



Comhairle Cathrach na Gaillimhe
Galway City Council

Halla na Cathrach
Bóthar an Chóiláiste
Gaillimh
H91 X4K8

City Hall
College Road
Galway
H91 X4KB

To: The Members of Galway City Council

From: Planning Department

Re: Part VIII Report for LA/3/2023
Proposed Development – Ballybane Road and Castle Park Road
Cycle Network Scheme

Date: 4th August 2023

A Chara,

Please find attached the Part VIII Report for LA/3/2023 for the proposed Ballybane Road and Castle Park Road Cycle Network Scheme, for your consideration.

Mise le meas,

Liam Blake,
Senior Executive Planner
Planning Department

Fáiltear roimh chomhfhreagras i nGaeilge / Correspondence in Irish is welcome

Seirbhís Custaiméara / Customer Service (091) 536400
Rphoist / Email customerservice@galwaycity.ie • Gréasán / Web www.galwaycity.ie



PART 8 PLANNING REPORT

under Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2023

LA 3/2023

BALLYBANE ROAD AND CASTLEPARK ROAD CYCLE NETWORK SCHEME

Provision of a segregated cycle route along the R865 Ballybane Road and the L5029 Castlepark Road

The format of this Part 8 Planning Report is as follows:

- i. Nature and extent of the proposed development and the principal features.
- ii. Evaluation of the proposed development.
- iii. Environmental Impact Assessment Screening.
- iv. Screening for Appropriate Assessment
- v. List the persons or bodies who made submissions or observations.
- vi. Summary of the issues in submissions or observations and response.
- vii. Recommendation.

i. Nature and extent of the proposed development and the principal features.

The proposed development is located as follows:

R865 Ballybane Road, from its junction with the R339 Monivea Road to a point approximately 130m north of Skerritt Roundabout (R338 Dublin Road).

L5029 Castlepark Road, from its junction with R865 Ballybane Road to its junction with R339 Monivea Road.



Figure 1 Location of proposed Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road Cycle Scheme

The existing Ballybane Road is a single lane carriageway widening in places to two lanes at junctions to allow for turning lanes. Ballybane Road has a short section of existing cycle infrastructure between the N6 Bothar na dTreabh junction and the Monivea Road junction, in the form of advisory cycle lanes. The remainder of Ballybane Road has no cycle infrastructure but has footpaths on either side of its length. The section of Ballybane Road under consideration is approximately 1.2km long.

Castlepark Road is a single lane carriageway with no existing cycle infrastructure. There are footpaths on both sides of the road. The section of Castlepark Road under consideration is approximately 1.24km.

Key features of the development will consist of:

- The provision of a 2m protected cycle track and 2m footpath on both sides of Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road, reducing in places where constraints exist.
- Reduction in road carriageway widths (typically 3m wide lanes).
- Junction realignments and the introduction of raised crossings on all side roads to prioritise pedestrian movements.
- Straight through cycle lane/track crossings on all side road junctions to prioritise cyclists movements.
- The provision of signalised crossings for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Upgrading of the R865 Ballybane Road / L5029 Castlepark Road junction and L5029 Castlepark Road / R339 Monivea Road junction to signalised junctions with provision for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The introduction of pedestrian and shared crossing points at several locations.
- The provision of landscaping along the routes.

ii. Evaluation of the proposed development

Section 1.2 Strategic Vision for Galway City under the City Development Plan 2023-2029 states that a strategic goal for the city is to integrate land use and transport planning to maximise opportunities for active travel and public transport usage and enable key transport projects included in the Galway Transport Strategy (GTS) which will deliver multi modal usage, smart mobility, and accessibility for all.

Policy 1.4 Core Strategy of the City Development Plan states that the Council will support the compact growth of Galway City through appropriate policies that promote co-ordination between land use and locations that can be served by public transport and the walking and cycling networks and enables the delivery of 50% of all new homes within the existing built footprint on lands as set out in the Core Strategy. The delivery of the identified GTS Cycle Network is supported in the Core Strategy of the Development Plan as it will play a critical element in developing a high quality, dedicated cycling network which is linked with existing and targeted settlement and employment areas. This will increase active travel, that is walking and cycling and usage of public transport.

The proposed cycle route is part of a dedicated cycling network in the city that will give priority to cyclists, both for commuting and as a leisure activity and will when delivered encourage the uptake in cycling, see figure no. 1. The proposed infrastructural works also incorporate improvements to pedestrian facilities providing safer crossing points and pedestrian prioritised raised crossings on all side roads.



Figure 2 GTS - Proposed Cycle Network, Source: Galway Transport Strategy 2016 – Proposed cycle route is part of the primary and secondary cycle network within the eastern suburbs of the city.

The Ballybane Road cycle route is part of the primary cycle network which focuses on the provision of segregated safe routes and connections from dedicated cycleways and footpaths to existing networks linking schools, workplaces and residential areas as alternatives to vehicular transport. These are designed to accommodate medium distance journeys. The Castlepark Road cycle route is part of the secondary cycle network which provides for connections from residential areas and areas of employment to the primary network accessing key destinations. Cycling and electric cycling combined have enormous potential to facilitate a high proportion of daily trips. To maximise this potential the appropriate infrastructure, as currently proposed, is required.

Policy 4.4 Sustainable Mobility - Walk and Cycle states it is the policy of the Council to support the Galway Transport Strategy proposals for a primary cycle network to facilitate safe and convenient medium distance journeys, support the Galway Transport Strategy proposals for a secondary cycle network and feeder links to facilitate safe and convenient local journeys and to afford linkage into the primary cycle network and implement a structured programme of improvements across the whole city pedestrian network and at street crossings.

The proposed cycle route is located within the Established Suburb Neighbourhood of Ballybane. The cycle route will serve the residents of the Ballybane and key community, educational and commercial facilities along both routes including the Atlantic Technological University, Ballybane Neighbourhood Shopping Centre, Ballybane Library, Pope John Paul Centre and St. Brigid's Church. The proposed cycle route and its related infrastructural improvements will encourage active travel including cycling and walking, support modal shift, encourage healthier mobility choices, relieve traffic congestion, improve the urban environment of Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road and help to tackle the climate crisis.

Upon evaluation, the proposed cycle route is consistent with the strategic vision, Core Strategy, sustainable mobility and climatic mitigation policies and provisions of the City Development Plan, as outlined under Chapter 1 Introduction, Strategic Context & Core Strategy, Chapter 2 Climate Action, Chapter 4 Sustainable Mobility and Transportation and Chapter 5 Natural Heritage, Recreation and Amenity, the GTS and also national sustainable mobility policy¹ and is consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

¹ National Sustainable Mobility Policy 2022

iii. Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

An Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report has been prepared in respect of the proposed development and in accordance with Article 120(1)(b)(1) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2023. The purpose of this report is to determine whether the project requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR). The project has been screened to generate a summarised overview of the potential impacts on the receiving environment, and in the context of relevant statutory requirements.

Based on all available information, and taking account of the scale, nature, and location of the proposed development it is concluded that the preparation of an EIAR is not a mandatory requirement (under Section 50 of the Roads Acts 1993-2022). The project is deemed a sub-threshold development; hence the potential for significant environmental effects arising as a result of the proposed project has been evaluated, in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 7A and Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Acts 2001-2023.

Key findings are summarised as follows:

- Due to the limited nature of the works, it is considered that there will be no significant cumulative impacts with other developments in the general area,
- Limited noise, vibration and dust emissions may be generated during construction; however, this is anticipated to be minimal in effect and will cause no significant impact,
- Soil and waste may be generated during construction; however, this is not anticipated to have significant effect,
- There will be no significant impact on biodiversity, groundwater, surface water or traffic; and,
- There will be no impact on recorded monuments or historic features.

Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Conclusion and Determination in accordance with Article 120(1)(b)(1) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2023

The Planning Authority has completed the environmental impact assessment screening of the proposed development and considers that the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report, identifies and describes adequately any likely direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment. Having regard to:

- The findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report,
- the nature and scale of the proposed development on an urban site predominantly along the existing Ballybane and Castlepark roads and verges,
- the absence of any significant environmental sensitivities in the area,
- having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2023,
- the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in Article 103(3) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2023,

It is concluded that, by reason of the nature, scale and location of the subject site, the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment. It is decided, therefore, that an EIAR for the proposed development is not necessary in this case.

iv. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

Policy 5.2 Protected Spaces: Sites of European, National and Local Ecological Importance of the City Development Plan states that it is the policy of the Council to:

1. Protect European sites that form part of the Natura 2000 network (including Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation) in accordance with the requirements in the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), EU Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and associated national legislation.
2. Ensure that all plans or projects within the Plan area will only be authorised and / or supported after the competent authority has ascertained based on scientific evidence, screening for appropriate assessment and /or a Habitats Directive Assessment that:
 - i. The plan or project will not give rise to an adverse direct, indirect or secondary effect on the integrity of any European site (either individually or in combination with other plans or projects); or
 - ii. The plan or project will have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site (that does not host a priority natural habitat type/and or a priority species) but there are no alternative solutions, and the plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature. In this case, it will be a requirement to follow procedures set out in legislation and agree and undertake all compensatory measures necessary to ensure the protection of the overall coherence of Natura 2000; or
 - iii. The plan or project will have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site (that hosts a natural habitat type and/or a priority species) but there are no alternative solutions and the plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons for overriding public interest, restricted to reasons of human health or public safety, to beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment or, further to an opinion from the Commission, to other imperative reasons of overriding public interest. In this case, it will be a requirement to follow procedures set out in legislation and agree and undertake all compensatory measures necessary to ensure the protection of the overall coherence of Natura 2000.

Galway City Council has carried out an Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening Report (stage 1) of the proposed development. The Screening for AA Report has been prepared by competent experts to ensure its completeness and quality and provides the best available scientific knowledge, and objective information. This Report was prepared with reference and due consideration to relevant European and national legislation and guidance, as outlined under Section 3.1. Guidance Documents of the Report, including the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC, Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland: Guidance for Planning Authorities (2010 DEHLG), and Appropriate Assessment Screening for Development Management Office of the Planning Regulator Practice Note PN01 (2021).

In summary, the AA Screening Report states that Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road are aligned predominantly along roadways and associated pathways and does not encroach into any protected habitats. The proposed project site does not lie within any European site, while there are 10 no. identified European sites within the potential zone of influence of the project; 6 no. SACs and 4 no. SPAs.

Following the precautionary principle, the potential for the proposed project to impact on the Galway Bay Complex SAC and Inner Galway Bay SPA is assessed in Screening for AA report, due to their proximity to the proposed project. The AA Screening Report finds that given the nature, scale and location of the proposed cycleway route it is considered that the construction and operation of the proposed project will not have a likely significant effect on the qualifying interest habitats and species of Galway Bay Complex SAC and Inner Galway Bay SPA. No proposed projects or plans were identified that would, in-combination with the proposed project, have likely significant effects on the European

sites within the zone of influence of the proposed project, or any other European site. The Report concludes that due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, it is considered that the proposed project, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will not result in likely significant effects on the Galway Bay Complex SAC or Inner Galway Bay SPA, or any other European site, in view of their conservation objectives and an Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) is therefore not required in respect of this proposed development.

AA Screening Conclusion and Determination in accordance with Article 6(3) of the EC Habitats Directive and Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended):

Having regard to the submitted screening for AA and Article 6(3) of the EC Habitats Directive and Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) the Planning Authority as the competent authority, is in agreement with the Screening for AA conclusions. The Planning Authority has completed the Appropriate Assessment screening exercise in relation to the potential effects of the proposed development on designated European Sites, taking into account the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, the Screening for Appropriate Assessment Report submitted with the Part 8 application. In completing the screening exercise, the Planning Authority has determined that, by itself or in combination with other development in the vicinity, the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any identified European Site and their qualifying interests and special conservation interests, alone and or in-combination with other plans and projects and that a Stage II Appropriate Assessment is not, therefore, required.

v. List the persons or bodies who made submissions or observations.

The closing date for written submissions or observations with respect to the proposed development dealing was 4.00pm on Thursday, 8th of June 2023. A total of 16 submissions were received.

Reference no.	Received From	Reference no.	Response
1	Heritage Officer	9	John Nolan
2	Environment Section	10	John Brennan
3	Sean Boyle	11	Galway Cycling Campaign
4	Chris Morris	12	Uisce Éireann
5	Kristen Cavagnet O'Rourke and Colm O'Rourke	13	Shane Foran
6	Tesco	14	Transportation Infrastructure Ireland (TII)
7	Gerard Leahy	15	Martina Callanan
8	Joseph McGinley	16	ATU Smarter Travel Group

vi. Summary of the issues in submissions or observations and response.

Further detail is presented in the *Ballybane Road & Castlepark Road Cycle Scheme Part 8 Submission Responses Report June 2023*. Several submissions include drawings, diagrams and photographs demonstrating points raised.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
1	Heritage Officer	All sub surface works being done in conjunction with this scheme must be archaeologically monitored and recorded by a suitably qualified archaeologist under licence and reported in full.	As part of the proposed works an Archaeologist will be present on site to monitor and record the sub surface works being carried out during construction.
2	Environment Section	Prior to the commencement of works, the applicant shall submit a detailed Waste Management Plan to the Environment Section, Galway City Council for consideration. All waste arising from demolition works, site clearance and construction on site shall be dealt with in compliance with all relevant waste and environment legislation.	Following the appointment of the Contractor for the works, and prior to any works commencing, a Waste Management Plan will be provided by the Contractor, reviewed by the Employer's Representative and submitted to Galway City Council. The completion of a Waste Management Plan shall form part of the Works Requirements for the Scheme. All waste management will be dealt with in accordance with current guidance/legislation and will be set out in the Waste Management Plan which will be submitted and reviewed by Galway City Council.
3	Sean Boyle	Supports the proposed scheme and raises the following points: 1.Location of Toucan crossing outside Ballybane Shopping Centre. States the proposed toucan crossing at Ballybane shopping centre is not a good location. Believes many people coming out the small gap at Lios na Run will not walk to the proposed Toucan crossing as many as going to shopping centre. Same applies to people moving from Rátylin Glebe, Rocklands Avenue and Castle Park. A location approx. 40 metres south of proposed crossing would be better location for this Toucan crossing. A yellow box should also be added at entrance to Beechwood Park (labelled as McHugh Avenue on drawings and documents).	1. Location of Toucan crossing outside Ballybane Shopping Centre. The location of the proposed crossings are generally based on the principle of providing "mid-block" crossings in accordance with DMURS sections 3.3.2 and 4.3.2. Given the frequency of junctions along the scheme the current location is deemed the most appropriate for the toucan crossing. The proposed crossing has strategically been located to serve existing estates, bus stops and the Ballybane Shopping Centre.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		2. Location of Bike Racks The proposed bike racks on the Ballybane Road will not be used and will end up being an eye sore. 3. Layout of side road junctions Cars coming out onto Ballybane road, the white line with "STOP" is further back as there have been pedestrian crossings added. Supports adding the pedestrian crossing but when Ballybane is busy, believes cars coming on to Ballybane road turning right will end up waiting on the pedestrian crossings as they will need to edge out to road to be able to get out onto Ballybane road. Beechwood Park incorrectly labelled as McHugh Avenue on all the maps.	2. Location of Bike Racks The proposed bike racks have been provided in their current location to allow for bike parking in the vicinity of the bus stops along the scheme, in line with the NTA's Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet for BusConnects Core Bus Corridors. 3. Layout of side road junctions The proposed layout of the minor road junctions along the route have been designed in accordance with Section 4.9.2 of the National Cycle Manual "Minor Side Road with Pedestrian Priority".
4	Chris Morris	Notes the omission of speed restrictions as the speed cars travel on the Castlepark/Ballybane Road is treacherous and liable to knock down a cyclist or pedestrian.	Although no change to speed limits are being proposed, the nature of the scheme itself will lead to a slowing of traffic when compared to the existing. The introduction of reduced carriageway widths, reduction in corner radii at junctions, signalisation of crossings and raised tables will all contribute to a reduction of speed along the scheme. This is a necessity in order to provide a scheme which is safe and in line with best practice and guidelines. These proposals will help to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between all road users, as will the segregation provided between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists.
5	Kristen and Colm O'Rourke	There is a need for a pedestrian zebra crossing at the T junction where Castlepark Road meets Ballybane Road. It is a very busy road and a road that many use to either go to ATU, Creche, or to Gaelscoil Dara or Scoil Caitriona and there is the need for a formal pedestrian zebra crossing at the T junction there is a yellow box for cars but nothing for pedestrians. Welcomes the east side of the city becoming more cycle and pedestrian friendly. A traffic light at a T junction where Castlepark Road meets Ballybane Road would only bring on more congestion to our area. A traffic light at that location would only work if the ATU changed the entrance to the	1. As part of the proposals for the scheme, signalised crossings will be provided for at the junction of Ballybane Road / Castlepark Road, for pedestrians and cyclists. The use of zebra crossings at this 3-way junction would not provide for a sufficiently safe crossing regime, given the multi-lane approaches on some arms. 2. Impact on traffic of signalisation of Ballybane Road / Castlepark Road Junction In general, there will be limited impacts to the existing vehicular traffic on the surrounding road network, however given the nature of the proposals (e.g. reduction in carriageway width, reduction in junction radii and an increase in signalisation to facilitate the proposed crossings) there will be a slowing of traffic speeds compared to that existing, and therefore some increase in journey time. This however is a necessity

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		parking lot to where the T junction is. The entrance to the ATU parking lot is primarily the cause of the traffic at that junction. A light will not solve this unless the parking lot entrance was at the traffic light also.	in order to provide a scheme which is safe and in line with best practice and guidelines. These proposals will help to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between all road users. A traffic modelling exercise has been carried at both the Ballybane Road / Castlepark Road junction and the Monivea Road / Castle Park junction. The results showed that there is some negative impacts on vehicular traffic flows at these junctions, however the junctions have still been shown to operate within their capacity. These impacts are a function of the requirement to bring the junctions in line with current design guidance, so as to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between all road users.
6	Tesco	Welcomes the proposed investment in active travel and the urban environment. It is considered that the proposed high-quality pedestrian and cycling infrastructure along both side of the Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road will enhance active travel in the area. Tesco operate the anchor store at the Ballybane Shopping Centre in which amendments to and adjacent to, the car parking entrance is proposed. The entrance is the only access point for the delivery of goods, used daily by HGVs, and other delivery and service vehicles. It is requested that the Local Authority during detailed design provide consideration to HGV access, treatments and levels to ensure safe and appropriate access is maintained to the Ballybane Shopping Centre. Requests that the Local Authority have regard for HGV movements and all operational requirements associated with the shopping centre throughout both the construction and operational requirements associated with the shopping centre throughout the construction and operational phases of the works to ensure that customers and deliveries can access the retail units in a viable and safe manner.	1. HGV Movement in and out of Ballybane Shopping Centre As part of the Detailed Design phase the Design Team will look to ensure continuity of accessibility to the Ballybane Shopping Centre including HGV movements and all other operational requirements.
7	Gerard Leahy	Expresses concern over the proposed development. Cycle lanes are not the solution to Galway traffic woes. Weather does not lend itself to bicycle use. Cycle lanes exacerbates existing traffic congestion. Represents poor value for tax payments represents poor spending and decision making. Notes hazard associated with unlit cyclists and poor visibility and suggests that additional street lighting be installed along the route especially near road junctions. The junction of the Dublin and Ballybane Roads is regularly congested in the mornings and states that	1. Impacts on Traffic In general, there will be limited impacts to the existing vehicular traffic on the surrounding road network, however given the nature of the proposals (e.g. reduction in carriageway width, reduction in junction radii and an increase in signalisation to facilitate the proposed crossings) there will be a slowing of traffic speeds compared to that existing, and therefore some increase in journey time. This however is a necessity in order to provide a scheme which is safe and in line with best practice and guidelines. These proposals will help to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between all road users.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		any narrowing of the Ballybane Road would likely to exacerbate this congestion. Notes that two-way cycle lanes in Spain are of the similar width to Irish one-way routes and are more cost effective and involve less road space removal.	A traffic modelling exercise has been carried at both the Ballybane Road / Castlepark Road junction and the Monivea Road / Castle Park junction. The results showed that there is some negative impacts on vehicular traffic flows at these junctions, however the junctions have still been shown to operate within their capacity. These impacts are a function of the requirement to bring the junctions in line with current design guidance, so as to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between all road users. 2. Public Lighting The public lighting on Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road will be upgraded where required as part of the scheme, to ensure that it is compliant with current design guidelines and fit for purpose for the scheme.
8	Joseph McGinley	A regular traveller by bike and by car along these roads, often with children, very supportive of the proposed scheme, hopes development will proceed as it is needed in the area. As a cyclist this development will make journeys safer, easier, and more attractive.	Supportive of proposals, no issues raised that require a response.
9	John Nolan	A regular user of these junctions at 8.15-8.30am and makes the following observations: 1.The left filter lane at the Ballybane Road and Bothar na dTreabh junction is normally blocked by cars going straight into the Industrial Estate (Boston Scientific etc.), with the addition of a cycle lane it is unlikely an extra metre required can be added to make the existing filter lane more accessible and useful. 2. Although outside the scope of this project the only long-term solution is to add another filter lane past the Circle K petrol station to allow extra access into the Industrial estate, this would give users the option of using the middle right turn lane as an extra option to enter the estate.	The issues raised are outside the scope of the project. For clarity, the project is not proposing to make amendments to the existing left filter lane at the Ballybane Road / Bothar na dTreabh junction.
10	John Brennan	Supports the positive aspects of the scheme with respect to segregated cycle tracks and raised entry treatments and supports the submission of the Galway Cycling Campaign and the points made therein, particularly in relation to proposed improvements to the Monivea Road Intersection.	Supportive of proposals and the points raised in the Galway Cycling Campaign submission. The issues raised in the submission from the Galway Cycling Campaign are responded to under reference no. 11.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
11	Galway Cycling Campaign	Section 2 of the Submission: Broadly supportive of the Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road Cycle Network Scheme acknowledges the inclusion of improvements for pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed design could and should be improved, in particular at some specific locations, and detail aspects that require further consideration is outlined in section3 and 4 of the submission. Sections 3 & 4 of the Submission 3.1. Intersection with Monivea Road - incoherent east-west route The proposed design at the intersection between Ballybane Road and Monivea Road appears to be poor in terms of the coherence and convenience for people cycling west to east along Monivea Road. This junction could be rationalised so that it is safer, more coherent and convenient for all road users according to the hierarchy in urban areas. Cycling and walking facilities have been designed to fit around the existing, complex junction creating circuitous diversions for cyclists, long delays on several stages of signal-requested crossings. The number of crossing stages for people navigating such junctions should be reduced. In the absence of a full redesign of this intersection, a simple amendment with an additional toucan crossing to the north of this intersection would provide for an east to west route with only a single crossing over a 75m distance. 3.2. Excessive use of shared space at Monivea Road Intersection Questions the excessive use of “shared space” in the proposals to the west of the Intersection between Monivea Road and Ballybane Road since there appears to be more than enough space for a dedicated two-way cycle track adjacent to a dedicated footpath. The partial use of both shared space with intermittent sections of segregation will create confusion and unnecessary conflict between people walking and cycling	Section 2 of the Submission: These comments are noted and welcomed. General comment in relation to an un-published version of the National Cycle Manual The submission quotes from an un-published version of the National Cycle Manual. For clarity: the current scheme design has been designed in accordance with the current National Cycle Manual (2011), DMURS (2019) and NTA’s Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet for BusConnects Core Bus Corridors (2021). Any un-published documentation is not applicable in terms of design guidance. Sections 3 & 4 of the Submission 3.1. Intersection with Monivea Road. The proposed scheme extents are such that they provide for enhancements for movements from Ballybane Road to Monivea Road and vice versa. Therefore, the proposed movements from Monivea Road (East-West across Ballybane Road) will continue to operate as per the existing arrangement, i.e. pedestrians and cyclists should use the existing shared paths and Toucan Crossings at the junction of Ballybane Road and Bothar na dTreabh to traverse across Ballybane Road. 3.2. Excessive use of shared space at Monivea Road Intersection The proposed design is in accordance with the design standards and has incorporated the section of shared space at the Monivea Road junction to cater for movements of both cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed shared space to be provided is 4m wide and will link to surrounding estates and Toucan Crossing locations. The frequency of access points results in a preference for a shared space as shown.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		and other users such as those with visual impairments would feel more comfortable and safer using a dedicated footpath.	
		3.3. Junction with ATU Galway campus and car park The current vehicular entrance/exit of ATU Galway campus and car park on Ballybane Road is currently hostile for people walking and cycling either in/out of this access point or those travelling across it and the proposed "Phase 1" of this scheme does nothing to address this. There is an opportunity to relocate this access point further north, aligned with Castlepark Road and creating a 4-way, signalised junction. Similar realignments have been proposed for other access points along the Dublin Road BusConnects scheme creating more coherent access/egress arrangements along this stretch of Ballybane Road, improve the safety and convenience of road users. The current vehicular entrance/exit could then be replaced with a walking and cycling only entrance/exit and recommends the relocation of the proposed toucan crossing on Ballybane Road further to the north to align with the obvious desire line for those crossing on foot to and from Glasán student village. Recommend that the design team engages with ATU Galway.	3.3. Junction at ATU Galway campus and car park The proposed relocation of the ATU entrance to create a 4-arm signalised junction at Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road junction is not feasible at present due the loss of parking spaces which would be inflicted on ATU. In addition, the existing entrance must be retained to provide for access to the campus (including emergency access). The proposed 3-way junction design also has advantages in terms of cyclist and pedestrian progression when compared to a 4-way junction, for users travelling on the west side of Ballybane Road. A 4-way junction would introduce an additional crossing point for these users. The provision for pedestrian and cyclist improvements across the existing entrance will be considered as part of the "Phase 2" works.
		3.4. Bus stop bay and taxi bay at ATU Galway for Phase 2 The timeline is not clear for the development of the Phase 2 "tie-in" of the scheme with the Dublin Road at the southern end of Ballybane Road, and if future changes to the proposals are likely, concerned by some of the proposed designs in this phase. In particular, the proposals for a bus bay and taxi bay are substandard in terms of minimising the potential conflict between people walking, bus/taxi passengers and people cycling, seemingly in the interest of preventing motor-traffic from being delayed by stopping buses or taxis and safety concerns for all users of these spaces. Where bus stop bays and taxi bays are required for buses, coaches and taxis serving ATU Galway exclusively which are stopped for longer periods, and where it is desired that motor-traffic flow should not be impacted, believes an agreement should be sought from ATU Galway to provide segments of the campus.	3.4. Bus Stop & Taxi Bay for Phase 2 The proposed design of Bus Stops and Taxi Bays at ATU will be designed at a later stage as part of the "Phase 2" works. The Phase 2 plans have only been provided as indicative at the present time and are subject to change, pending approval of the BusConnects Dublin Road Scheme. The purpose of Phase 2 is to demonstrate alignment with the future scheme which will be subject to a statutory consent process.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		3.5. Barriers and potential linkages adjacent to the scheme Welcomes the enhancement of various existing, pedestrian linkages linking various residential developments to Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road within the scheme. Some existing barriers should be removed, and further linkages should be enhanced to improve the usage and accessibility of the facilities proposed in this scheme; including the removal of barriers and improved design of an access point on the eastern side of the Castlepark Road is critical to improve the accessibility to the footpaths connecting Ard Álainn to the bus stop and cycle route. 3.6. Bus stop island design and legibility There are certain locations where the proposed design for bus-stop islands might be improved by guiding bus passengers to cross via the designated crossing point by removing sections of footpath directly adjacent to the cycle track in the vicinity of the crossing, thereby reducing potential conflict between bus passengers and people using the cycle track. 4.1. Position of cycle lane relative to available grass verge At several locations in the scheme's proposed design, there is a grass verge between the cycle track and the footpath or behind the footpath, in particular along the eastern edge of Ballybane Road between McHugh Avenue and St James Road. Recommends that the design is revised to avail of the opportunity to put the cycle track and footpath inside any grass verge where one is available, and in doing so provide greater lateral segregation between the cycle track and busy general traffic lanes. This would create a more attractive cycling environment which feels safer, and which does not compromise the convenience or safety of other road users. Improved conditions will likely lead to greater usage and shift to more sustainable modes of transport for local trips.	3.5. Barriers and Potential Linkages to the scheme During the proposed detailed design stage of the project the design team will look to develop further locations of possible linkages and continue to liaise with Galway City Council Parks Department relating to the linkages between the scheme and surrounding estates. 3.6. Bus Stop Island Design & Legibility The proposed bus stop design has been designed in accordance with the current design guidance, and the most appropriate bus stop type provided based on the space available. The submitted suggestions in terms of minor improvements to bus stop layouts will be considered as part of the detailed design, subject to compliance with design standards. 4.1. Position of Cycle Lane Relative to Available Grass Verge The design team has reviewed the possibility of relocating the cycle track to provide a grass verge between the carriageway and the cycle track. Following this review, and in consultation with GCC's appointed landscape architect it has been considered that the design as displayed remain unaltered for the following reasons: • it provides a simple consistent cycleway treatment along both sides of the road, avoiding deviations into adjacent verges; • it provides for the most direct route for cyclists; • it facilitates a large green space with the most scope for large areas of planting; • it provides a consistent cross-section along the scheme from a driver's perspective, ensuring that the cycle track remains adjacent and evidently visible at all times; • the suggested change would require additional crossing points to be developed in order to facilitate all movement along the route and provide side road access for cyclists, thereby increasing impacts on the green space.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		4.2. Width of cycle tracks The width of all one-way cycle-tracks appears to be 2m throughout the scheme. While welcoming this consistent provision believes there is an argument to widen sections of cycle track to 2.5-3.0m along the route. This would enable easier and safer overtaking of people cycling at different speeds. Increased width of the cycle track approaching junctions would also enable stacking of cyclists travelling in different directions and increase the quality of service at those junctions. From the perspective of existing users of similar facilities, the cycle tracks along Séamus Quirke Road and the N6 are typically 2m but many users report feeling uncomfortable overtaking or being overtaken with a 100mm kerb-drop to the right and a 100mm right-angled kerb to the left. This would be particularly acute for wider cycles such as cargo-bikes, trikes, bikes with trailers or recumbent bikes and speed differentials between cyclists and e-bikes. 4.3. Signalling Rises a number of queries about signalling and signal phasing of some of the proposed junctions as follows: • It is not clear how signalling will protect straight ahead cyclists from left-turning motorists at the proposed "Dublin-style" junction at Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road. • It is not clear how the signalling at the proposed junctions at Ballybane Road-Castlepark Road and at Castlepark Road-Monivea Road will work to ensure that right-turning cyclists waiting to cross do not obstruct straight-ahead cyclists. • It is not clear how the signalling for cyclists will work at t-junctions proposed in the scheme. In particular it is not clear whether cyclists proceeding straight ahead through a t-junction and not crossing any junction mouth or entrance will be able to proceed with caution when motor-traffic at the minor junction arm has a green phase. • It would be desirable if induction loops were installed and tuned which are sensitive enough to detect all cyclists waiting	4.2. Width of Cycle Track The proposed cycle track width is designed in accordance with the current national guidance and ensures that a consistent width is provided throughout. Any additional width of cycle track will have impacts on the surrounding landscaping features and grass areas being incorporated into the scheme. 4.3. Signalising The proposed design allows for the proposed Ballybane Road / Castlepark Road junction to have separate signalling phases for each mode of transport (pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles). This signalling layout will allow for pedestrians and cyclists to safely transition through the junction without conflict. At the Monivea Road / Castlepark Road junction, right turning cyclists travelling from the west will have a dedicated signal. The signalisation design will be finalised as part of the detailed design phase, including the consideration of detection loops, push buttons, etc.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		at arms of signalised junctions without any cycle-tracks. Example locations include the entrances/junctions to Belmont, the Galway Hospice, Merlin Park Hospital, and the Rosshill Road.	
		4.4. Use of “forgiving kerbs” between cycle-track and footway Recognises the importance of a level difference or kerbing between cycle-tracks and adjacent footways to clearly delineate each designated area to users, in particular to those with visual impairments. However, the use of right-angled kerbs (those with 90-degree kerb edges) can present a crash risk for some cyclists, especially those less accustomed to such infrastructure. ‘Forgiving kerbs’ are angled, or splayed, kerbs that can be easily traversed by cycles, while still presenting a clear physical height difference between a cycle track and a footway are preferable.	4.4. Forgiving Kerbs The proposed design has been designed in accordance with current national design guidance.
		4.5. Kerb-segregation of cycle-track at roadside/bus lane Recognises that designs are preliminary, and some design aspects are yet to be detailed, interpret from the cross-section drawings that the kerb-segregation being proposed is a standard vertical kerb drop from the cycle-track to the adjacent bus-lane or general-traffic lane. Proposes the alternate usage of “raised separator kerbs” on the road-side edge of the cycle-tracks where pedestrian activity is low, on the sections of the route where pedestrian activity is relatively low and the need for pedestrians to cross-over the cycle-track is low. This would apply at least to the section east of the Skerritt Junction. The advantage of this design is that it reduces the risk of cyclists accidentally entering the roadway with a forgiving edge, and the higher upstand towards the road will more effectively deter illegal parking on the cycle track and footpath.	4.5. Kerb segregation of cycle-track at roadside/bus lane The proposed design has been designed in accordance with current national design guidance.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		4.6. Inclusive design at toucan crossings Notes that the design of the toucan crossings at the recently constructed Kirwan Junction is not suitable for users of cargo bikes or other non-standard cycles. The installation of the signal heads and signal request box close to the roadside means that users of such cycles cannot reach the request button safely unless they dismount. Recommend a design is chosen for the request buttons at toucan crossings to be sufficiently set back from the crossing to be safely used by users of non-standard cycles, without the need to dismount. Or the use of induction loops at designated waiting areas. 4.7. Bus stop island geometry Notes that many of the cycle tracks going behind bus-stop islands appear to have very tight curvature. Acknowledges the efforts should be made to reduce the speeds of people cycling as they approach the crossing points to the bus-stop islands, remain concerned that an excess of constraints through geometry will make such sections of cycle track less accessible to users of non-standard cycles and increase hazard to some cycle users. Kerb radii on cycle tracks approaching bus-stop islands appear to be very short, and possibly below the 4m radius recommended in the latest draft design guidance. 4.8. Maintenance Seeks the investigation on whether an annual maintenance budget and shared resources can be allocated/sought in advance to ensure the route will have dedicated debris cleaning and de-icing. 4.9. Drainage channels Requests that drainage channels on footpaths and at intersections where cyclists transition over are recessed aco style drains. The use of surface concrete dished water channels is problematic for maintenance and presents a hazard of slip/trip for pedestrians and cyclists and for wheelchair, buggy and mobility impaired users as there is an unexpected change in level.	4.6. Inclusive Design at Toucan Crossings The signalisation design will be finalised as part of the detailed design phase, including the consideration of detection loops, push buttons, etc. 4.7. Bus Stop Island Geometry The proposed bus stop design has been designed in accordance with the current design guidance. 4.8. Maintenance Galway City Council will undertake routine maintenance of the routes as required. 4.9. Drainage Channels The proposed drainage design will be developed further during the Detailed Design Stage.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
12	Uisce Éireann	Uisce Éireann has no objection in principle to the proposal, however records indicate the presence of water services infrastructure which may be impacted by the proposed development. Therefore, Uisce Éireann requests that applicant to liaise with Uisce Éireann during the final design stage of the proposed development works in order to ascertain the impact on the existing Uisce Éireann network infrastructure so that protection works or replacement works can be agreed and carried out as appropriate. Uisce Éireann requests that prior to any works being undertaken, that the location of any / all watermain(s) / sewer(s) and any associated fittings shall be confirmed on the ground with the local water curator. Any new kerb-lines should be set out on site so that the local water curator can ensure that any proposed new kerb-line will not be sitting on top of the existing water main and sewer line. Uisce Éireann requests that the integrity of the infrastructure shall be protected during the works and the Council's water service's engineer consulted prior to and during construction. Uisce Éireann requests the attachment of a number of conditions to any grant of permission.	The design team has already commenced liaison and will continue to liaise with Uisce Éireann and Galway City Council Water Services Department in relation to the detailed design of the scheme. The conditions specified by Uisce Éireann shall be complied with in line with standard and proper procedure. The Local Authority shall liaise with Uisce Éireann regarding existing water services infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposal prior to and during construction to ensure that the integrity of Uisce Éireann's infrastructure shall be protected both during and after the completion of the works relating to this proposal. All development shall be carried out in compliance with Uisce Éireann Standards codes and practices. Any proposals by the Local Authority to divert or build over existing water or wastewater services shall be submitted to Uisce Éireann for written approval prior to works commencing. All Uisce Éireann infrastructure affected by the works shall be reinstated in accordance with Uisce Éireann Standards.
13	Shane Foran	1. Lack of coherent tie in with the Ballybane Rd/Monvea Road/N6 Junction. The key destinations served at the northern end of Ballybane Road are the Ballybrit/ Ballybane business Park (Boston Scientific/Hewlett Packard) and Bothar Na Mine, this junction is also used by cyclists to access the N6 to get to Parkmore. The drawings do not show a coherent direct route to the N6 junction for northbound cyclists. The cycle track ends at a shared space feature at a crossing. In my view many existing cyclists will expect to proceed to the junction unimpeded so either they will be trying to get back on the road before this point or be using the waiting area of the crossing as an off-ramp. This element of the proposals needs to be reconsidered.	1.Lack of Coherent tie in with Ballybane Road/Monivea Road and N6 Junction The proposed design will retain the existing layout of the Ballybane and Bothar Na dTreabh junction as it is currently outside the scope of the project. However, the new arrangement on the approach to the junction will help to divert cyclists along a safer route and give access to the existing toucan crossings on all arms of the Bothar Na dTreabh junction.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		2.Monivea Road footpaths In 2023 there is still a section of Monivea Road that does not have footpaths on both sides; the scheme footprint should be expanded to include this section of Monivea Road and footpaths provided. 3.Monivea Road west of junction with Ballybane Road The engineering drawing shows a crossing at the location of the current speed ramp. This should be relocated west to align with the path to the pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights. This matches an established desire line to and from the Ballybrit business park and for reaching Castlepark using existing crossings. 4. Monivea Road entrance to Monivea Park Monivea Park is an obvious route for people using bicycles to avoid the junction of Monivea Road and Ballybane Road. A raised table junction should be considered at the entrance/exit to Monivea Park to assist cyclists turning in or out. 5. Monivea Road east of junction with Ballybane Road There are currently toucan crossings over the N6 and Ballybane arms of the N6 junction but there is no equivalent crossing on the Monivea road (Castlepark side) for people who wish to get to them either on foot or bike. The proposed toucan crossing west of the Rocklands access should be relocated to the east side to tie in with existing toucan crossings. This matches an existing desire line for cycle traffic seeking to cross the Ballybane Road and use the Monivea Road in either direction. 6. Ballybane Road: Separation from traffic Where it runs along Rahylin Glebe, consideration should be given to moving the cycle track on the east side of the road behind the grass verge and alongside the footway, away from the traffic.	2.Monivea Road Footpaths The issue raised is outside the current scope of the project. 3. Monivea Road West of Junction with Ballybane Road The proposed crossing location is on the site of an existing and established crossing, which directly links to Monivea Park. Additionally, the relocation of the crossing further northwest would be less desirable to Ballybane Road 's northbound cyclists wishing to utilise the crossing to cross Bothar na dTreabh. 4. Monivea Road entrance to Monivea Park The issue raised is outside the current scope of the project. 5. Monivea Road East of Junction with Ballybane Road The proposed toucan crossing on Monivea Road has been located in its current position in order to facilitate movements of pedestrians and cyclists in all directions along Ballybane Road. The suggested alternative crossing location on Monivea Road is currently outside the current scope of this project. 6. Ballybane Road: Separation from traffic The design team has reviewed the possibility of relocating the cycle track to provide a grass verge between the carriageway and the cycle track. Following this review, and in consultation with GCC's appointed landscape architect it has been considered that the design as displayed remain unaltered for the following reasons: • it provides a simple consistent cycleway treatment along both sides of the road, avoiding deviations into adjacent verges; • it provides for the most direct route for cyclists;

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
			• it facilitates a large green space with the most scope for large areas of planting; • it provides a consistent cross-section along the scheme from a driver's perspective, ensuring that the cycle track remains adjacent and evidently visible at all times; • the suggested change would require additional crossing points to be developed in order to facilitate all movement along the route and provide side road access for cyclists, thereby increasing impacts on the green space.
		7. Shared space at pedestrian crossings Some of the pedestrian crossing designs show cyclists mixed with pedestrians in the space where pedestrians will be expected to wait for a green man signal. These elements should be removed. Cyclists should be given a clear path to transit through the crossing when the green signal is in their favour without coming into conflict with pedestrians waiting to cross.	7. Shared Space at pedestrian crossings The proposed design is in accordance with the design standards, and has incorporated the section of shared space at the Monivea Road junction to cater for movements of both cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed shared space to be provided is 4m wide and will link to surrounding estates and Toucan Crossing locations. The frequency of access points results in a preference for a shared space as shown.
		8. Ballybane Road permeability problem - road closure at Monivea Park Work is needed to reopen road closure between at the old entrance/exit for the Monivea Park estate on the Ballybane Road to cyclists. There is no justification for blocking cyclist access.	8. Ballybane Road permeability problem – road closure at Monivea Park As shown on the Part 8 drawings, cyclists will be afforded passage at this location, where flush/bevel kerbs have been proposed to facilitate this. Vehicular traffic will not be permitted access.
		9. Permeability problem - road closure blocking access to Ballybane Road Work is needed to reopen road closure between Beechwood Park and McHugh Avenue to cyclists. There is no justification for blocking cyclist access. While adding cycle facilities to Ballybane road is welcome, retaining features that block cyclists from getting to Ballybane road might be argued to defeat the purpose of the funding.	9. Ballybane Road permeability problem – road closure at Monivea Park & Road Closure blocking access to Ballybane Road The location shown is currently outside the current scope of this project. However, during the proposed detailed design stage of the project the design team will look to develop further locations of possible linkages and continue to liaise with Galway City Council Parks Department relating to the linkages between the scheme and surrounding estates.
		10. Junction of Ballybane and Castlepark Roads Consider refactoring as a Cyclops format junction allowing cyclists to bypass junction on certain signal phases. This junction should also have	10. Junction of Ballybane and Castlepark Roads The proposed design allows for the proposed Ballybane Road / Castlepark Road junction to have separate signalling phases for each mode of transport (pedestrians,

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		direct link(s) into the ATU campus. The campus is a valuable route that avoids the roundabout.	cyclists, and vehicles). This signalling layout will allow for pedestrians and cyclists to safely transition through the junction without conflict. The signalisation design will be finalised as part of the detailed design phase, including the consideration of detection loops, push buttons, etc. It is noted that "Cyclops" format junctions are not part of the published design manuals in Ireland currently.
		11. Continuous footways The presence of continuous footways in the drawings is welcome. Consideration should be given to using Dutch-type exit constructions at these locations. 12. Junction of Castlepark and Monivea Roads Consider refactoring as a Cyclops type junction with left-in left-out slips for cycle traffic. Consider allowing eastbound cyclists to by-pass the lights.	11. Continuous Footpaths Where possible on minor road junctions a continuous pedestrian footpath is proposed in accordance with Section 4.9.2 of the National Cycle Manual. In this regard the footway shall continue through (i.e. with concrete footway surface, along the top of the raised table). 12. Junction of Castlepark Road and Monivea Road At the Monivea Road / Castlepark Road junction, right turning cyclists travelling from the west will have a dedicated signal. The signalisation design will be finalised as part of the detailed design phase, including the consideration of detection loops, push buttons, etc.
14	TII	No specific observations to make.	Noted, no issues raised that require a response.
15	Martina Callanan	Supports the proposed road safety changes to Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road. It is great that the east of the city is getting attention to improve active travel and the proposed scheme will make a real difference to Ballybane residents.	Supportive of proposals, no issues raised that require a response.
16	ATU Smarter Travel Group	Submission divided into two sections, the first deals with the entrance to ATU and the location of the proposed Toucan crossing, and the second section addresses other aspects of the scheme, external to the ATU campus. 1. Junction at ATU The current ATU entrance is not safe as it lacks proper provision for those entering on foot or by bike from the Ballybane Rd. Additionally, making a right turn from the Ballybane Rd into ATU Galway or making a	1. Junction at ATU The proposed relocation of the ATU entrance to create a 4-arm signalised junction at Ballybane Road and Castlepark Road junction is not feasible at present due the loss of

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		right turn from the ATU campus onto the Ballybane Rd. in either a car or on a bike is dangerous. Because of the volume of traffic on the Ballybane Rd. and because of the number of cars entering and exiting our campus, we believe a signalised junction would be the safest for all road users. The current junction layout however does not lend itself to a signalised junction because of the offset with Glasán. To remedy this, suggesting 2 options (detailed below). Otherwise, if a decision is made to retain the current entrance location, recommend moving the existing pedestrian (proposed Toucan) crossing to be closer to the 'desire line' between Glasán and the ATU entrance (see option 3 below). Option 1: Realign the entrance of ATU Galway to be opposite Glasán. A similar realignment has been proposed for Belmont on the Old Dublin Road scheme. Aligning the junctions opposite each other allows the junction to be signalised and offers safe crossing to all road users. Option 2: Realign the entrance of ATU Galway to be opposite Castlepark Road. A better option would be to realign the entrance of ATU Galway to be opposite Castlepark Rd. A signalised junction like this could offer improved access and improved safety for all road users. Such an upgrade could also offer direct access to the northern carpark, while still offering service access to the west of the campus. By moving the entrance, it enables the development of the ATU campus in the north-wards direction (any northwards development of the building is currently blocked by the access road (highlighted in green)). The existing access road also lacks safe pedestrian/cycling infrastructure. This could all be reimagined in a safer, more efficient manner with a new internal road layout. An additional advantage of moving the entrance opposite the Castlepark Road is that this junction will be newly signalised in the upcoming improvements. Note: there is sufficient space along the boundary marked in yellow to widen the road slightly to accommodate a generous right-turn lane into ATU from the Ballybane Rd. Option 3: Leave it as it is;	parking spaces which would be inflicted on ATU. In addition, the existing entrance must be retained to provide for access to the campus (including emergency access). The proposed 3-way junction design also has advantages in terms of cyclist and pedestrian progression when compared to a 4-way junction, for users travelling on the west side of Ballybane Road. A 4-way junction would introduce an additional crossing point for these users. The same would apply to any proposal to create a 4-way junction opposite Glasán. The provision for pedestrian and cyclist improvements across the existing ATU entrance will be considered as part of the "Phase 2" works.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		If traffic volumes along the Ballybane Road continue to increase, accessing ATU will become more difficult and the existing morning congestion caused by vehicles trying to access the campus in an uncontrolled manner will worsen. Request that the proposed location of the Toucan crossing be changed to be more on the desire line between ATU and Glasán. Hundreds of ATU students live in Glasán, while very few use the existing crossing because of its inconvenient location. It is suggested to move the Toucan crossing north and swap places with the bus-stop. As a result of the inconveniently placed existing pedestrian crossing, the existing pedestrian access is rarely used. Believe the kissing gate should also be removed, as it provides no obstacle to any vehicle entering the campus grounds (it only hinders cyclists and wheelchair users trying to gain access). 2. Toucan Crossing location The proposed Toucan crossing offers a very convoluted and long-winded way for cyclists to access the secure bike parking from the Ballybane Road. Regarding swapping the Toucan Crossing with the existing bus-stop, the bus-stop in question is not used by any current or proposed city-bus service. It is instead used by ATU-only buses. The bus-stop location also results in a shared space (where pedestrians and cyclists mix) being necessary, along an otherwise uninterrupted stretch of high-quality cycle lanes. Suggests that, in consultation with ATU Management, this bus-stop could be moved further south and perhaps either swapped or placed alongside the Taxi Bay to preserve the high-quality segregated pedestrian and cycling infrastructure along the whole stretch from Skerritt junction to Ballybane Retail Park	2. Toucan Crossing location The Part 8 proposals include the upgrade of the existing crossing at its current location, which aligns with the existing pedestrian entrance to ATU. The removal of the kissing gates here will be discussed with ATU Management. The consideration of a relocation of this toucan crossing can be looked at further as part of any future "Phase 2" works as its relocation will impact the existing bus bay.

Reference	Received From	Submission Summary	Response
		3. Bike Parking within the ATU Campus Suggests that a new secure bike parking be constructed either near the north or south entrance (to better accommodate those entering from the Dublin or Ballybane Roads). Other Scheme Aspects for Consideration: Many students who get the bus to Ballybrit on the existing (401) and proposed (BusConnects Route 1) bus routes embark on the bus on Castlepark Road. Similarly, students travelling in the opposite direction on the same route towards North Mervue, Wellpark, Shantalla, Salthill and beyond get the same bus in the opposite direction on the Ballybane Rd. Both of these bus-stop shelters as indicated on the plans are very exposed to the elements and the prevailing winds. The only solution would be to increase the size/depth of the bus-stop island. This would allow weather protection to be installed against the prevailing wind/rain while still allowing access from the front of the shelter. There is sufficient space to the rear of the bus-island to facilitate increasing its depth.	3. Bike Parking within the ATU Campus This would be a matter for ATU Management and is outside of the extents of the Part 8 scheme. 4. Bus Stop Shelter Orientations The proposed orientation and type of bus stop shelters throughout the scheme will be further examined by the design team during the detailed design stage of the project, with a view to limiting the potential exposure to weather.

vii. Recommendation

All public submissions have been thoroughly examined and responded to in detail in Section V of this report and in the *Ballybane Road & Castlepark Road Cycle Scheme Part B Submission Responses Report June 2023*. It is considered that the scheme does not warrant any significant modification consequent on assessment of these submissions.

The proposed development is fully consistent with the policies, objectives and standards of the Galway City Development Plan 2023 -2029 and the Galway Transport Strategy and would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

It is recommended that the proposed development should be proceeded with as proposed.

Signed: 
Diane Egan
Executive Planner
23/06/2023


Signed: _____
Liam Blake
A/Senior Planner
26/06/2023