

# Kenilworth Road Cycle Route, Leamington Spa (K2L Section 1a)

## Appendix E: NFBUK Concerns and WCC Response

Email from NFBUK, 22 September 2022, to [tpu@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:tpu@warwickshire.gov.uk)

'The National Federation of the Blind of the UK (NFBUK) have assessed the Kenilworth Road cycle route, Leamington Spa scheme which is currently out for public consultation. The NFBUK has serious concerns over the design which if implemented will cause significant discrimination against blind, deaf blind and visually impaired (referred to blind and visually impaired through out this response) pedestrians and bus passengers as well as other disabled and vulnerable pedestrians and bus users. We recommend that the scheme is significantly modified to ensure discrimination is not created with this scheme for disabled people and that safe access to the pavement, pedestrian crossings and direct access from the pavement to and from the bus stop is maintained. The scheme needs to be significantly redesigned to ensure discrimination is not designed into this scheme.

In summary the following design features are not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and should not be used in the new scheme:

- Proposed shared footway cycleway at bus stops is where pedestrians have to step into a two way cycle lane to get on and off a bus should not be used as they are dangerous and not accessible for blind and visually impaired bus users. The design makes it significantly worse and dangerous for disabled people with no sight or limited sight to get on and off a bus stop. Expecting blind people to get on a bus and get off a bus from an active cycle lane is not safe and this design should not have reached at the consultation stage as it should not have even been considered. The majority of cyclists do not stop to let bus passengers get on and off a bus, and this particular design has proved very dangerous in Denmark, where research in 2007 revealed that shared use bus stops present a particular hazard for all pedestrians with their introduction led to an increase in collisions between cyclists and passengers from 5 to 73 - a 1,725% increase in collision rates on what had been expected. In a later report, in 2010, the authors report an increase in collisions at bus stop bypasses of 1951% resulting in a 1762% increase in injuries. **Access to and from the bus stop should be direct from the pavement which is designated for pedestrian use only.**
- Road humps that make side roads a level surface take away design features blind and visually impaired people use to know they are walking into the road which is very dangerous. There should be at least 60mm difference in kerb height at the crossing point with dropped kerbs for wheel chair users to use to safely get on and off the pavement, with a 6mm upstand designed into the dropped kerb.
- Cycle lanes which run behind pedestrian crossings on pavements are not safe at all and with changes to the street layouts these should be removed from the design.
- Toucan crossings should not be used in the scheme, existing toucan crossing should be upgraded for pedestrian only crossings.

- Shared space / use pavements are not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>.
- Proposed segregation / demarcation cycle kerb - white paint and low kerbs are not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>.

The NFBUK would like to state that Sheet 1 of the plan does not highlight the proposed changes to the bus stop in words in VIEW 1 and in View 2 it does not make it clear that the pavement around the bus stop is actually now a shared used pavement in relation to the bus stop. The sheet is misleading and could prevent people responding to this consultation correctly.

Further concerns raised about the use of shared used bus stops designs are given below and in Annex 1 below. It is also essential access to the bus stops is direct from the pavement designated for pedestrians only and the kerb is the correct size to allow safe access to and from the bus.

Designers and planners are not taking into account the changing nature of how people are travelling and the rapid adoption of many e-devices now being used on the public highway legally and illegally, including many e-scooters and e-bikes which have been modified. Cycle infrastructure at bus stops and when cycle lanes cut through pavements is already unsafe for pedestrians with no or limited sight when cyclists use their own power however with the added e-devices and resultant e-speeds that they can travel, cycling infrastructure for active travel has to be rethought and redesigned. Expecting pedestrians and bus users who are blind or visually impaired, or older people who cannot move very quickly to get across these cycle lanes with the riders of cycle and e-devices going through at all speeds and take priority is not safe or accessible. It is essential that safe access is maintained on the pavement swell as to get on and off a bus directly from the pavement. This will prevent disabled pedestrians and bus users being discriminated against.

It is not known how the designs could have got this far when there are significant design flaws in the scheme which will create discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. It is essential the information will be used to change the proposed designs to prevent any discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians and bus users, who will stop using these routes and bus stops independently, leaving them to greater isolation and unable to get where they want either walking or using public transport. Which is not acceptable. We are more than willing to discuss the scheme with you further however we cannot accept the designs being proposed in the existing plans. I have cc'd our President Andrew Hodgson into this email as he is very keen to ensure all changes undertaken are safe and accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and bus users'.

Sarah Gayton  
Street Access Campaign Coordinator

National Federation of the Blind of the UK  
<https://www.nfbuk.org>

Reg. Charity No. 236629 (England & Wales) SC 040134  
(Scotland)  
Sir John Wilson House, 215 Kirkgate, WAKEFIELD, West  
Yorkshire, WF1 1JG  
Contact+ 44 (0)1924 291 313 [admin@nfbuk.org](mailto:admin@nfbuk.org)

## NFBUK concerns and WCC design response

### Sheet 1 A452 - Kenilworth Road K2L Leamington Town Centre Cycle Link General arrangement Sheet 1 of 2

<b>NFBUK Concerns</b>	<b>WCC Design response</b>
<p><b>Proposed shared footway cycleway at bus stops</b> is where pedestrians have to step into a two way cycle lane to get on and off a bus. These bus stops should not be used as they are dangerous and not accessible for blind and visually impaired bus users. The design makes it significantly worse and dangerous for disabled people with no sight or limited sight to get on and off a bus stop. Expecting blind people to get on a bus and get off a bus from an active cycle lane is not safe and this design should not have reached at the consultation stage as it should not have even been considered. The majority of cyclists do not stop to let bus passengers get on and off a bus, and this particular design has proved very dangerous in Denmark, where research in <u>2007</u> revealed that shared use bus stops present a particular hazard for all pedestrians with their introduction led to an increase in collisions between cyclists and passengers from 5 to 73 - a 1,725% increase in collision rates on what had been expected. In a later report, in <u>2010</u>, the authors report an increase in collisions at bus stop bypasses of 1951% resulting in a 1762% increase in injuries.</p> <p><b>Access to and from the bus stop should be direct from the pavement which is designated for pedestrian use only.</b> Expecting a blind and visually impaired person to keep themselves safe which accessing public transport using these designs is not safe and they should not be expected to have to do this. This design will cause discrimination against disabled pedestrians and the design should not be used. Access to and from the bus should be direct from the pavement. Having cyclists and people using e-micromobility riding directly at you is not safe, it is frightening as you cannot hear or see them, they can hit you or your mobility aid, be it a white cane or a Guide Dog.</p>	<p><b>Existing</b></p> <p>There are 3 existing bus stops along the proposed cycle route on the east side of Kenilworth Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus flag, bench and bin outside 12 Kenilworth Road (opposite Arnold Lodge School).</li> <li>• Bus flag and bench outside 38 Kenilworth Road (just south of Woodcote Road).</li> <li>• Bus flag outside 52 Kenilworth Road (north of Cloister Crofts).</li> </ul> <p>There are currently issues with cycling on the footways and parking on the footways. E-scooters are illegal on highways in Warwickshire.</p> <p><b>LTN1/20 Guidance</b></p> <p>The latest guidance for the UK is LTN1/20 which is based on best practice in the UK in cycle infrastructure design.</p> <p>Paragraphs 6.6.6 to 6.6.15 provide guidance on bus and tram stops including bus stop bypasses and bus stop boarders. (Bus stop boarders may require passengers to cross a cycle track to get on and off a bus).</p> <p>LTN1/20 Table 6.3 sets out minimum widths of 3.0m for shared use routes with up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour.</p> <p><b>Proposed</b></p> <p>The proposal is to discontinue the segregated cycle track either side of the bus stops and widen the existing footway to provide a shared use area of approximately 5.0m. Double yellow lines and bus bay markings are also proposed.</p> <p>The increased space (approximately 5.0m wide at each of the three bus stops) will help to minimise conflicts between users.</p>

White canes can be knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast at the bus stops.

If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is a terrifying and very dangerous situation to be put in and it is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.

If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.

**Proposed shared footway cycleway** should not be used throughout the scheme. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>. Allowing cyclists to share space is not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and is not advised in areas like this as in [Cycling Guidance 1/20](#).

### **Modifications**

Bus stop bypasses and bus stop boarders were considered in the original design process and again following the local engagement as possible ways of maintaining the segregation at the bus stops.

However, there is limited space to create separate facilities, and it was considered that the provision of shared space would enable bus passengers and other pedestrians to have greater priority across the wider footway/ cycle track and help to reduce cycle speeds.

Final designs will be modified to include on carriageway bus stop markings and bus kerbs at all bus stops, to improve access for buses and passengers.

Additional text could be used alongside shared use signs to reinforce pedestrian priority around bus stops.

Monitoring will take place following scheme delivery.

### **Existing**

There is an existing footway but no cycle route along Kenilworth Road.

There are currently issues with cycling on the footways which indicates some cyclists do not consider the road to be a suitable environment for cycling and parking on the footways which can create a hazard and narrow the space available for pedestrians.

### **LTN1/20 Guidance**

**Principles** - LTN1/20 sets out clear principles that, 'on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians'. However, the guidance also explains where shared use facilities may be used.

Having bikes riding behind you, in front of you and at the side of you on pavements is not safe or accessible. It is frightening, can cause disorientation for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.

Blind and visually impaired pedestrians using white canes can get them knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast on crossings.

If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is a terrifying and very dangerous situation to be put in and it is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.

If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.

**Proposed segregated footway cycleway / Proposed segregation / demarcation cycle kerb** White paint and low kerbs are not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and should not be used to segregate the footway way from the cycle way. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination

**Engagement** - LTN1/20 Paragraphs 6.5.5 and 6.5.6 explain that shared use facilities are appropriate in some situations and suggest early engagement with relevant interested parties.

**Dimensions** - LTN1/20 Table 6.3 sets out minimum widths of 3.0m for shared use routes with up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour.

**Proposed**

**Principles** - the design of the Kenilworth Road cycle route aims to maximise segregation between users in line with the principles of LTN1/20.

**Engagement** – local engagement took place with interested parties about this scheme in Autumn 2022.

Council officers met with members of the Warwickshire Vision groups in Leamington Spa and Nuneaton in August and September 2022 and discussed the experiences of blind and visually impaired pedestrians and their views on future walking and cycling schemes. Members stated a preference for separation between users as much as possible with clear tactile paving and a raised delineation line between cycle tracks and footways – that could be detected by a cane and followed by guide dogs. They also welcomed clearer signs informing cyclists about cycle routes.

Other feedback from engagement included concerns about the reallocation of road space and lack of continuity for cyclists. The proposals therefore need to achieve a balance between maintaining routes for walking, providing a new route for cycling and keeping traffic moving.

**Dimensions** – the segregation has been achieved in many areas by reallocating space from the carriageway and the existing wide footways to create a new 3.0m wide cycle track and a 2.0m wide footway.

against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>.

However in some locations, the traffic requirements of heavily trafficked Kenilworth Road, particularly north of the junction with Lillington Avenue where the road has A road designation and forms part of the Major Road Network have limited the space available for other road users, and in these areas it is not possible to provide full segregation and therefore shared use is proposed.

The most significant section of shared use is 270m long and is located at the northern extent of the scheme where pedestrian use of the scheme is expected to be relatively low. At other locations (bus stops, pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads) there are also short sections of shared use to enable pedestrians to have greater priority across the full width of the footway/ cycle track and to help reduce cycle speeds.

Shared use sections of the Kenilworth Road cycle route will be created by widening of the existing footway to 3.0m, with busier sections on the southern part of the route up to 5.0m wide, including at bus stops. Traffic and user counts in March 2022 show that there are currently less than 50 pedestrians and cyclists per hour using the footway on the east side of the Kenilworth Road at the busiest hours of the day.

Users will be alerted to the change between segregated and shared use provision and vice versa by the provision of buff coloured ladder / tramline tactile paving and corduroy hazard warning surfaces as per national standards.

### **Modifications**

Following feedback from the community engagement and advertising of the orders / notices, the designs were reviewed to identify if there was further scope to extend the segregation.

The design team concluded this was not possible due to the complexity and confusion of switching between shared use and segregated provision for very short sections, and the need to provide sufficient space to allow cyclists to reduce speed in advance of

	<p>bus stops, pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads.</p> <p>There was also a need to retain space for traffic movements, particularly at the busier junctions (Northumberland Road and Lillington Avenue). This limited the space available to create segregated facilities.</p> <p>Options for the delineation between cycle track and footway on the segregated sections were also reviewed. A trapezoidal kerb was rejected on advice from manufacturers due to the driveway crossings and risk of damage caused by vehicle overrun. The proposed design will therefore use either a raised white line (as per Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD), diagram 1049.1) or other physical separation feature that can be identified by a blind or visually impaired person using a mobility cane.</p>
<p><b>Proposed shared footway cycleway at pedestrian crossings</b> should not be used. The design allows cyclists and riders of e-micromobility to bypass the pedestrian controlled crossing. This is not safe for blind or visually impaired pedestrians, disabled and vulnerable pedestrians. The cycle lane has also to be included into the pedestrian crossing traffic lights phase. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017  <a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347">https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347</a>.</p> <p>Having bikes riding behind you, in front of you and at the side of you on a pedestrian crossing is not safe or accessible. It is frightening, can cause disorientation for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.</p> <p>Blind and visually impaired pedestrians using white canes can get them knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck</p>	<p><b>Existing</b></p> <p>There is an existing footway but no cycle route along Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>There are currently issues with cycling on the footways and parking on the footways.</p> <p><b>LTN1/20 Guidance</b>  <b>Principles</b> - LTN1/20 sets out clear principles that, 'on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians'. However, the guidance also explains where shared use facilities may be used.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5.6 states that shared use may be appropriate in some situations, if well-designed and implemented. Including those listed are, 'At and around junctions where cyclists are generally moving at a slow speed including in association with Toucan facilities'.</p> <p><b>Dimensions</b> - LTN1/20 Table 6.3 sets out minimum widths of 3.0m for shared use routes with up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour.</p>

<p>in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast on crossings.</p> <p>If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is a terrifying and very dangerous situation to be put in and it is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.</p> <p>If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.</p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p> <p><b>Principles</b> - the design of the Kenilworth Road cycle route aims to maximise segregation between users in line with the principles of LTN1/20. However, short sections of shared-use cycle tracks/ footways are provided near Toucan and Puffin crossings, areas where cyclists are moving at a slower speed and pedestrians need access to the kerbside crossing points.</p> <p><b>Dimensions</b> – widening of the footway is proposed (in excess of the LTN1/20 minimum of 3.0m) to reduce conflicts within these shared use areas.</p> <p>Users will be alerted to the change between segregated and shared use provision and vice versa by the provision of buff coloured ladder / tramline tactile paving and corduroy hazard warning surfaces as per national standards.</p> <p><b>Modifications</b></p> <p>Following feedback from the community engagement and advertising of the orders / notices, the designs were reviewed to identify if there was further scope to extend the segregation, provide additional crossing points or provide separate crossings for cyclists.</p> <p>The design team concluded that additional segregation was not possible due to the complexity and confusion of switching between shared use and segregated provision for very short sections, and the need to provide sufficient space to allow cyclists to reduce speed in advance of the pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads.</p>
<p><b>Toucan pedestrian crossings:</b> On view 1 the 'Existing toucan crossing to remain' should actually be made into a pedestrian only crossing and the proposed change of the puffin crossing to a toucan crossing should be used in the scheme.</p> <p>It is not recommended to have toucan crossings in <u>Cycle Guidance 1/20</u> (page 114) in areas where pedestrian and cycle flows are high as would be the case in this location.</p>	<p><b>Existing</b></p> <p>There is an existing Toucan crossing just north of Binswood Avenue. This provides a connection to an existing cycle route along Binswood Avenue (east) and Lillington Road between Kenilworth Road and North Leamington School.</p> <p><b>LTN1/20 Guidance</b></p> <p>LTN1/20 guidance (page 114 Paragraph 10.6.19) notes that Toucan facilities can be</p>



Having bikes riding behind you, in front of you and at the side of you on a pedestrian crossing is not safe or accessible. It is frightening, can cause disorientation for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.

Blind and visually impaired pedestrians using white canes can get them knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast on crossings.

If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is a terrifying and very dangerous situation to be put in and it is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.

If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.

**Proposed road humps:** In view 2 a 'road hump' is proposed that makes side roads a level surface take away design features blind and visually impaired people use to know they are walking into the road which is very dangerous. There should be at least 60mm difference in kerb height for the same reason given above at the crossing point with dropped kerbs for wheel chair users to use to safely get

provided at signal junctions and to accommodate this it is necessary to provide shared use facilities around the junction - therefore it is unlikely such an arrangement would be suitable where pedestrian and cyclist flows are high. No thresholds for flows are given.

### **Proposed**

It is proposed to retain the existing Toucan crossing just north of Binswood Avenue but to remove the existing refuge island. These changes will reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians and cyclists but increase the existing shared use footway/ cycle track width on the east side, providing more space for people to wait and pass each other and accommodate any increases in pedestrian and cycle flows.

### **Modifications**

Following feedback from the community engagement and advertising of the orders / notices, the designs were reviewed to identify if there was further scope to widen the Toucan crossing or provide separate crossings for cyclists.

No changes are currently planned but monitoring will take place following scheme delivery including traffic and user counts.

### **Existing**

There are dropped kerbs with blister tactile paving either side of Woodcote Road (east).

### **LTN1/20 Guidance**

LTN1/20 Paragraphs 10.5.7 to 10.5.30 provide details of priority crossing of cycle tracks at side roads.

on and off the pavement, with a 6mm upstand designed into the dropped kerb.

**Proposed**

A priority crossing is proposed on Woodcote Road, partially setback on a contrasting coloured surfacing and road hump. Clear line markings will help to slow down turning traffic and make the crossing more conspicuous, as suggested in the guidance. The road hump will make the side road a level surface, making it easier to cross for pedestrians and cyclists. There will be standard blister tactile paving to indicate the edge of the footway/ cycle track and carriageway so that blind and visually impaired people can identify the edge of the footway.

**Modifications**

Detailed design work has indicated that it may not be possible to provide a road hump on Woodcote Road within the adopted highway. However, the crossing distance will be reduced to provide easier crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.

Following local engagement an additional priority crossing is proposed at Cloister Crofts setback 5.0m from the junction mouth.

This will be subject to further advertisement before being implemented.

**Sheet 2 A452 - Kenilworth Road K2L Leamington Town Centre Cycle Link General arrangement**  
 Sheet 2 of 2

**Proposed shared footway cycleway** should not be used throughout the scheme. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>. Allowing cyclists to shared space is not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and is not advised in areas like this as in [Cycling Guidance 1/20](#).

**Existing**

There is an existing footway but no cycle route along Kenilworth Road.

There are currently issues with cycling on the footways and parking on the footways.

**LTN1/20 Guidance**

**Principles** - LTN1/20 sets out clear principles that, 'on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians'. However, the guidance also explains where shared use facilities may be used.

**Engagement** - LTN1/20 Paragraphs 6.5.5 and 6.5.6 explain that shared use facilities are

Having bikes riding behind you, in front of you and at the side of you on pavements is not safe or accessible. It is frightening, can cause disorientation for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.

Blind and visually impaired pedestrians using white canes can get them knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast on crossings.

If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is a terrifying and very dangerous situation to be put in and it is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.

If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.

**Proposed segregated footway cycleway/ Proposed segregation / demarcation cycle kerb** White paint and low kerbs are not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and should not be used to segregate the footway way from the cycle way. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination

appropriate in some situations and suggest early engagement with relevant interested parties.

**Dimensions** - LTN1/20 Table 6.3 sets out minimum widths of 3.0m for shared use routes with up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour.

#### **Proposed**

**Principles** - the design of the Kenilworth Road cycle route aims to maximise segregation between users in line with the principles of LTN1/20.

**Engagement** – local engagement took place with interested parties about this scheme in Autumn 2022.

Council officers met with members of the Warwickshire Vision groups in Leamington Spa and Nuneaton in August and September 2022 and discussed the experiences of blind and visually impaired pedestrians and their views on future walking and cycling schemes. Members stated a preference for separation between users as much as possible with clear tactile paving and a raised delineation line between cycle tracks and footways – that could be detected by a cane and followed by guide dogs. They also welcomed clearer signs informing cyclists about cycle routes.

Other feedback from engagement included concerns about the reallocation of road space and lack of continuity for cyclists. The proposals therefore need to achieve a balance between maintaining routes for walking, providing a new route for cycling and keeping traffic moving.

**Dimensions** – the segregation has been achieved in many areas by reallocating space from the carriageway and the existing wide footways to create a new 3.0m wide cycle track and a 2.0m wide footway.

However in some locations, the traffic requirements of this busy 'A' road have limited the space available for other road users, and in these areas it is not possible to provide full

against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>.

segregation and therefore shared use is proposed.

The most significant section of shared use is 270m long and is located at the northern extent of the scheme where pedestrian use of the scheme is expected to be relatively low. At other locations (bus stops, pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads) there are also short sections of shared use to enable pedestrians to have greater priority across the full width of the footway/ cycle track and to help reduce cycle speeds.

Shared use sections of the Kenilworth Road cycle route will be created by widening of the existing footway to 3.0m,, with busier sections on the southern part of the route up to 5.0m wide, including at bus stops. Traffic and user counts in March 2022 show that there are currently less than 50 pedestrians and cyclists per hour using the footway on the east side of the Kenilworth Road at the busiest hours of the day.

Users will be alerted to the change between segregated and shared use provision and vice versa by the provision of buff coloured ladder / tramline tactile paving and corduroy hazard warning surfaces as per national standards.

### **Modifications**

Following feedback from the community engagement and advertising of the orders / notices, the designs were reviewed to identify if there was further scope to extend the segregation.

The design team concluded this was not possible due to the complexity and confusion of switching between shared use and segregated provision for very short sections, and the need to provide sufficient space to allow cyclists to reduce speed in advance of bus stops, pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads.

Options for the delineation between cycle track and footway on the segregated sections were also reviewed. A trapezoidal kerb was rejected on advice from manufacturers due to

	<p>the driveway crossings and risk of damage caused by vehicle overrun. The proposed design will therefore use either a raised white line (as per Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD), diagram 1049.1) or other physical separation feature that can be identified by a blind or visually impaired person using a mobility cane.</p>
<p><b>Cloister Crofts</b> - this junction needs to be redesigned as the tactile paving and the way it has been laid is not safe for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.</p>	<p><b>Existing</b>        There are dropped kerbs with blister tactile paving either side of Cloister Crofts.</p> <p>The existing pedestrian refuge just north of Cloister Crofts does not have dropped kerbs or tactile paving and has limited width at the refuge.</p> <p><b>LTN1/20 Guidance</b>        LTN1/20 Paragraph 10.4.7 states that refuges should be free of clutter, and at least 3.0m long (in the direction of travel for the cyclist) to protect users, including the cycle design vehicle, wheelchairs and mobility scooters.</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.5.7 to 10.5.30 provide details of priority crossing of cycle tracks at side roads.</p> <p><b>Proposed</b>        It is proposed to remove the existing pedestrian refuge just north of Cloister Crofts.</p> <p><b>Modifications</b>        Following local engagement an additional priority crossing is proposed at Cloister Crofts with a full setback of 5.0m. In response to several comments, the pedestrian refuge is proposed to be relocated from just north of Cloister Crofts to just south of Northumberland Avenue.</p> <p>The priority crossing will have contrasting coloured surfacing on a road hump. Clear line markings will help to slow down turning traffic and make the crossing more conspicuous, as suggested in the guidance. The road hump will make the side road a level surface making it easier to cross for pedestrians and cyclists. There will be standard blister tactile paving to indicate the edge of the footway/ cycle track and carriageway so that blind and visually</p>

	<p>impaired people can identify the edge of the footway.</p> <p>The road hump at Cloister Crofts will be subject to further advertisement before being implemented.</p>
<p><b>Proposed shared footway cycleway at pedestrian crossings</b> should not be used. The design allows cyclists and riders or e-micromobility to bypass the pedestrian controlled crossing. This is not safe for blind or visually impaired pedestrians, disabled pedestrians and vulnerable pedestrians in this location. The cycle lane has to be included into the pedestrian crossing traffic lights phase. There also has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347">https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347</a>.</p> <p>Having bikes riding behind you, in front of you and at the side of you on a pedestrian crossing is not safe or accessible. It is frightening, can cause disorientation for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.</p> <p>Blind and visually impaired pedestrians using white canes can get them knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast on crossings.</p> <p>If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is terrifying and a very dangerous situation to be put in and it is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and</p>	<p><b>Existing</b></p> <p>There is an existing footway but no cycle route along Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>There are currently issues with cycling on the footways and parking on the footways.</p> <p><b>LTN1/20 Guidance</b></p> <p><b>Principles</b> - LTN1/20 sets out clear principles that, 'on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians'. However, the guidance also explains where shared use facilities may be used.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5.6 states that shared use may be appropriate in some situations, if well-designed and implemented. Including those listed are, 'At and around junctions where cyclists are generally moving at a slow speed including in association with Toucan facilities'.</p> <p><b>Dimensions</b> - LTN1/20 Table 6.3 sets out minimum widths of 3.0m for shared use routes with up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour.</p> <p><b>Proposed</b></p> <p><b>Principles</b> - the design of the Kenilworth Road cycle route aims to maximise segregation between users in line with the principles of LTN1/20. However, short sections of shared-use cycle tracks/ footways are provided near Toucan and Puffin crossings, areas where cyclists are moving at a slower speed and pedestrians need access to the kerbside crossing points.</p> <p><b>Dimensions</b> – widening of the footway is proposed (in excess of the LTN1/20 minimum of 3.0m) to reduce conflicts within these shared use areas.</p> <p>Users will be alerted to the change between segregated and shared use provision and vice</p>

<p>pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.</p> <p>If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.</p>	<p>versa by the provision of buff coloured ladder / tramline tactile paving and corduroy hazard warning surfaces as per national standards.</p> <p><b>Modifications</b>        Following feedback from the community engagement and advertising of the orders / notices, the designs were reviewed to identify if there was further scope to extend the segregation, provide additional crossing points or provide separate crossings for cyclists.</p> <p>The design team concluded that additional segregation was not possible due to the complexity and confusion of switching between shared use and segregated provision for very short sections, and the need to provide sufficient space to allow cyclists to reduce speed in advance of the pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads.</p>
<p><b>Raised Table</b> In view 3 what was called a 'road hump' in view 2 is now called a raised table. Again this will makes the side road a level surface take away design features blind and visually impaired people use to know they are walking into the road which is very dangerous. There should be at least 60mm difference in kerb height at the crossing point with dropped kerbs for wheel chair users to use to safely get on and off the pavement, with a 6mm upstand designed into the dropped kerb.</p>	<p><b>Existing</b>        There are dropped kerbs with blister tactile paving either side of Woodcote Road (east).</p> <p><b>LTN1/20 Guidance</b>        LTN1/20 Paragraphs 10.5.7 to 10.5.30 provide details of priority crossing of cycle tracks at side roads.</p> <p><b>Proposed</b>        A priority crossing is proposed on Woodcote Road. The road hump will make the side road a level surface, slowing down traffic and making it easier to cross for pedestrians and cyclists. There will be standard blister tactile paving to indicate the edge of the footway/ cycle track and carriageway so that blind and visually impaired people can identify the edge of the footway.</p> <p><b>Modifications</b>        Detailed design work has indicated that it may not be possible to provide a road hump on Woodcote Road within the adopted highway. However, the crossing distance will be reduced to provide easier crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Following local engagement an additional priority crossing is proposed at Cloister Crofts with a full setback of 5.0m.

This road hump will be subject to further advertisement before being implemented.

**Sheet 3 A452 - Kenilworth Road K2L Leamington Town Centre Cycle Link Scheme Overview Plan**  
Purpose of Drawing: Consultation

**Proposed shared footway cycleway** in View 1 should not be used. There has to be at least 60mm height from pavement to the cycle lane to keep blind and visually impaired pedestrians and cyclists / e-micromobility users separate from each other. Anything lower will cause discrimination against blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The requirement for 60mm kerbs has been established in this legal case from 2017 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-39902347>. Allowing cyclists to shared space is not safe or accessible for blind and visually impaired pedestrians and is not advised in areas like this as in Cycling Guidance 1/20.

Having bikes riding behind you, in front of you and at the side of you on pavements is not safe or accessible. It is frightening, can cause disorientation for blind and visually impaired pedestrians.

Blind and visually impaired pedestrians using white canes can get them knocked, broken or ripped out of their hands as they can get stuck in the spokes of the wheels of the bikes and Guide Dogs can also be hit or frightened with bikes trying to pass too close and too fast on crossings.

If a white cane is broken or ripped from somebody's hand it leaves them without a mobility aid and stuck in the middle of the road without being able to find the cane or have access to a fully functioning mobility aid to carry on their journey. This can also hurt the hand, wrist, arm and shoulder of somebody using a white cane as a mobility aid and it can be a very painful experience. This is a terrifying and very dangerous situation to be put in and it

**Existing**

There is an existing footway but no cycle route along Kenilworth Road.

There are currently issues with cycling on the footways and parking on the footways.

**LTN1/20 Guidance**

**Principles** - LTN1/20 sets out clear principles that, 'on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians'. However, the guidance also explains where shared use facilities may be used.

**Engagement** - LTN1/20 Paragraphs 6.5.5 and 6.5.6 explain that shared use facilities are appropriate in some situations and suggest early engagement with relevant interested parties.

**Dimensions** - LTN1/20 Table 6.3 sets out minimum widths of 3.0m for shared use routes with up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour. Shared use sections of the Kenilworth Road cycle route will be created by widening of the existing footway to 3.0m, with busier sections on the southern part of the route up to 5.0m wide, including at bus stops. Traffic and user counts in March 2022 show that there are currently less than 50 pedestrians and cyclists per hour using the footway on the east side of the Kenilworth Road at the busiest hours of the day.

**Proposed**

**Principles** - the design of the Kenilworth Road cycle route aims to maximise segregation between users in line with the principles of LTN1/20.



is essential cyclists / e-micromobility riders and pedestrians are not brought into conflict by new street designs to accommodate active travel.

If a Guide Dog is hurt or frightened too much, it may not be able to work or refuse to work any more and have to be retired. This is a devastating blow to the partnership between the Guide Dog users and the Guide Dog, and an immediate loss of the benefit of a Guide Dog which gives many blind and visually impaired people independence. New dogs are not always available and there is a long waiting list to get a new one.

**Engagement** – local engagement took place with interested parties about this scheme in Autumn 2022.

Council officers met with members of the Warwickshire Vision groups in Leamington Spa and Nuneaton in August and September 2022 and discussed the experiences of blind and visually impaired pedestrians and their views on future walking and cycling schemes. Members stated a preference for separation between users as much as possible with clear tactile paving and a raised delineation line between cycle tracks and footways – that could be detected by a cane and followed by guide dogs. They also welcomed clearer signs informing cyclists about cycle routes.

Other feedback from engagement included concerns about the reallocation of road space and lack of continuity for cyclists. The proposals therefore need to achieve a balance between maintaining routes for walking, providing a new route for cycling and keeping traffic moving.

**Dimensions** – the segregation has been achieved in many areas by reallocating space from the carriageway and the existing wide footways to create a new 3.0m wide cycle track and a 2.0m wide footway.

However in some locations, the traffic requirements of this busy 'A' road have limited the space available for other road users, and in these areas it is not possible to provide full segregation and therefore shared use is proposed.

The most significant section of shared use is 270m long and is located at the northern extent of the scheme where pedestrian use of the scheme is expected to be relatively low. At other locations (bus stops, pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads) there are also short sections of shared use to enable pedestrians to have greater priority across the full width of the footway/ cycle track and to help reduce cycle speeds.

Users will be alerted to the change between segregated and shared use provision and vice versa by the provision of buff coloured ladder / tramline tactile paving and corduroy hazard warning surfaces as per national standards.

**Modifications**

Following feedback from the community engagement and advertising of the orders / notices, the designs were reviewed to identify if there was further scope to extend the segregation.

The design team concluded this was not possible due to the complexity and confusion of switching between shared use and segregated provision for very short sections, and the need to provide sufficient space to allow cyclists to reduce speed in advance of bus stops, pedestrian crossing points and intersections with footways at side roads.

Options for the delineation between cycle track and footway on the segregated sections were also reviewed. A trapezoidal kerb was rejected on advice from manufacturers due to the driveway crossings and risk of damage caused by vehicle overrun. The proposed design will therefore use either a raised white line (as per Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD), diagram 1049.1) or other physical separation feature that can be identified by a blind or visually impaired person using a mobility cane.

**Proposed bike parking** should not be located that close the junction as it will obscure the view of drivers and pedestrians. A build out could be constructed to reduce the width of the side road and improvements could be made to the dropped kerbs at the side junction. Some of the car parking spaces could be removed for cycle parking. What is being proposed in the plan is not safe.

**Existing**

There is on-street car parking along Beauchamp Road but no cycle parking provision.

**LTN1/20 Guidance**

Paragraphs 11.2.1 to 11.5.2 provide guidance on cycle parking.

**Proposed**

Cycle parking space is proposed on the corner of Beauchamp Road and Clarendon Avenue by constructing a buildout, narrowing the side road and removing 2-3 car parking spaces.

	<p><b>Modifications</b></p> <p>Detailed designs will ensure that there is clear space for pedestrian and cycle movements at this location and that the installation of cycle stands does not obscure intervisibility of drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
--	--