

Southern Gateways and Corridors

Planning applications at Lockwood, Longroyd Lane and Queensgate.

(Please note that some the responses are supported by a reference note from the Appendix of Dft's "Gear Change" document. These notes are at the bottom of this paper).

Lockwood:

Generally, it is difficult to see any significant improvements in these plans from the currently poor cycling conditions at Lockwood. Whilst it is understood that the main aim of this project is to increase capacity of motor traffic at this junction, Kirklees does also state that this project aims to make better conditions for cyclists and pedestrians. The council should be honest and accept that this aim has not yet been fulfilled.

1. **There is a missed opportunity** to install a cycling refuge on the corner of Bridge St and Woodhead Rd so that cyclists can safely wait before turning right into Lockwood Scar. They would then be able to safely access the (to be improved) Lockwood Riverside Path, which is a good potential cycling route into the town centre from the Holme Valley.
2. Measures should be taken to prevent Bentley St from being a 'rat run' and to improve the local environment of these local streets for residents. (Low Traffic Neighbourhood?)
3. The painted/marked advisory cycle lane on Lockwood Road is not acceptable. (See ref. note 1).
4. These plans present difficulties and hazards for a cyclist turning right into Albert St from Bridge St and then wishing to continue down Albert St instead of using the newly created road to access Lockwood Rd.
There is signage permitting a right turn into the second part of Albert St, and a marked green painted access area for cycles.
 - (a) This green area needs **protection** from right turning HGV's and other vehicles.
 - (b) There needs to be a **refuge** to allow cyclists to wait until it is safe to turn right into the green painted access of Albert St.

Longroyd Lane:

1. The outbound cycle lane is a step in the right direction, but it is not acceptable in its current design. Whilst 2m is normally an acceptable width, this cycle lane is bordered by a stone wall and requires to be 2.5m and to be protected. (See ref. note 1).

2. The inbound shared-use footway on Longroyd Lane does not comply with Ref. note 2 we would like to see cyclists physically separated from pedestrians along this stretch. We appreciate that this may require the council to acquire a small amount of additional land.
3. The inbound cycleway and footway should have priority over any side road or entrance. The drawing shows priority for motor vehicles but not for cyclists and pedestrians. This drawing needs to be revised to show a continuous footway and cycleway. We would suggest installing a 'Copenhagen Crossing'/Continuous footway similar to that used extensively in Waltham Forest.
4. The Toucan Crossing at the junction of Longroyd Lane and Manchester Road needs to be a 'Tiger' Crossing so that cyclists and pedestrians do not have to share the same space. See ref. note 3.
5. There is a **missed opportunity** to continue the cycle route beyond the Toucan crossing along the Manchester Road and Outcote Bank and into the town centre. By doing this, there would be some merit in the "Southern Gateways" name for this scheme.

Huddersfield Southern Corridors Queensgate

Sheet 1 of 3:

1. The hybrid cycle track and shared space leading into Alfred St needs to be continued for another 50 metres to allow a safe crossing point for northbound cyclists. This then gives good 'sight time' away from the complicated traffic crossings at the Alfred St/Queensgate junction.
2. A good link needs to be established between Queen St South and Alfred St across the Ring Road. Without this there cannot be a continuous route from the Holme Valley into the Civic Centre/Leisure Centre part of the town. (See Ref. note 5)
With a little imagination the use of the underpass could make this possible.
3. The existing Toucan crossing across Queensgate near Page St needs to be upgraded to a one-phase parallel crossing without chicanes. It needs to be similar to the one proposed at Zetland St. (Ref. note 3)

Sheet 2 of 3:

1. This plan seems to take no account of cyclists moving between Queen St and the hybrid cycle lane on Queensgate (Ref no. 4.).
On this plan cyclists exiting Queen St and wanting to go south on Queensgate have no sight time to know whether a vehicle on Queensgate is going to turn left into Queen St and cross the cyclist's path. The cycle track and footway should be continuous at this point, giving clear priority to pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles who wish to enter or exit Queen St.
A 'Copenhagen Crossing', similar to that used in Waltham Forrest, is recommended.

2. The plans for a wide parallel crossing from the University to near Zetland Street is very welcome. (Ref. no. 4).
3. On this plan cyclists coming from King St and Zetland St are unable to directly access the University, on carriageway. Motor traffic is required to turn left at these lights, but a small gap in the central barrier would allow cyclists, on a green light, to safely go straight ahead to the University entrance.
This would not require any modifications of the traffic light timings, but it would be helpful to have some ‘elephant footprints’ marked out on the road together with a dedicated traffic light for the cyclist.
4. Although this is a controlled crossing, the cycle track across Zetland St should be raised to the same level as the pedestrian platform, making it a continuous cycleway and footway.

Sheet 3 of 3:

1. The pedestrian crossing across Queensgate is pleasingly generous, but it is not clear whether it is anticipated that cyclists might also use this crossing. If so, it needs to be changed to a parallel crossing with cyclists and pedestrians having their own distinct space. (Ref. note 3).
2. It is a pity that this plan did not embrace a bigger picture of – as yet – undeveloped cycle routes from this point. The Queensgate hybrid cycleway leads to Oldgate which then can be linked to Beastgate from which an updated crossing at Southgate would lead to a further planned cycleway leading to Leeds Road.
Links could also be developed to the Huddersfield Narrow Canal Towpath at St Andrews Road and to the proposed cycle route on the Wakefield Road to Waterloo.
None of the potential of this, is evident in this plan.

Reference Notes from DFT’s “Gear Change” issued July 2020

1. *Cyclist must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them.*
2. *Cycles should be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and not share space with pedestrians.*
3. *At crossings and junctions cyclists should not share the space used by pedestrians but should be provided with a separate parallel route.*
4. *All designers of cycle schemes must experience the roads as a cyclist.*
5. *Cycle infrastructure must join together (with) a holistic connected network approach.*

