

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

## **Holgate Road (Iron Bridge to Acomb Road) Cycle Scheme**

### **Summary**

1. This report summarises the responses to recent consultation on a proposed cycle lane scheme on Holgate Road, which includes the creation of new residents' only and community parking bays. The report seeks approval of a preferred layout and to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

### **Recommendations**

2. It is recommended that the Executive Member approves:
  - a) the progression of the scheme as proposed in **Annex F**
  - b) the advertisement of the necessary TROs, and implementation of the scheme if no substantive objections are received.

Reason - To enhance road safety for cyclists by providing more continuity of the cycle lanes on Holgate Road, whilst maintaining good parking provision for local residents.

### **Background**

3. A feasibility study was carried out in 2013 looking at ways of providing continuous cycle lanes on Holgate Road between the Iron Bridge and Acomb Road. This study showed that the extent of cycle lane provision on both sides of Holgate Road would be largely determined by the amount of on-street parking retained. Indeed, fully continuous cycle lanes would require all the existing parking to be removed.

Discussions based on the study's findings took place with the residents of Holgate Road. Those residents living in the raised dwellings between numbers 101 and 111 presented a request in early 2014 to Cllr Alexander, the then Leader of the Council, that a residents priority zone be set up to allow local residents a much greater chance of finding a parking space close to their property.

4. At a subsequent meeting between Members and Officers, it was agreed that a parking survey was required to obtain a clear picture of the extent and location of the existing parking. A parking survey was therefore subsequently carried out to obtain a clear picture of the existing situation, and three cycle lane scheme options were subsequently developed:
  - Option (i) removed all the existing parking to allow continuous cycle lanes to be provided.
  - Option (ii) sought to achieve a reasonable balance between reducing parking and cycle lane provision.
  - Option (iii) retained most of the parking, but had large gaps in the cycle lane provision;

In 2015 the Acting Director decided that option (ii) offered the best way forward, and authorised consultation on this basis, with feedback to be reported to an Executive Member Decision Session.

## **Consultation**

5. Consultation has been carried out in two stages. The **first stage** was a scheme-wide consultation exercise undertaken in the autumn of 2015, based on the option (ii) layout (see **Annex A**). This involved local residents/businesses, key Members, and external organisations.

The **second stage** consultation dealt specifically with how two of the proposed parking bays in the scheme should operate. The results of both stages of consultation are outlined below:

## STAGE ONE - overall scheme

### 6. Residents/Businesses

The boundary for the consultation concerning the whole scheme is shown in **Annex B**.

The results are summarised in **Annex C**, and show five respondents supporting the cycle scheme, with three opposing it.

There was a varied selection of comments. One objector replied that he would only support the scheme if the streets leading immediately off Holgate Road were designated residents' only parking too. Another respondent objected because she felt that the proposed parking restrictions outside Nos. 150-154 would ruin her business. The third objector was unconcerned about the changes to the parking, but felt that the road was too narrow for the scheme to be successful.

#### *Officer response*

Consideration of an area wide residents' only parking scheme is considered to be beyond the scope of the cycle lane scheme. Usually the council would expect to receive a petition requesting residents' only parking for an area, which would demonstrate that a more formal Council survey would be justified. We would not initiate this approach as there needs to be clear support in the area and because there is a significant cost involved.

The proposed daytime restriction outside Nos. 150-154 is outside the respondent's business, and will result in about three spaces being unavailable. Therefore customers arriving by car will need to find alternative parking nearby. However, this should be available during the day in adjacent streets, and it is considered important for cycling safety not to have any parking in this part of Holgate Road at peak traffic times.

It would be very tight to fit in cycle lanes in some places, and in places it may be necessary to reduce cycle lane width from 1.5m to 1.2m. This should still be better for cyclists than having no lanes at all.

## **Members' Views**

7. **Ward Councillors** - Councillor Cannon has raised concerns that the parking on the surrounding streets will get worse as a result, and queried whether it would be feasible to widen the consultation area to include streets on both sides.

**Group Spokespersons** - Councillor D'Agorne suggested that we omit certain sections of cycle lane to improve safety. Examples of these are: (1) stopping the cycle lane in advance of a parking bay to allow cyclists more distance to manoeuvre around any parked vehicles, (2) removing a length of cycle lane for outbound cyclists opposite the parking bay between nos. 138-146. He also agreed with Cllr Cannon regarding consulting more widely.

### *Officer response*

On Holgate Road itself we are proposing to reduce the overall parking capacity by about 9 spaces during the day time, and 6 at night, to facilitate better provision for cyclists. By proposing extra areas of residents' only control we are seeking to minimise the impact on the local residents and businesses. This could lead to some additional parking in other streets, but it is very difficult to predict where this might be and how much of a problem it might cause. Hence it was not considered practical to expand the consultation area to the all the areas that might be affected, and it can be assumed that the general response would be in opposition. This is in line with council practice when implementing parking schemes across the city.

If the cycle scheme and associated parking changes are implemented, we would investigate any subsequent requests for changes to local parking arrangements on a separate basis.

As mentioned earlier in paragraph 6, consideration of an area wide residents' only parking scheme is considered to be beyond the scope of the cycle lane scheme.

Where a cycle lane is heading directly towards a parking bay it would seem sensible to terminate it a little in advance to encourage cyclists to move outwards more gradually. Hence it is proposed to include this change in the final scheme layout.

Regarding the suggestion that the cycle lane adjacent to numbers 138-146 should be omitted, officers agree with this idea. The width of carriageway here does not allow the provision of an uphill lane and buffer while retaining adequate width for the general traffic lanes. However, it does permit either a narrow downhill cycle lane and two equal general lanes of 2.7m, or it allows a wider uphill general lane and a reasonable downhill one, but without cycle lanes in either direction. Where there is insufficient space, it is safer to omit a cycle lane on the downhill side, and provide extra width on the uphill side. This is because the exertion of travelling uphill tends to make cyclists meander from side to side and so require more width. For this reason, officers are proposing to amend the scheme to omit the cycle lanes in both directions and to move the centre line to provide a wider uphill general lane. The inclusion of cycle symbols in place of cycle lane lines has been included to make the presence of cyclists more obvious to other road users.

### **External Organisations**

8. The Cyclists' Touring Club highlighted existing drainage issues at the entrance to the former carriageworks entrance. The Club also suggested that we should widen the cycle lane in advance of the Hamilton Drive East junction to help prevent "left hook" turns by vehicles, and that extra signage is required at the Ashton Lane segregated shared use path.

#### *Officer response*

These issues would be considered further at the detailed design stage.

The York Cycle Campaign representative commented that the cycle lanes are at the minimum of 1.5m. He suggested that we provide just above the minimum width for general traffic lanes and provide the rest as cycle lane, and that we should terminate the cycle lanes well in advance of parking bays (similar to Cllr D'Agorne's comment).

#### *Officer response*

The traffic lanes will already be narrow, and it is not considered practical to provide cycle lane widths greater than 1.5m.

## **STAGE TWO – Detailed Parking Proposals**

9. A further consultation was conducted in February 2016, focussing on the proposed residents' only parking bays at the east end of the scheme.

The proposals in **Annex D** show two separate parking zones: a **residents' only** priority bay on the south side and a **community bay** on the north side. This is being put forward because there are a number of residential properties on the south side with no alternative parking provision, whilst on the north side there are mainly guest houses. Importantly a **residents' only bay** can only be used by permit holding residents. **Community bays** are mainly intended for use where there is a nearby mix of businesses and houses in multiple occupancy (HMO's), but can also be used by permit-holding residents. Hence the proposals are designed to give the residents on the south side the best chance of being able to park nearby, whilst supporting local businesses.

A general letter about this detailed amendment to scheme proposals was sent to all of the residents/businesses in the original distribution area (**Annex B**), and an additional information and voting pack was sent to those properties within the proposed parking zone (**Annex E**) boundary. This was drawn up tightly around the area concerned because of a need to restrict the numbers of potential permits issued and thereby prevent the bays being greatly oversubscribed.

### **Response**

10. The results show that that five respondents are in favour of the proposals (all residents on the south side), while two are opposed (guest houses on the north side). Neither of the two objectors stated their reason for doing so.

#### *Officer response*

The results show that the creation of the parking bays is strongly supported by the adjacent residents, and they also expressed a preference for them to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

However, there does not appear to be support for creating the parking bays among the guest-houses owners on the north side.

It should be noted that all the guest-houses on the north side of the road have off-street parking which is either accessible from Holgate Road or Watson Terrace.

Officers' view of the uncontrolled parking on this side of Holgate Road by commuters and shoppers is that it undermines the Council's transport strategy. Uncontrolled parking of this nature does not encourage the use of the Council's Park and Ride sites, and leads to further congestion and pollution.

As the overall number of respondents met the required threshold of 50% of ballot papers returned, the proposed changes to the parking arrangements may proceed to be considered. The next stage would be to advertise a formal TRO.

In light of the feedback, there is an option to omit the community bay proposal at this stage, leaving that length of road as uncontrolled parking. However, given the low response from the north side of the road, and the lack of reasons given for opposing the idea, it would still seem sensible to include the proposal to create a community bay in the TRO advert, which should draw out more responses before a decision is made.

Also, since the number of residents' only parking spaces on the south side is unlikely to meet demand at peak times, it is probable that adjacent residents would be unhappy about a community bay not being provided on the other side of the road. Hence it would be officers' intention to put forward the residents' only and community bays as two independent proposals in the TRO advertisement, and make locals aware that there could be an option for the north side parking to be left uncontrolled depending on the feedback received.

### **Amended Scheme**

11. In response to the feedback from the two stages of consultation and amended scheme plan has been developed, as shown in **Annex F**. The main differences to the plan originally put forward for consultation (**Annex A**) are:
  - the cycle lanes leading directly into a parking area would be terminated approximately 15m in advance

- at the east end of the scheme the parking bay on the south side of the road is proposed to be a residents' only bay, whilst on north side a community bay is proposed.
- The proposed residents' only parking bay on the south side of the road near Nos. 99 -111 has been moved eastwards a few metres to improve visibility for drivers exiting from No. 127 (Hollybank House).
- The downhill cycle lane outside nos 138-146 has been removed and the centre line moved to provide a wider uphill general traffic lane. Cycle symbols have been added along both sides of this section of road.

## Options

- 12 Based on the above information, there are considered to be three basic options available:
- a) Approve the overall scheme layout as shown in **Annex F**, and approve the advertisement of necessary TROs .
  - b) Approve the overall scheme layout as shown in **Annex F**, with any changes considered necessary, and approve the advertisement of the necessary TROs .
  - c) Do nothing.

## Analysis of Options

### 13. Option (a)

The overall scheme shown in **Annex F** should achieve a reasonable balance between cycle lane provision and the retention of on-street parking, and is in- line with the earlier Acting Director decision on the best solution.

There would be a reduction of six parking spaces on the southern side. However, the decrease in competition for the remaining spaces in the residents' only and community bays ought to make it easier for permit holders to find a space. There would also be an additional daytime reduction of three spaces on the northern side, where an 8am to 6pm restriction is proposed outside nos. 150-154.



As discussed at the end of paragraph 10, although consultation has revealed some opposition to the proposed creation of a community parking bay, it is still considered sensible to include this in the TRO advert before making a final decision on this.

#### Option (b)

It is not thought that the consultation feedback warrants any further changes to the scheme proposals shown in **Annex F**

#### Option (c)

This would not achieve the objective of helping cyclists travelling along Holgate Road, but it would leave the levels of parking at their current numbers.

Based on the analysis, option (a) is recommended.

### **Safety Audit**

- 14 A safety audit was carried out on the original scheme layout. The auditors' recommendations have been largely followed in developing the current proposal, or will be considered as part of the detailed design of any scheme which is taken forward.

### **Council Plan**

15. The links to the priorities in the Council plan are:
  - **A council that listens to residents** –since the idea of residents' priority parking came from residents' suggestions, the implementation of the proposals would show how the Council is working in partnership with local communities to solve local problems. The provision of better road safety conditions on Holgate Road for cyclists, would also show how the Council is listening and responding to the concerns of road users.

### **Implications**

16. This report has the following implications:-
  - **Human Resources (HR)** – None
  - **Financial**

It is estimated that Option (a) could be implemented for approximately £15,000, which includes the TRO advert. This expenditure will take place in 16/17.

The 15/16 budget for the scheme was £20K, and about £15K was spent on developing the scheme design and carrying out consultation.

The remaining expenditure will be funded by a combination of carry over from the 15/16 budget, plus an allocation from the 16/17 cycling block within the Transport Capital Programme.

- **Equalities** – None
- **Legal** – The City of York Council, as Highway Authority, has powers under the Highways Act 1980 and associated Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 to implement the measures proposed.
- **Crime and Disorder** – None
- **Information Technology (IT)** – None
- **Property** – None
- **Other** – None

## **Risk Management**

17. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified and described in the following points, and set out in the table below,

- Health and safety – the risk associated with this is in connection with the road safety implications of the final layout, and has been assessed at 2.
- Authority reputation – this risk is in connection with local media coverage and public perception of the Council not undertaking a project that has been consulted upon and is assessed at 6.

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Health and safety	Insignificant	Unlikely	2
Organisation/ Reputation	Moderate	Minor	6

Together these produce a risk score of 6, which being in the 6-10 category means that the risks have been assessed as being “Low”. This level of risk requires regular monitoring.

### Contact Details

**Author:**

**Tom Blair**

Tel: (01904 553461)

Transport Projects

**Chief Officer:**

**Neil Ferris**

Acting Director

City and Environmental Services

**Report**

**Approved**



**Date 24/03/2016**

### Specialist Implications Officer(s)

There are no specialist implications

**Wards Affected:** Holgate

### Background Papers:

“Report to the Acting Director of City and Environmental Services Decision Session meeting on 2nd February 2015”.

### Annexes

**Annex A** Original scheme layout approved for consultation at Director of City and Environmental Services Decision Session meeting on 2nd February 2015.

**Annex B** Stage One - Consultation Boundary.

**Annex C** Stage One - Results of Consultation.

**Annex D** Parking Zone proposals.

**Annex E** Stage Two Consultation Boundary.

**Annex F** Holgate Road (Iron Bridge to Acomb Road) Cycle Scheme – amended proposed layout.

## **Abbreviations used in the report**

HR- Human Resources

HMO- Houses in Multiple Occupation

TRO- Traffic Regulation Orders