.

2.1.2.3. Corners with radii suitable for the bicycle standard design vehicle, including cyclists with child trailers and luggage.

2.1.3. Creating better cycle routes which enable families to travel by bike from major residential areas such as Manor Kingsway, Mackworth, Mickleover, Allestree, New Zealand, Little Eaton, and Breadsall to major destinations such as Royal Derby Hospital, University of Derby, Derby city centre, Markeaton Park and many others.

2.1.4. Connecting existing cycle routes together, formalising them better and making them more visible for everyone, so they will be used more. Where existing routes exist, they are often of poor quality, discontinuous, are poorly signed, are difficult to access because of poor road crossing design, and do not have enough space for the number and mix of pedestrians and cyclists using them. Our comments and suggestions below are aimed at mitigating the

current shortcomings of the existing provision and making sure that the new facilities which are created avoid perpetuating the usability issues of the past.

## 2.2. During the construction phase of the A38 Derby Junctions scheme:

2.2.1. All existing cycle routes must remain open at all times while the construction phase is underway. Where the physical path needs to be worked on, short, good quality, diversionary routes must be provided which are accessible to everyone (no steps for instance). We believe it is important that active travel is seen to be regarded as important and worth nurturing by making the effort to protect the numbers travelling actively while this project is in development. Journeys made on foot and by bike in the areas around the three junctions affected, are not very easily changed to use other routes – there often are no other routes. The project must enable those people who undertake active travel in these areas today to be able to continue to do so unhindered while the project is in progress. We would like to see evidence of contingency planning for route continuity, ideally with a named point of contact with whom issues can be raised and discussed. A good example of where this has been done before was on the Raynesway Park Junction project. The more recent Derby A38 Junctions improvements, in 2013, especially in the vicinity of Little Eaton island, was an example of inappropriate temporary provision, with unsupervised, steep steps meaning many people were unable to use the route because they could not physically get their bikes up and down the steps, even using the ramps provided. If the NMUs are closed at all, or made unusable by some people, then this would go against one of the four stated objectives of the project – “Connect people by maintaining existing facilities (eg crossings and ramps etc) or providing new means for cyclists, pedestrians and disabled users to cross the road.”

2.2.2. We would like that all contractors vehicles be required to be fitted with the latest cycle safety equipment and that all drivers be trained in cycle safety and awareness, as part of the contracts issued for the project, in a similar way to the Crossrail project in London, and for the project to enforce those standards for all vehicles coming on-site. HGVs are not only involved in a disproportionately high number of cyclist deaths and serious injury collisions compared to the number of these vehicles on the road, they are also a source of fear for many people which prevent them from getting on a bike in the first place. We need to know that every effort is being made to keep cyclists as safe as possible while the numbers of HGVs and other site traffic are unusually high during the construction of the new junction layouts.

## 3. Kingsway

3.1. We support the proposed NMU route over the new bridges, to link the Manor Kingsway development with Mackworth (Greenwich Drive South), but we object to the proposal for uncontrolled crossings over the slip roads. This is intended as a route to school and to enable that to happen these must be signal controlled crossings.

3.2. Cycle access from Brackensdale Avenue to Greenwich Drive North is needed, utilising the land to be vacated by the old A38 access road at this point. This will also give access to the new public open space which will be created here while providing access towards Markeaton Park on this side of the A38.

3.3. The Brackensdale Avenue area has the potential for many improvements to enable more cycle travel:

3.3.1. Creating an off road link between the existing NCN cycle path from Mackworth Park, along Greenwich Drive South to its junction with Brackensdale Avenue.



3.3.2. Parallel crossings over Brackensdale Avenue on both sides of the A38, to give better continuity of routes to school and shops (eg Kingsway Retail Park) through this critical and already well used, NMU junction.

3.3.3. An off-road connection along Brackensdale Avenue from opposite Greenwich Drive South to connect with Brackensdale Primary School.

3.4. We support the proposal for NMU routes along Kingsway Park Close, but more details are needed about them. We recommend at least a parallel crossing on a raised platform where the existing cycle path will cross the new Kingsway Park Close link road and the side-section of Kingsway Park Close. The cycle paths must be of good quality and must connect back onto the carriageway safely (eg offset kerbs in a genuine parallel access arrangement).

3.5. Derby Cycling Group objects to the 2-lane exits from the new roundabouts onto the A38 slip road westbound and Kingsway Park Close. These will encourage aggressive driving styles and faster speeds which pose problems and risks for the proposed NMU crossings. We recommend single lane exits to be provided.

#### 4. Markeaton

4.1. We support the plan to retain the “curly bridge” which links Markeaton Street and Queensway with Markeaton Park and welcome the upgrading which is planned to enable cyclists to be fully accessible to it. We recommend that the bridge width be at least 4m wide, which will give an effective width of 3m due to the necessary side railings.

4.2. Relating to the configuration of the curly bridge, we suspect (but have no evidence) that most journeys over the bridge are to or from Markeaton Street, and if so would like the ramp access to be most easily accessible from that direction, and similarly on the Markeaton Park side. Has any analysis been done regarding the NMU journeys over the existing bridge? If not we would like that to be done and if necessary the main direction of access adjusted to accommodate them.

4.3. We also support the plan to retain the existing cycle access to Markeaton Park directly from the new A38 slip road, adjacent to the cycle crossing, even though the adjacent motor traffic entrance will be closed.

4.4. The signal controlled junction on Ashbourne Road with Markeaton Park and the garage/McDonalds has several issues:

4.4.1. The cycle routes are not continuous over the entrance to the garage/McDonalds or Markeaton Park, and they need to be. Full consideration of cyclists coming along the west (Mackworth) side of Ashbourne Road and wanting to access the park must be given and a direct route to the park is needed, with suitable, convenient, road crossings provided.

4.4.2. A cycle route into the park from this junction is also needed; it is no good getting a young family to the park gates on their bikes and then just dropping them onto the access road with the cars. This path also needs to be on the plan.

4.4.3. We object to the creation of a roundabout within Markeaton Park; it would cause risks and issues for cyclists and pedestrians.

4.5. We are pleased to see a cycle facility being provided on Ashbourne Road, immediately prior to the Markeaton Junction, when coming out of Derby, but we need details of this facility (is it a path, or a cycle lane, etc) and especially how it gives access to the off-road paths on the new roundabout, and how it enables more confident riders to remain on the carriageway and ride the roundabout if they so choose.

4.6. The plan shows “existing paths” from Kedleston Road to the start of the new scheme. These existing paths are far below standard and need to be included in the project scope and upgraded accordingly:

4.6.1. Crossings at the top of the A38 Queensway entry sliproad, on Kedleston Road, are badly needed, and also a redesign of that junction.

4.6.2. The paths alongside both sliproads for Queensway/Kedleston Road are far too narrow and the surface is very sub-standard and must be brought to national standard. Because of adjacent fencing, 3m would be too narrow here and we suggest a segregated path.

4.7. The direct NMU route from Greenwich Drive North, past the existing entrance to the garage/McDonalds to Markeaton Island must be retained and enhanced to make it safe for cyclists and pedestrians. We would prefer the only access to these businesses to be from Ashbourne Road, for the safety of cyclists and pedestrians travelling along this route.

4.8. The cycle path from Windmill Hill Lane, via Thurcroft Close to Raleigh Street is disjointed and is not direct. This needs to be streamlined and the brief on-road section removed. We propose a direct, continuous, off-road path alongside the A38, with links to Windmill Hill Lane, Thurcroft Close and the cut-off end of Raleigh Street; joining Raleigh Street part way down (further from the corner than at present).

4.9. The closing of the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing between Thurcroft Close and Greenwich Drive North is disappointing, however in general Derby Cycling Group regards the existing crossing as dangerous and it will only get worse following the implementation of this scheme. We understand that any safe crossing here would be expensive and would prefer that this money is spent on creating really good, state-of-the-art crossings at Brackensdale Avenue in particular, and Markeaton Island, to encourage and enable more journeys by bike, rather than being spent on a new crossing resulting in poorer quality crossings at other locations. We must emphasise that in agreeing to the closure of the Thurcroft Ave to Greenwich Drive North crossing, we do expect the Brackensdale Ave and

Markeaton Island crossings to be very good and to fully consider the many, complex NMU journeys which go through them everyday.

## 5. Little Eaton

5.1. We are concerned that current plans are for the very narrow shared path which links Ford Lane over the railway to the Little Eaton island to remain unchanged. This path is severely sub-standard as any sort of NMU route, in particular it is far too narrow.

5.1.1. EITHER, the NMU route over the rail bridge between Little Eaton island and Ford Lane needs to be widened to allow a segregated cycle/pedestrian route to be constructed; this is a major NMU route and will become even more so with the future construction of the Derwent Valley Cycleway (DVC).

5.1.2. OR, if the existing path above is retained in its present form, a new, segregated cycle/pedestrian path should be created to the south of the A38, connecting the route of the Derwent Valley Cycleway with the A61 NCN54 route at Little Eaton Island. This would rise up from the DVC path adjacent to the NMU underpass beneath the A38 to cross over the railway, then descend to the new roundabout at Little Eaton junction. We emphasize that this would be an additional path to the existing route on the north side of the A38 and additional to the DVC route through the NMU underpass towards Ford Lane. It must be built to best practice cycle path standards.

5.2. The route away from the Little Eaton junction, along the A61 towards Pektron Island, should be a segregated path.

5.3. We support the intention that signal controlled NMU crossings are planned where the NMU path crosses the A38 slip-roads.

5.4. In our opinion, the A38 Derby Junctions scheme must include within its scope, the objective of reducing the number of car journeys by enabling more cycling and walking journeys. To this end, in the vicinity of the Little Eaton junction, we would like to see:

5.4.1. A segregated cycle path leading from Little Eaton junction to the Pektron Island, including purchase of land from Bookers to create the space for it.

5.4.2. A signal controlled crossing over the A61 towards Breadsall to replace the existing dangerous uncontrolled crossing.

5.4.3. The construction of a off-road route connecting Ford Lane with Haslams Lane along the riverside; i.e. this section of the Derwent Valley Cycleway

## **Appendix B: Sustrans' Consultation Response submitted on the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018**

### **Sustrans response to the A38 Derby junction consultation**

Please find below Sustrans response to the planned changes at the three major roundabouts on the A38 next to Derby.

Sustrans is the UK's leading sustainable transport charity. Our aim is to increase walking and cycling. We are responsible for the development of the National Cycle Network.

Our overall position is that we cannot build our way out of a problem by increasing road capacity for motorised vehicles. Therefore Sustrans would want to see the funding allocated to this scheme to be used to dramatically improve the local walking and cycling provision and improve public transport. We believe that this course of action would alleviate many of the issues that this work has identified to relieve.

If the work is to go ahead then some general principles should apply both during the work and after completion.

#### **General Principles**

- The quality of the provision for active travel ie walking and cycling should be maintained both during construction and significantly improved upon completion.
- All crossings should have user operated lights to control traffic.
- There should be walking and cycling segregation.
- All active travel routes should meet the minimum accepted best practice design standard for shared use paths. This is usually 3m though can be 3.5m or more in certain situations.
- All contractor vehicles should have the latest available technology to ensure the safety of vulnerable road users.

#### **General Concerns**

- The plans show that some of the slip roads in the scheme as two lanes, this is excessive, it encourages speeding and should be reduced to one lane.
- We do not support the increase in the speed limit to 50 mph
- We would like to know when the projected increase in numbers and speed of motorised vehicles means that the poor air quality returns to its current levels.

We have a number of suggestions for each of the three parts of the scheme.

#### **Little Eaton flyover**

- We are pleased to see that there is provision of user activated lights at the toucans on the slip roads which form part of route 54 of the NCN
- We want assurances that during construction there will be no severance of NCN R54, and user lights will be retained.
- When the current tunnel under the A38 is moved we want to see this made into a walking cycling route linking Ford lane to Haslams lane.
- We want to see an active travel link between the tunnel and NCN R54 along the city/ southern side of the A38. This is essential as the northern side of the A38 will not be altered and it is too narrow for a shared use path by national standards.
- We would like to see improvements to the active travel links to Little Eaton.

- The delivery of user activated lights to provide a safe crossing across the A61 linking NCN R54 to Breadsall.

### **Markeaton Island**

- We are pleased to see that Markeaton Roundabout will be fully signalised with toucan crossings on the roads approaching the roundabout.
- There should be user operated lights on the slip road leading onto the A38 from Kedleston Road. This is a heavily used route as it leads to The University of Derby and Markeaton Park. There is likely to be an increase in traffic on this slip road. This is essential.
- There is concern as to how site traffic will access the site compound that has been identified at the top of Markeaton St. No solution seems ideal. Markeaton Street is too narrow, two of the three fields are protected by Village Green status and a link onto the A38 would have to cross a key walking and cycling route alongside Queensway. We suggest an alternative site is found.
- We would like to see a segregated cycle route along the whole of Ashbourne Road on both sides of the roundabout.
- The cycle routes alongside Queensway/ A38 need to be upgraded to segregated routes that meet national standards.
- The replacement spiral bridge need to be 3.5m wide. We need to ensure that the positioning and angle is suitable to active travel users.
- There are significant concerns over the junction for active travel users entering Markeaton Park from Ashbourne Road. There needs to be provision across the junction with the petrol station/ McDonalds entrance. The position of the crossing of Ashbourne Road could be the city side of the junction so avoiding crossing the entrance to the petrol station.

### **Kingsway Roundabout**

- We welcome the addition of a route the links Kingsway to NCN R54/68.
- There must be user controlled lights on all sections where users are crossing roads, in particular on slip roads. This is essential. This route above will link the new housing at Kingsway with Brackensdale Primary school. The safety of active travel users to a primary school must require signalised crossings on the slip roads.
- We want to see a cycle route that links Kingsway and Markeaton Roundabout along the north side of the A38. The route could be found if the A38 was two lanes and not the proposed three lanes each way. Even if it is 3 lanes, it is important to have a cycle route on the north side of the A38 where we currently have Greenwich Drive North.

We hope that these suggestions are seen as constructive. It is vital that we do not further segregate our communities. Derby needs less vehicles travelling on its roads not more. We believe that it is vital that significant attention is paid to ensure that it is even easier to walk and cycle across the A38 than at present.

David Clasby

East Midlands Partnership Manager

P/P

Matt Easter

Sustrans England Director Midlands and East.

Thursday October 18<sup>th</sup> 2018