



Road classification and space clarity (2/6)

There are **different kinds of roads**. The **fast** A167, Great North Road, Scotswood Road and Coast Road are very different to **slower neighbourhood streets**. We would like to see a much clearer classification system in city road design so no-one is in doubt what these are for when you use them. Whether roads are for "expedient flow of vehicle traffic" or whether the **purpose** is for people to go about their local business - better **visual clues** and **road designs** are required to achieve that. As outlined in space4cycling episode 1/6, whatever a road, the space should be fairly allocated to the **desired modal share** (and to allow for future growth and modal shift).

Specially on roads with a 30mph speed limit, we ask **engineers to design outside-in** starting at providing for pedestrians, then cycling space, then look at the space that is left. We do not support the "free flow of vehicular traffic" model. We do not support **extensive traffic modelling**, as it traditionally does not take into account the desired modal shift. This may well be something the city engineers could bring to the Department for Transport's attention as a **barrier to designing for cycling and walking**.

Many of our city's roads have **untidy kerblines**, jutting in and out, varying the 'available' road width. This is not conducive to cycling. The purpose of the roads must be clear, and so should be its design including car parking.

Along a stretch of **on-street car parking** where cars can be parked intermittently, cyclists are being forced to ride in the parking bays and may find it difficult to re-enter the carriageway. We therefore prefer short stretches of parking bays to long uninterrupted on-street car parking. We would like to see a different road surface for parking bays to give clearer indication of the road's edge.

Go to our space4cycling webpage for more information

<http://newcycling.org/space4cycling/buildingblocks>

