



Quality Audit Report

Athlone Link Road Phase 2 – Coosan Point to The Crescent

On behalf of **Westmeath County Council**

Prepared By:

CST Group / PUNCH Consulting Engineers

1, O'Connell Street, Sligo, F91 W7YV

+353 (0)71 919 4500 info@cstgroup.ie www.cstgroup.ie

May 2025

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Document Control | 3 |
| 1. Introduction | 4 |
| 2. Access Audit..... | 5 |
| 3. Walking Audit..... | 18 |
| 4. Cycle Audit | 21 |
| 5. Other Considerations..... | 23 |
| 6. Quality Audit Statement | 24 |
| Appendix A List of Documents Examined | 25 |

Document Control

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Revision | R0 | R0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Purpose of Issue: P=Preliminary C=Comment F=Final | C | PL | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date: | 14 05 25 | 02 07 254 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Originator: | PE | PE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Checked By: | SS | SS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approved By: | SS | SS | | | | | | | | | | |

© CST Group 2025

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This report describes a Quality Audit carried out on behalf of Westmeath County Council on the proposed Athlone Link Road - Phase 2.
- 1.2. The scheme proposals are to construct 375m approx. of new road between Northgate Street/Southern Station Road junction in the west and The Crescent in the East. The new road will include off-carriageway facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The scheme proposals also include modifications to the existing Southern Station Road such that the western section will be restricted to buses only, with all other vehicles being required to access/egress the railway station from the eastern end of Southern Station Road. New and upgraded pedestrian and cycle facilities will be provided along Southern Station Road. Details are indicated on the drawings listed in Appendix A, which were provided for this Quality Audit Report.
- 1.3. The Quality Audit will demonstrate appropriate consideration has been given to all relevant aspects of the development in accordance with the guidance provided in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) produced by the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport in May 2019.
- 1.4. This Quality Audit includes the following individual audits: -
 - Access Audit
 - Walking Audit.
 - Cycle Audit
- 1.5. A separate Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on this scheme and should be read in conjunction with this Quality Audit.
- 1.6. The Audit team comprised of:
Team Leader: Philip Edwards BSc (Hons.) (Civil Engineering).
Team Member: Stuart Summerfield, HNC (Civil) FCIHT FSoRSA
- 1.7. The audit was carried out during May 2025.
- 1.8. The audit comprised an examination of the drawings relating to the scheme supplied by the Design Team. Appendix A describes the documents examined by the Audit Team

2. Access Audit

2.1 Overview

The Access Audit identifies a range of barriers that potentially restrict access for disabled people in the external and internal built environments. No details have been provided for the interior of the buildings of the proposed scheme and they are not included within the scope of this Audit.

For the purposes of the access assessment, the environment's features have been broken down into its constituent features. Each feature is assessed for conformity against certain access criteria. These criteria are derived from the following range of Best Practice sources, guidelines, standards, publications and legislation:

- Building Regulations 2022, Technical Guidance Document M, Access and Use (Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government),
- Buildings for Everyone -Access and use for all citizens (National Disability Authority).
- Design Manual for Urban Road and Streets (Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport).
- Inclusive Mobility A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (Department of Transport United Kingdom).
- Guidance on the use of Tactile Paving Surfaces: UK Department for Transport.

Where a site feature does not conform to this guidance, an explanation as to the potential restriction on access is provided, together with a suggested action and the priority in which such actions should be undertaken.

The Disability Act 2005 and the National Disability Authority's initiatives build on relationships and practices which currently exist among councils, city planners, building professionals and community groups to make services in Ireland more accessible to people with disabilities. In addition to people who use wheelchairs or have restricted mobility, there are many people affected by some degree of hearing loss, learning disability, visual impairment or conditions such as arthritis. This access assessment seeks to consider the needs of all potential users from a universal access perspective.

The audit is an organisation's first step in identifying physical barriers that people with disabilities may encounter when engaging with the community, public services and facilities.

2.2 Paths and Pavements in Streets, Roads and Public Areas

The scheme provides for a footpath along the southern side of the proposed new link road, signalised crossings at various locations. The drawings also indicate the footpath along Southern Station Access Road will be upgraded, but details of the upgrade are not provided. It also appears that the existing signalised crossing of Station Southern Road, directly outside the railway station will be reconstructed.

Table 2.2 Footpaths

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 2.2.1 | Are the footpaths a minimum width of 1.5m (1.8-2.0m in high volume areas)? | Yes. New Link Road | The proposed cross-section for the new link road indicates a 1.8m wide footpath. | None |
| | | Unknown. Southern Station Road | The existing footpath along the southern side of Southern Station Road is indicated to be upgraded, but no dimensions are given. It appears that the existing footpath is narrow in places. | Designer to detail footpaths to appropriate width. 1.8m minimum is recommended. |
| 2.2.2 | Is the main footpath clear of obstructions that would impede wheelchair users or be a trip hazard to sight-impaired users? | Unknown | Generally insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Lighting columns, sign posts, etc. should be positioned accordingly. |
| 2.2.3 | Are all surface water gullies / slot drains outside of the desire line or less than 13mm wide and set at right angles to the line of traffic? | Yes. New Link Road | It appears the proposed gulleys along the new link road are located clear of pedestrian crossing points. Contours are not provided, but it appears that gulleys have also been positioned slightly upstream of pedestrian crossing points, which is considered to be good practice. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Detailed design should re-check location of gulleys in conjunction with a contour plan. |
| | | Unknown. Southern Station Road. | Existing and proposed gulleys are not indicated on the existing Southern Station Road. | Gulleys should be positioned clear of pedestrian crossing points, and preferably upstream. Potentially existing gulleys may need to be relocated. |
| 2.2.4 | Are all paving materials suitable for the passage of | Yes | Proposed footpath in new link road is concrete which should be suitable for all users. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|--|----------|---|--|
| | sight impaired and arthritic and wheelchair users? | | <p>The exiting footpath along the Southern Station Road appears to be "Tarmac" (and a recent section of concrete at the western end), which should also be suitable for all users.</p> <p>If other types of paving are proposed, further consideration would be required to ensure they are suitable for all users.</p> | |
| 2.2.5 | Is the footpath clear of obstacles mounted more than 300mm above ground and protruding into the footpath by more than 100mm? | Unknown | <p>Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage.</p> <p>Some existing bollards in front of the railway station are silver/grey, and may not contrast well from the existing grey paving.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design. For the new part of the development, there should be no reason for any features to protrude into the footpath.</p> <p>Street furniture such as bollards could be highlighted with contrasting bands added.</p> |
| 2.2.6 | Is the footpath route to an acceptable gradient of less than 1:20? | Unknown | <p>Levels and gradient information has not been provided at this preliminary design stage.</p> <p>However, by inspection, there does not appear to be any reason for gradients to exceed 1 in 20.</p> | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.2.7 | Are the footpath routes clear of abrupt changes in level with crossfalls less than 2.5%? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design. With careful detailing, excessive crossfall can be avoided.</p> |
| 2.2.8 | Are the footpaths clear of physical obstructions or windows, doors, and gates that open onto the access route? | Yes | There do not appear to be any features opening out over the footpaths of the proposed new link road, or along existing Southern Station Road. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| 2.2.9 | Are the footpath routes clear of headroom hazards (2.1m or 2.3m if shared with cyclists)? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. However, provided any traffic signs are carefully detailed, there does not appear to be any reason for objects to overhang the footpaths impinging on headroom. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.2.10 | Is the footway route clear of any slip, trip hazards for sight impaired users? | Yes | The construction details drawings do indicate flush kerbs at pedestrian crossing points, and there do not appear to be any other locations where trip hazards would be created. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.2.11 | Is the footpath clear of advertising 'A' boards? | Yes | There does not appear to be any necessity for A-boards – they are not anticipated. | |
| 2.2.12 | Is the footpath shared with cyclists or abutting a cycle lane where cyclists may encroach? | Not fully. New Link Road | The footpath is vertically separated from the cycle track along the proposed new link road. It is not clear how cyclists are intended to leave/rejoin the carriageway at each end of this cycle track without conflicting with pedestrians. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The design should make provision for cyclists to leave/rejoin the carriageway at each end of this cycle track without conflicting with pedestrians. |
| | | Not fully. Southern Station Road | There is a new 2-way cycle track proposed along part of Southern Station Road, on the northern side. This intersects the existing narrow footpath. This existing footpath appears too narrow for shared use, but it is not clear how cyclists will leave/rejoin the carriageway at each end of this cycle track without conflicting with pedestrians. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The design should make provision for cyclists to leave/rejoin the carriageway at each end of this cycle track without conflicting with pedestrians. At the same location, it appears that pedestrians need to be enabled to cross the carriageway to/from the footpath on the southern side of Southern Station Road, and be discouraged from using the proposed cycle track. |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|--------|--|-----------|---|--|
| | Is the footpath shared with cyclists or abutting a cycle lane where cyclists may encroach? | Not fully | <p>There is a section of unsegregated footpath/cycle track proposed leading from the eastern end of the proposed new link road at the Crescent, to Southern Station Road. The width is not dimensioned on the drawings, but by scaling, it appears to be 3m wide, and with no buffer strip from the carriageway.</p> <p>Forward visibility may be restricted on the inside of the bends including by the “future bike shed location”. Pedestrians, especially visually and mobility impaired may be at risk of being unsighted to a cyclist on the unsegregated footpath/cycle track.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>A segregated facility is preferred to minimise potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>If this section remains unsegregated, adequate intervisibility should be provided.</p> <p>Corduroy warning tactile paving should also be considered.</p> |
| 2.2.13 | Is the footpath or public area adequately illuminated for night-time use? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| | | | <p>It is noted that the proposed new link road will be lit. The footpath is remote from the carriageway. Therefore, it is not obvious that the footpath will be adequately lit, just relying on “spillage” from the carriageway illumination.</p> <p>No details are provided for lighting within the exiting Southern Station Road.</p> | <p>The proposed, the road lighting will need a design check to ensure the scheme complies with design standards, including for the footpath.</p> <p>To be taken into account at detailed design. The adequacy of the existing street lighting should be considered.</p> |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|--------|--|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 2.2.14 | Is suitable tactile surfacing provided at all pedestrian crossing locations? | Generally yes. | <p>The drawings do indicate/ imply dropped kerbs and associated tactile paving at pedestrian crossing points.</p> <p>However, no tactile paving is indicated at the bus depot access. Given that the proposed layout appears to be an access junction (not a vehicular crossing of a footpath) tactile paving is likely to be appropriate.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>Details for the bus depot access should be reviewed.</p> |
| | | Unknown. Bus Station Access | No improvement is indicated to the pedestrian crossing of the bus station access, although it appears to be a non-standard feature (and is within the scheme boundary). | The existing situation at the bus station access should be reviewed and if necessary rectified as part of the scheme. |

2.3 Public Seating in the Street or Public Area

It is recommended that seating should be provided to public areas or within a street environment at intervals of approximately 50 metres, particularly in streets and pavements that have inclines or slopes to give rest points for persons with mobility-impairments, also to provide a wheelchair rest position on hillside streets, sloping footways and other public areas.

Table 2.3 Seating

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|----------|---|---|
| 2.3.1 | Is seating provided at intervals of approximately 50m? | No | No seating is indicated on the drawings provided, and there does not appear to be any existing seating. | The detailed design should provide external seating in safe and convenient locations. |
| 2.3.2 | Is seating provided at inclines or slopes as rest points for mobility impaired users? | No | Although there are existing or proposed ramps or steep gradients, there are locations where seating may be beneficial, particularly for elderly or infirm. E.g. outside the railway station for the taxi rank, and at the proposed bus stops. | In particular, seating should be considered for the taxi rank and bus stops. |
| 2.3.3 | Are flat areas provided at regular intervals on inclines or slopes as rest point for mobility assisted (wheelchair, frames, stick) users? | No | Levels and gradient information has not be provided at this preliminary design stage. However, by inspection, there does not appear to be any reason for there to be steep ramps or gradients along the footpaths. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Should there be any steep section of footpaths or access ramps, level areas should also be provided. |

2.4 Controlled and Un-controlled Pedestrians Crossings

The proposals include for un-controlled crossings of the college site accesses and the existing signal-controlled crossing of Carriageway within the development. Carrigrohane Road will also be affected.

Table 2.4 Controlled and Un-controlled Pedestrians Crossings

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|---|---|---------------|--|---|
| Traffic Signal-controlled Crossing | | | | |
| 2.4.1 | Do the controlled crossing have tactile paving in compliance with the standards and in red colour? | Generally Yes | The proposed signal-controlled crossing points appear correctly detailed, except at the eastern end of the Crescent and junction with Gleeson Street. At this location a new segregated cycle track is proposed, but the proposed layout does not cater for pedestrians crossing the cycle track at the existing signalised crossing. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Details amended layout at the eastern end of Grace Crescent should be considered. |
| 2.4.2 | Does the controlled crossing have an unobstructed width of 2400mm? | Unknown | Dimensions are not provided, although by inspection they appear reasonable (e.g. 2400mm wide). | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.4.3 | Are the kerbs lowered to form a dished kerb approach gradient no greater than 1:12 and an upstand above road level no greater than 6mm? | Unknown | The construction detail drawings specify kerbs 0 – 6mm at crossing points, but the footway gradient crossfall is not specified. However there does not appear any reason that acceptable crossfall gradients cannot be achieved through careful detailing. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.4.4 | Is the crossing free of road gullies, gratings or channels that may cause wheelchair or stick users problems? | Unknown | It appears the proposed gulleys along the new link road are located clear of pedestrian crossing points. Contours are not provided, but it appears that gulleys have also been positioned slightly upstream of pedestrian crossing points, which is considered to be good practice. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Detailed design should re-check location of gulleys in conjunction with a contour plan. |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | It appears It appears the existing crossing point of Southern Station Road, outside the station is also free from gulley grates etc. | |
| 2.4.5 | Is visibility to approaching traffic achieved from all crossing locations and clear of temporary obstructions such as parked vehicles? | Unknown. New Link Road | Intervisibility zones and splays have not been provided. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Intervisibility zones and spays should be confirmed through the detailed design. |
| | | No. Southern Station Road | Visibility to the southern side of the crossing on Southern Station Road, is (by scaling) approximately 40m. It is noted that this is an existing situation. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Intervisibility should be confirmed through the detailed design. If it is found to be sub-standard, mitigation measures may be required. |
| 2.4.6 | Is the crossing area adequately covered with street lighting? | Unknown. New Link Road | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. It is noted that the proposed new link road will be lit, but it is not clear what standards may have been applied to the pedestrian crossings. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The proposed, the road lighting will need a design check to ensure the scheme complies with design standards, including for the pedestrian crossings. |
| | | Unknown. Southern Station Road. | No details are provided for lighting within the exiting Southern Station Road. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The existing road lighting at the pedestrian crossing outside the station may require upgrading. |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|--|---|
| Uncontrolled Crossings | | | | |
| 2.4.7 | Does the crossing have tactile paving in compliance with the standards and in buff colour? | No | Further to 2.2.14, no tactile paving is indicated at the bus depot access. Given that the proposed layout appears to be an access junction (not a vehicular crossing of a footpath) tactile paving is likely to be appropriate. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Details for the bus depot access should be reviewed. |
| | | Unknown | Further to 2.2.14, no improvement is indicated to the pedestrian crossing of the bus station access, although it appears to be a non-standard feature (and is within the scheme boundary). | The existing situation at the bus station access should be reviewed and if necessary rectified as part of the scheme. |
| 2.4.8 | Does the un-controlled crossing have dished kerbs with an unobstructed width of 1200mm? | Yes | The drawings do indicate/imply dropped kerbs and associated tactile paving at pedestrian crossing points. Dimensions are not provided, but by inspection, they appear at least 1200mm wide. | |
| 2.4.9 | Are the kerbs lowered to form a dished kerb approach gradient no greater than 1:12 and an upstand above road level no greater than 6mm? | Unknown | The construction detail drawings specify kerbs 0 – 6mm at crossing points, but the footway gradient crossfall is not specified. However there does not appear any reason that acceptable crossfall gradients cannot be achieved through careful detailing. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.4.10 | Is the crossing free of road gullies, gratings or channels that may cause wheelchair or stick users problems? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.4.11 | Is visibility to approaching traffic achieved from all crossing locations and clear of temporary obstructions such as parked vehicles? | Unknown | Dimensions are not provided, but by inspection, visibility appears adequate. | To be checked as part of detailed design. |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|--------|---|----------|--|--|
| 2.4.12 | Is the crossing area adequately covered with street lighting? | Unknown | No details are provided for lighting within the exiting Southern Station Road. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The existing road lighting at the pedestrian crossing, and at the proposed bus depot access may require upgrading. |

2.5 Disabled User Parking Spaces

For Disabled Parking Spaces within a parking scheme, it is important to provide designated Accessible Parking Spaces to serve the needs of disabled drivers or passengers. These spaces should be located to minimise travel distance for the user from the space to their intended destination.

The number of Disabled User spaces provided will change dependant on the destination i.e. a medical centre will require a greater provision than a crèche.

Table 2.5 Disabled Parking

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|----------|--|---|
| 2.5.1 | Are Disabled User Parking spaces provided | Unknown | There are no proposed disabled parking spaces indicated along the proposed new link road. However, there does not appear to be any adjacent feature which would require on-street parking along the new link road, and therefore specific designated parking spaces may be unnecessary on the new link road. | |
| | | | There are 4No. existing disabled on-street parking spaces on Southern Station Road, directly in front of the station, and it appears that these are being retained. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The Design Team should review whether or not the current provision of on-street spaces is sufficient. |
| | | | It is also noted that there are 7No. disabled parking spaces within the station car park. However, Works within the station car park are | None |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | outside the site boundary and scope of this project. | |
| 2.5.2 | Are disabled parking spaces provided with a clearly marked RRM 015 symbol on the road surface to show parking assigned to disabled or mobility-impaired drivers or passenger? | Yes | | None |
| 2.5.3 | Is there a flush kerb to allow wheelchair access to the adjacent footpath? | No | Based on the current layout, flush kerbs are only accessible from the these on-street parking spaces via the carriageway – at the signalised pedestrian crossing, or the bus-station access crossing point. The scheme proposals do not indicate any works to improve this situation. | To be taken into account at detailed design. The Design Team should consider improving the accessibility of the on-street parking spaces, e.g. provision of flush kerbs. |
| 2.5.4 | Is there a yellow cross hatch marking to indicate the travel clear route for the user? | No | | To be taken into account at detailed design. The Design Team should consider improving the accessibility of the on-street parking spaces, e.g. provision of hatch markings. |

2.6 Wayfinding

It is important to provide way-finding signage in the area. It should be noted that information signage should not be positioned too high for persons of short stature and wheelchair users to access. Also, visitors to the area with vision impairment will find it difficult to read signage at high levels.

Information boards benefit blind or visually impaired persons if essential notes and information are provided in conjunction with existing visual signs, directional routes in Braille and tactile will assist visitors to the area.

Effective colour contrast on signage is essential and is as important as the size of the lettering or symbols. Colours can appear different under various light sources, so when choosing sign colours ensure that under the same lighting conditions be used in the area where the sign is to be located at night. Particularly avoid red and green colour schemes in signage due to the prevalence of red/green colour blindness.

Table 2.6 Wayfinding

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|--|----------|---|--|
| 2.6.1 | Is signage provided to guide the user through the development? | No | No direction signage has been proposed. It is noted that there is some existing signage, but that at least one existing "finger post" will have to be taken down where it is affected by the proposed new link road. Signage could be useful for pedestrian movement to relevant destinations, e.g. train station and bus station. | To be taken into account at detailed design. Direction signage for pedestrians should be provided where it may be beneficial. |
| 2.6.2 | Are the signs of a suitable size and colour combination? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.6.3 | Are the signs mounted at a suitable height so they can be read but not cause a head clearance issue? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 2.6.4 | Are the signs positions so they do not cause a hazard? | Unknown | Insufficient detail at this preliminary design stage. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |

3. Walking Audit

Walking audits examine and evaluate the walking environment in a given area. The audit's purpose is to identify concerns for pedestrians related to the safety, access, comfort, and convenience of the walking environment.

Many of the concerns for able-bodied pedestrians are the same as for the disabled users i.e., footpath surface condition, footpath width etc. and may also be raised in the Mobility Audit.

Table 3.1 Walking Audit

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|---|---|--|
| 3.1.1 | Does the proposed design adequately cater for the safe passage of existing pedestrian users after completion of the project by reinstating existing facilities or providing alternative new facilities? | Generally yes, but some details may require further consideration and possible amendment to ensure continuity of pedestrian routes. | <p>It is not clear how suitable the existing footpath along the northern side of Southern Station Road will be.</p> <p>It terminates at the station car park exit, where intervisibility is severely restricted by the boundary wall. There is no continuity along the station car park frontage.</p> <p>The scheme proposals indicate that to the west of the station the exiting footpath will be replaced with a 2-way cycle track, where pedestrians do not appear to be catered for.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>Designer to ensure continuity of pedestrian routes. Where footpaths terminate, there should be safe and convenient crossing points of the adjacent road.</p> <p>In some instances, measures may be required to deter pedestrians from using routes which do not provide continuity.</p> |
| 3.1.2 | Are the footpaths of adequate width to cater for expected pedestrian numbers? | Unknown | <p>The proposed cross-section for the new link road indicates a 1.8m wide footpath.</p> <p>The existing footpath along the southern side of Southern Station Road is indicated to be upgraded, but no dimensions are given. It appears that the existing footpath is narrow in places.</p> | <p>Designer to detail footpaths to appropriate width. 1.8m minimum is recommended.</p> |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|-------------------|--|--|
| 3.1.3 | Do the footpaths terminate at an appropriate location? | Not in all cases. | The footpath along the northern side of Southern Station Road does not terminate in suitable locations. See 3.1.1 above. | To be taken into account at detailed design. See 3.1.1 above. |
| 3.1.4 | Are the footpaths direct without unnecessary diversions, loops etc? | Yes | It appears that the existing and proposed footpaths provide reasonably direct routes for pedestrians. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| 3.1.5 | Do the footpaths conflict with cycle or motor users? | No | <p>Further to 3.1.1 and 3.1.3 above, it is not clear how it is intended that the end of the cycle track and interface with the existing footpath on the northern side of Southern Station Road is managed.</p> <p>The current proposed layout is likely to give rise to conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and buses.</p> | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| | | No. | <p>Further to 2.2.12, there is a section of unsegregated footpath/cycle track proposed leading from the eastern end of the proposed new link road at the Crescent, to Southern Station Road. The width is not dimensioned on the drawings, but by scaling, it appears to be 3m wide, and with no buffer strip from the carriageway.</p> <p>Forward visibility may be restricted on the inside of the bends including by the "future bike shed location". Pedestrians, especially visually and mobility impaired may be at risk of being unsighted to a cyclist</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>A segregated facility is preferred to minimise potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>If this section remains unsegregated, adequate intervisibility should be provided.</p> <p>Corduroy warning tactile paving should also be considered.</p> |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|--|----------|--|---|
| | | | on the unsegregated footpath/cycle track. | |
| 3.1.6 | Are suitable signs provided to enable wayfinding through the development? | No | <p>Further to 2.6.1 above, no direction signage has been proposed. It is noted that there is some existing signage, and at least one existing "finger post" will have to be taken where it is affected by the proposed new link road.</p> <p>Signage could be useful for pedestrian movement to relevant destinations, e.g. train station and bus station.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>Direction signage for pedestrians should be provided where it may be beneficial.</p> |
| 3.1.7 | Are any areas of shared use suitably signed by way of change in environment (surface colour, texture, signage, furniture, etc.)? | Unknown | Further to 2.2.12 above, there is a section of unsegregated footpath/cycle track proposed leading from the eastern end of the proposed new link road at the Crescent, to Southern Station Road. There is no corduroy warning tactile paving which is typically used to warn pedestrians of a possible hazard, in this case, sharing the path with cyclists. | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>Corduroy warning tactile paving should also be considered.</p> |

4. Cycle Audit

Cycling in Ireland is increasing in popularity. Advice for the safe provision of cycle facilities is given in both the DMURS and the Cycle Design Manual in order to promote cycling as a sustainable form of transport and seeks to rebalance design priorities to promote a safer and more comfortable environment for cyclists.

4.1 Cycleway Provision

The Cycle Design Manual provides guidance on where best to accommodate the cyclist in the public environment i.e. on lightly trafficked/low speed streets designers are generally dictated to create shared streets where cyclists and motor vehicles share the carriageway. On busier/moderate speed streets designers are generally dictated to apply separate cycle lanes/cycle tracks.

Table 4.1 Cycle Audit

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|--|----------------|---|---|
| 4.1.1 | Are cycle facilities appropriate to the environment? | Generally yes. | It is noted that it is proposed to provide a 2-way cycle track along the southern side of the proposed new link road and also provide a new cycle track along the western part of existing Southern Station Road. | To be taken into account at detailed design. |
| | | | <p>It is not clear how cyclists are intended to leave and rejoin the carriageway at the ends of these facilities.</p> <p>Further to 2.2.12, and 3.1.5, there is a section of unsegregated footpath/cycle track proposed leading from the eastern end of the proposed new link road at the Crescent, to Southern Station Road. The width is not dimensioned on the drawings, but by scaling, it appears to be 3m wide, and with no buffer strip from the carriageway.</p> <p>Forward visibility may be restricted on the inside of the bends including by the “future bike shed location”. Pedestrians, especially visually and mobility impaired may be at risk of being unsighted to a cyclist on the unsegregated footpath/cycle track.</p> | <p>At each of the ends of these proposed cycle tracks, the Design Team should produce details which are safe and convenient to enable cyclists to leave and rejoin the carriageway.</p> <p>To be taken into account at detailed design. See 2.2.12 & 3.1.5.</p> |

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Access Comment | Action |
|-------|---|----------|---|---|
| 4.1.2 | Are Advanced Stop Lines (ASL) provided for the on-road at the signal-controlled junction? | Unknown | <p>Advance Stop Lines are not proposed at the various existing and proposed traffic signal junctions within the scheme.</p> <p>However, do not appear necessary because of the Cycle Tracks which are proposed, which provide off-carriageway routes for cyclist.</p> <p>Where a cycle track commences at a signalised node, it would be useful if “slip-off” from the carriageway is provided for cyclists to joint the cycle track in advance of the traffic signal stop line.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>The Design Team should consider providing “off-slips” for cyclists to join the cycle tracks in advance of traffic signal stop lines.</p> |
| 4.1.3 | Are suitable and safe bike storage solutions provided at the nodes of demand? | Unknown | <p>It is noted that there are some exiting cycle racks at the railway station, which appear to be well used.</p> <p>It is noted that a location for “Future Bike Shed” near to the junction of the proposed new link road and Southern Station Road. However, it is not clear what demand for cycle parking this is intended to cater for, since the site is currently undeveloped. Cycle storage should be near to intended destinations. If cycle storage is remote from a destination, it reduces the advantage of cycling, and may not be well used.</p> <p>No details of how cycles could be securely stored at the proposed bike shed are provided.</p> <p>Provision of secure covered cycle parking/storage and charging is an important measure where it is intended to promote cycling (including ebikes) as a viable alternative mode of transport.</p> | <p>Design Team should check that the proposed location for the bike shed will be suitable to serve intended destinations.</p> <p>Any design for a bike shed should ensure cycles can be stored securely, in view of the relatively high value of some bikes and risk of theft.</p> <p>The proposed number of parking spaces should be confirmed, to be sufficient to meet anticipated demand.</p> |
| | | | It is noted that the proposed bikes shed canopy gives 2m headroom. This may be too low, with a risk of dismounted cyclist striking their head. | Details of the bike shed should be reviewed. |

5. Other Considerations

Table 5.1 Other Considerations

| Ref | Feature | Conforms | Audit Comment | Action |
|-----|-----------|----------|--|--|
| | Bus Stops | No | <p>2 “Town Service and Local Bus” Stops are indicated in Sothern Station Road in front of the railway station.</p> <p>No bus shelter, seating, or bus-boarder kerb facilities are indicated.</p> | <p>To be taken into account at detailed design.</p> <p>The Design Team should consider providing improved facilities at these bus stops, e.g. shelters, seating and bus-boarders to contribute to a good level of service and accessibility.</p> <p>Provision for “Real Time Information could also be considered.</p> |

6. Quality Audit Statement

We certify that we have examined the drawings and other information listed in Appendix A. This Quality Audit has been undertaken to demonstrate that appropriate consideration has been given to all of the relevant aspects of the design.

Signed Philip Edwards
Philip Edwards BSc Hons GMICE
Audit Team Leader

Date 14th May 2025

Signed Stuart Summerfield
Stuart Summerfield
Audit Team Member

Date 14th May 2025

Appendix A List of Documents Examined

| DOCUMENT REF / NAME: | RECEIVED FROM: | DATE: |
|---|----------------|------------|
| 120278-4501 PL1 Athlone Link Road – Athlone Active Travel Routes | CST Group | 07/05/2025 |
| 120278-001 PL1 Athlone Link Road – Proposed Site Layout | CST Group | 07/05/2025 |
| 120278-501 PL1 Athlone Link Road – Proposed Storm and Foul Drainage Layout | CST Group | 07/05/2025 |
| 120278-725 PL1 Athlone Link Road – Typical Cross Section | CST Group | 07/05/2025 |
| 120278-750 PL1 Athlone Link Road – Standard Details | CST Group | 07/05/2025 |
| 120278-1301 PL1 Athlone Link Road – Proposed Lighting Layout | CST Group | 07/05/2025 |
| | | |



1, O'Connell Street, Sligo, F91 W7YV
+353 (0)71 919 4500 info@cstgroup.ie
www.cstgroup.ie

Civil
Structural
Traffic