

---

**Decision Session –  
Executive Member for Transport**

**22 June 2021**

Report of the Director of Place

**Scarborough Bridge Sub Projects: Bootham Crossing**

**Summary**

1. This report seeks Executive Member approval to:
  - (a) implement the changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to reduce parking on St Mary's in order to facilitate the introduction of traffic signals at the junction of Bootham and St Mary's.
  - (b) the arrangement and positioning of the traffic signal poles on St Mary's, and the change of material at the junction of Bootham and St Mary's.

**Recommendations**

2. The Executive Member is asked to:
  - i. Note but over-rule the objection to the TRO amendment and implement as advertised.
  - ii. Approve the implementation of the proposed signal layout as shown in Annex B subject to the outcome of a Road Safety Audit on the detailed design. .

Reason: to allow for the introduction of the traffic signalised junction in order provide improvements to cycle links and to enhance road safety.

**Background**

3. During the Executive Member Decision Session on 3rd November 2020, the Executive Member approved the installation of traffic signals at the Bootham/St Mary's junction.

4. Vehicle swept path analysis has highlighted the need to set the proposed traffic signal stop line back a specified distance into St Mary's. To enable this and to avoid conflict between turning vehicles and those parked within the Residents' Parking bay, there is a need to reduce the length of the parking bay. 13m of residents' parking space (approximately 2 to 3 car spaces) would be removed. There is no suitable nearby location where alternative parking space could be offered as a replacement.
5. When considering the positioning of the signal poles, representations by were received by Officers from the owners of Penn House concerning the potential impact of the signal heads on the aesthetics of the historic building of Penn House. In order to reduce the impact on the quality of the frontal aspect of Penn House, alternative positions for the signal poles were considered.
6. The resulting proposal considered a primary signal positioned in advance of the vehicle stop line and a low level cycle signal (LLCS) positioned nearer to the junction to minimise the impact on the view of the property. This arrangement was a departure from guidance and so the Department for Transport (DfT) were approached for approval. The DfT refused to grant approval. As a result of this response alternative layout options were developed as shown in Annexes A and B.
7. The potential to introduce setts across the mouth of St Mary's to emphasise the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing included in the consultation layout has also been reviewed. There are particular challenges delivering a change to the surfacing materials at this location due to the conservation area location and the potential to cause significant disturbance and disruption to access to properties on St Mary's during construction. The width of road is not sufficient to allow the work to be undertaken without an extended closure of the street. Alternative materials which would provide a similar change to the surface appearance have been investigated but there would be concerns about future maintenance and impact on the conservation area. It is therefore proposed to remove any surface change at this location from the scheme pending the completion of a Road Safety Audit on the final design.

## **Consultation**

8. The proposed changes to the TRO were advertised between 27<sup>th</sup> April and 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021. Details were sent to the usual consultees as well as the residents of St Mary's and the residents' parking permit holders in Zone 12. Notices were displayed on site.
9. Only one objection was received, from a resident of St Mary's. The resident did not specify a reason for objecting to the proposed changes to the TRO, but instead highlighted their dissatisfaction with the recent re-surfacing of St Mary's.

## **Options**

TRO Option 1- Recommended.

10. Approve the changes to the TRO as advertised to enable the implementation of the signal scheme.

TRO Option 2.

11. Uphold the objection and not amend the TRO.

Signal Layout Option A - See Annex A

12. Narrow Advance Stop Line area for cyclists and Signal in cobbled area on Bootham.

Signal Layout Option B – Recommended See Annex B

13. Primary Traffic Signal and Full width Advanced Stop Line area further down St. Marys close to lighting column by entrance to Penn House.

## **Analysis**

TRO Option 1- Recommended

14. Under Option 1, the loss of parking would be implemented and would enable the installation of the traffic signal junction to meet the aims of the project.

15. The changed parking restrictions would enable the junction to be signalised providing significant improvement for cyclists on the key Station to Hospital route. It is considered that these benefits outweigh the objection to the loss of parking capacity in the area.
16. The loss of 2-3 spaces on St Mary's is considered to have a relative low impact. There is considered to be no readily available alternative location for additional parking provision in the area.

#### TRO Option 2

17. If the parking restrictions were not amended the provision of a traffic signal junction scheme would be severely compromised as sufficient space for the stop line and queuing area on St Marys could not be provided. This in turn would mean that the wider objectives of the scheme to provide improved cycle links between Bootham Park Hospital and the railway station would not be realised, and the existing life-expired signal crossing on Bootham would remain at risk of imminent failure.

#### Signal Layout Options

18. Two signal layout options (see Annexes A&B) have been assessed to minimise the impact on Penn House whilst still meeting the objectives of the scheme to provide a controlled crossing facility for cyclists. It is considered that both options would be acceptable but would need to be subject to a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit prior to implementation.

#### Signal Layout Option A – Annex A

19. Option A would allow for cyclists to be positioned in advance of the vehicle stop line and allow for queueing space for 2 to 3 vehicles. The swept paths of larger rigid vehicles would be able to be accommodated in and out of St Mary's, without conflict or obstruction. The positions of the signal poles would preserve the view of the Penn House frontage from Bootham but the distance to the primary stop line to the primary signal is greater than normally provided. A kerbed build-out would be required to protect the signal pole that is proposed to be sited on the cobbles. To preserve the appearance and conservational value of the cobbled area, cobbles would be used as the surfacing material on the build-out. The restricted width of the Advanced Stop Line could limit the capacity for cyclists to gain access to this area however it is considered

acceptable in this low trafficked area and enables the stopline to be closer to Bootham reducing delay on the junction and reducing the crossing time for cyclists.

#### Signal Layout Option B – Annex B

20. Option B would move the stop line further down St Mary's which would enable a full width ASL to be provided increasing the capacity for cyclists and could potentially be considered to reduce the impact on Penn House as the signal would have less impact on the view of the building from Bootham. However the stop line would be further from Bootham increasing the distance and time (1-2 seconds) needed for cyclists and vehicles to pass through the junction from St. Mary's and would reduce the stacking capacity for vehicles up to the stop line increasing the risk of vehicles blocking St Mary's at the junction. The primary signal would be closer to the stop line which is standard design practice.
21. On the basis that Option B, subject to a Road Safety Audit on the detailed design, provides additional capacity for cyclists in the ASL area, without significantly impacting on the junction capacity and the signal head is closer to the stop line in accordance with standards this option is recommended for approval.

#### **Council Plan**

22. The Council's Plan sets out a number of key priorities.
23. The proposed change to the TRO would result in a reduction of on-street parking on St Mary's and may result in encouraging the use of sustainable transport, thereby potentially promoting good health and wellbeing.
24. The revision to the signal pole locations demonstrates that the council is an open and effective authority and that officers are willing to listen to residents.

#### **Implications**

- **Financial** The scheme is being funded from WYCA resources. Delay in delivering the project could jeopardise the funding allocation.
- **Human Resources (HR)** There are no HR implications

- **Equalities** There are considered to be limited equalities implications – See Equalities Impact Assessment in Annex C
- **Legal.** The Council has the legal power to make these changes under the Highways Act 1980.
- **Crime and Disorder** There are no crime and disorder implications
- **Information Technology (IT)** There are no IT implications.
- **Property** There are no property implications.
- **Other** There are no other implications

### **Risk Management**

25. Physical - there is always a potential for new road safety issues to arise whenever an existing traffic arrangement is altered. Identification and management of these issues would be through the road safety audit process.
26. Organisation/Reputation - there could be criticism from potential supporters of the scheme if the scheme is not implemented. The ambitions of the council to introduce and promote improved cycle links would not be realised.

<b>Risk Category</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Score</b>
Physical	Moderate	Unlikely	13
Organisation/Reputation	Minor	Unlikely	8

27. Measured in terms of impact and likelihood, the risk scores have all been assessed at lower than 16. This means that, at this point, the risks need only to be monitored.

### **Contact Details**

**Author:**  
**Tom Blair**  
 Transport Projects  
 07881 686032

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**  
**James Gilchrist**  
**Director of Place**

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** 11/06/21

**Wards Affected:** Guildhall

**Background Papers:**

Executive Member Decision Session Report 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2020.

**Annexes**

Annex A.

Annex B Scarborough Bridge Sub Projects - Bootham Crossing – Lining and Signing Option B

Annex C – Equalities Impact Assessment.