

**Decision Session – Executive Member for
Transport**

21 March 2023

Report of the Director of Transport, Environment and Planning

Hospital Fields Road Active Travel Scheme

Summary

1. In February 2022, The Executive Member of Transport approved the proposed Hospital Fields Road project outline as part of the Active Travel Programme, refer to Annex K.
2. A further report was taken to Executive in November 2022 (refer to Background Paper 1), which approved the prioritisation of phase 1 projects within the Active Travel Programme, this included Hospital Fields Road.
3. The objective for the Hospital Fields Road scheme is to investigate the potential for segregated cycle facilities between the off-road path at the western end and the Fulford Road junction at the eastern end.
4. Four preliminary designs have been prepared to deliver segregated cycle facilities on Hospital Fields Road between the Millennium Bridge - New Walk (off-road path) and Fulford Road / Barracks off-road path to University of York).
5. A public consultation took place between November and December 2022.
6. This Executive report summarises the findings received in the public consultation period. An analysis of the public consultation has been undertaken.
7. This report proposes options for delivery of the scheme and requests a decision to confirm which proposal will be delivered.

Recommendations

9. The Executive Member is asked to:

- a. Select a preliminary scheme to proceed to detailed design stage and construction of the scheme as detailed within this report, and in line with the preliminary designs included within the Annex taking into consideration the reduction of the footpath width, introduction of parking restriction and the impact the scheme has on protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Impact Assessment.

Reason: To deliver the schemes aims and objectives within the available budget.

- b. Approve the advertisement of amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to extend 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions to cover both sides of Hospital Fields Road for the full length.

- c. Delegate authority to Director of Environment, Transport and Planning to approve Detailed Design of the scheme selected by The Executive Member for Transport.

Reason: This will provide the necessary approval to advertise proposal to remove parking and follow the Statutory Consultation TRO process. Any objections received to the Statutory Consultation to be reported back to Executive Member for Transport Decision Session.

Background

10. The Active Travel Programme consists of 24 no. individual projects focussed on improvements to pedestrian and cycling provision in the city, as part of the Council's wider commitment to enhancing sustainable travel in the city and addressing the climate emergency.

11. In February 2022, the Executive Member of Transport approved the Hospital Fields Road project outline, refer to Annex K.

12. A further report was taken to Executive in November 2022. The report provided a summary of the Active Travel Programme and prioritised projects for delivery.

13. The Hospital Fields Road project outline is to investigate the potential for segregated cycle facilities between the off-road path at the western end and the Fulford Road junction at the eastern end.
14. Hospital Fields Road forms an important part of the East-West cycle route and currently has minimal facilities for cyclists. The introduction of segregated cycle facilities will fill a key gap on this important strategic route which links the University of York to the Millennium Bridge.
15. The scheme meets the York Council priorities of “getting around sustainably” and “provide a greener and cleaner city”.
16. The Hospital Fields Road scheme is capital funded by City of York Council.
17. The 4 no. proposed preliminary drawings are as follows:
18. Design 1 – Light segregation eastbound / On-street westbound (Annex A)
19. Design 2 – Kerbed segregation eastbound / On-street westbound (Annex B)
20. Design 3 – Stepped cycle eastbound / On-street westbound (Annex C)
21. Design 4 – Footway level demarcated cycle lane eastbound / On-street westbound (Annex D)

Consultation

22. The consultation period was available between 17th November and 19th December 2022, open to all wanting to share their views on the proposals.
23. The online questionnaire received 210 no. responses from residents and local businesses.
24. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Annex E, with a copy of the responses in Annex F.
25. A total of three responses were received via the active travel email. The York Cycle campaign and the York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group provided comments, which can be found in Annex G and Annex H.

26. The type of cycling segregation that was included within the public consultation were the following:

- Light Segregation
- Kerbed Segregation
- Stepped Segregation
- Footway level demarcated cycle track

27. During the public consultation process the technical design drawings provided in Annex A to D were not distributed. The consultation focused on obtaining feedback on the different types of cycle segregation. This is because all 4 designs are very similar and not readily digestible by the general public. The consultation therefore focussed on the type of segregation preferred by users, and on the other related issues, such as parking provision.

Demographic

28. 77% of the respondent's cycle on Hospital Fields Road, with 45% respondents walking, and 36% drive on Hospital Fields Road.

29. The feedback responses indicate that multiple modes of transportation are used, with a significant portion coming from those who cycle.

Scheme Preference

30. Respondents were asked which type of cycling infrastructure they preferred and to score from 1 (most support) to 4 (least support). (Q20, Annex F)

31. The survey results indicate that light segregation received the most support with 38.5%, while kerbed segregation received 37% support.

32. The data suggests that there is a close level of support for both light segregation and kerbed segregation.

33. According to the survey results, 43.2% of respondents believed that light segregation would have a positive impact on safety and usability, while 54.55% believed that kerbed segregation would have a positive impact on safety and usability.

Key Themes

34. From the survey results, there were certain common themes expressed within the comments.

35. The key themes raised within the public consultation are:

- Loss of Parking
- Reallocation of Funds
- Belief that the scheme is not required
- Loss of Road Space
- Footpath width
- Cycle lane width
- Lack of protection
- No provision to improve Junction
- Support scheme

Loss of Parking

36. The public consultation on the Hospital Fields Road scheme yielded a range of opinions in regards to parking, both in favour and against the change. Some comments expressed concern about the displacement of parking spaces.

37. The removal of parking is a necessary requirement to enable the provision of segregated cycle infrastructure, which is the primary objective of the scheme as detailed within the project outline (Annex K).

38. On street parking is proposed to be removed to allow carriageway space to be relocated. The results from the public consultation indicate 31% did not support the removal of parking spaces, whilst 29% supported the removal of the parking spaces.

39. This illustrates that there is a difference of opinion on the removal of parking spaces.

40. It is to be noted that all preliminary designs require the removal of parking to deliver the scheme objectives.

41. The introduction of 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions will be subject to a separate consultation based on the traffic regulation order (TRO) process.

42. This report seeks authority to advertise amendments to existing Traffic Regulation Orders.
43. The Principal Designer acknowledged that in areas of constrained width parking and other kerbside activity are problematic to cyclists for the following reasons:
44. Buffer width – There is a requirement to provide a minimum buffer width between parking and segregated cycle facilities.
45. Conflict with on-coming vehicles - Parking narrows the effective width of the carriageway creating requirement to 'give and take' for manoeuvring vehicles.
46. The Principal Designer comments support the requirement of for the introduction of 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions to improve the active facilities on Hospital Fields Road.

Reallocation of Funds

47. The Hospital Fields Road scheme was prioritised in the November 2022 Executive meeting (Background Paper 1). As a result, the possibility of redirecting funds to other projects within the active travel programme this has already been taken into consideration. Please refer to the aforementioned report for full detailed reasoning behind the scheme prioritisation.

Scheme not required

48. Based on the public consultation, there were numerous comments made that the current conditions for cyclists are safe and there is no need for this scheme.
49. A review of the existing Hospital Fields Road was undertaken based on the Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycling Level of Service assessment. The assessment found the existing road does not meet the criteria and fails to meet the 70% pass threshold.
50. The existing layout does not provide any form of cycle facilities with cyclists sharing the carriageway with motor vehicle traffic. As a result of existing issues, detailed in Appendix I, the existing layout scored 56%, resulting in a fail, and importantly, a critical fail.

51. The critical fail is due to the existing carriageway lane widths, in which cyclists are required to cycle on carriageway in lanes within the critical range of between 3.2m and 3.9m.
52. Hospital Fields Road forms an important part of the East-West cycle route. It is part of a bigger cycle movement and therefore improving this section will aid in improving active travel on this strategic route that links the University of York to the Millennium Bridge.
53. The scheme meets the York Council key priorities in getting around sustainably and provide a greener and cleaner city.

Loss of Road Space

54. There were several comments which expressed concerns regarding the reduction of space for other road users.
55. The reason for reducing space for other road users is to provide space to construct the segregated cycle facilities, which is an objective of the project.
56. According to 2020 Automatic Traffic Count data, 11% of traffic flow is made up of High Goods Vehicles (HGV). The high proportion of HGVs is due to access to industrial units on Hospital Fields Road. The Principal Designer recommends it is necessary to maintain a carriageway width that is adequate for HGV movements.
57. The Principal Designer has recommended a lane width of 3 metres in either direction to allow for two HGVs to pass without the need for "give and take" manoeuvres, based on guidance from the Manual for Streets.
58. Based on this design constraint of providing a 3 metre carriageway, this has restricted what can be constructed within the available space. Therefore this has resulted in a reduction of space for other users.

Footpath width

59. A few comments in the public consultation raised concerns at the reduction of the footpath. As discussed previously, the reduction of space for other users is required to construct the segregated cycle facilities, which is an objective of the project (Annex K). Due to the physical

constraints of the site and design constraints it is necessary to reduce the footpath width to accommodate the scheme.

60. The Principal Designer attempted to maximise the width of the northern footpath, given the limitations of the site and the aspirations of creating a segregated cycle infrastructure.
61. It is acknowledged that the width of the northern footpath within the preliminary scheme designs falls below the recommended 2 metres as stated within the Department for Transport (DfT) Inclusive Mobility guidance.
62. Footway typical widths and pinch point widths for each proposal are provided below:

Option	Northern – Typical	Northern – Pinch Point
Design 1	1.7m	1.5m
Design 2	1.6m	1.4m
Design 3	1.8m	1.7m
Design 4	1.7m	1.5m

63. It is recognised that reducing the width of the footway on the northern side is not a desirable outcome. However, due to the need to maintain a 6m carriageway (due to HGV traffic flows), the only way of achieving segregated cycle infrastructure in an eastbound direction is to reduce the footway width.
64. The DfT allows for a minimum width of 1.5 m if the recommended width of 2m is not feasible due to physical constraints. A 1.5m is deemed acceptable as this should enable a wheelchair user and a walker to pass each other according to DfT Inclusive Mobility guidance.

Cycle lane width

65. A few comments made were in reference to the width of the cycle track in all of the cycle infrastructure options consulted on. A common concern that was raised was that due to width of the track this may prevent the ability to overtake slower cyclists.
66. The design that will be progressed to Detailed Design stage will be part of a Road Safety Audit. Any safety concerns will be addressed by the Principal Designer.

67. As per the design constraints stated previously carriageway space is limited. To increase the cycle width, this would create further reduction in other facilities for road users.

Lack of protection

68. A common theme that was made within the public consultation was a lack of protection provided in the westbound direction.

69. Several comments in the public consultation noted that the westbound lane for cyclists will be less comfortable due to the narrowing of the carriageway, as cyclists will have to share a narrower roadway than before.

70. The carriageway cross-section is circa ~ 11.3 m. To provide facilities in both directions would reduce the footpath to below minimum widths.

71. An eastbound cycle track was preferred by the Principal Designer as this provides a better continuity to and from both the shared footway of 'New Walk' to the west and into the advanced stop line (ASL) at the Fulford Road junction to the east.

72. There are multiple accesses and 2 no. side roads along the northern kerb line in the eastbound direction. As such, a cycle track in an eastbound direction gives priority and improves safety at potential conflict points along the northern kerb line.

No provision to improve Junction

73. It was noted in the public consultation there is no provision offered to improve the junction of Fulford Road.

74. The project outline approved in the February 2022 Executive Decision, excluded changes to the existing traffic signal junction at Fulford junction / Hospital Fields Road / The Barracks.

75. Therefore to address any safety concerns at this junction is outside of the project scope.

Support Scheme

76. There were comments received in support of the options being proposed. A copy of the comments can be found in Annex F.

Responses from York Cycle Campaign

77. The response received from York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group can be found in Annex G.
78. The observations of York Cycle Campaign align with the key themes highlighted in the public consultation.
79. In the response received by York Cycle Campaign, the following observation was made: *“Hospital Fields Road is a 20 mph road with limited levels of traffic not being a through-route. Reference to figure 4.1 of LTN 1/20 indicates that the combination should likely be acceptable as mixed traffic or mandatory/advisory lanes.”*
80. The existing posted speed limit along Hospital Fields Road is 20mph. It is noted that speed data obtained by the Principal Designer during COVID-19 where there was limited kerbside parking, recorded 85th percentile speeds of 28 mph eastbound / 26 mph westbound.
81. York Cycle Campaign made observations that the cycling infrastructure could lead to waiting/parking vehicles abusing the cycleway for parking/loading for deliveries to the residential units or units within the industrial estate that are existing and proposed along the route, as it will be easy for drivers to mount the kerb to park off the main carriageway.

Responses from York Civic Trust

82. The response received from York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group can be found in Annex H.
83. The observations of York Civic Trust align with the key themes highlighted in the public consultation.
84. The York Civic Trust preferred Footway level demarcated cycle track.

Housing Delivery Programme

85. The City of York Council has granted planning permission for a housing development site that is currently proposed.
86. It has been recognised by Officers that both projects must ensure compatibility with one another, and Officers will work towards achieving this goal.

87. The officers will maintain communication with the Housing Development team throughout the Detailed Design phase to ensure that both schemes adhere to the necessary requirements.

Proposed Preliminary Designs

88. Four no. Preliminary designs have been proposed based on the type of cycling segregation that was consulted on during the public consultation.

89. Design 1 proposes the construction of a light, segregated cycle lane heading eastbound on Hospital Fields Road heading towards Fulford Road, with on-street cycling heading westbound to the River Ouse. The lane would be on the same level as the road surface and feature light physical segregation to separate cars and cyclists for added protection.

90. Design 2 proposes the construction of a kerbed segregation cycle lane eastbound on Hospital Fields Road and on-street cycle lane heading westbound. The cycle lane would be at the same level as the carriageway with a kerb to physically separate cyclists and vehicles for added protection.

91. Design 3 proposes a stepped cycle lane heading eastbound with on-street cycling heading westbound on Hospital Fields Road. This option separates all road users by having the cycle lane, the road and pavement at different levels.

92. Design 4 proposes a demarcated cycle lane eastbound on the same level as the footway, with on-street cycling heading westbound. The footway and cycle track will be separated by a small kerb.

Analysis

93. This below table presents an appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of each design proposed.

	Pros	Cons
Design 1 – Light segregation eastbound / On-street westbound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most cost effective solution. • Offers segregated protection to cyclists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option reduces the northern pavement width to an average of 1.7m, with a 1.5m.

	Pros	Cons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle lane on road, so it directly aligns with Hospital Field Road for eastbound cyclists • The type of infrastructure included in Design 1 received support from public consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest Cycle of Level Service (CLoS) audit score (78%) • Does not offer the same level of segregated protection other designs
Design 2 - Kerbed segregation eastbound / On-street westbound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers physical protection for cyclists travelling eastbound • Established form of cycle track segregation that is widely used around the UK • Creates a continuous link along the entire north side of Hospital Fields Road from New Walk path to Fulford Road junction. • Offers pedestrian priority. • Uses 'Dutch kerbs' to slow vehicles turning in/out of access roads • High Cycle of Level Service (CLoS) audit score • The type of infrastructure included in Design 1 received support from public consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern footway averages 1.6 m in width, with a 1.4 m pinch point which falls below the DfT minimum width of 1.5m. • Cycle track average of 1.5m wide.
Design 3 - Stepped cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space efficient solution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No physical boundary stopping vehicles pulling onto the cycle way, which

	Pros	Cons
eastbound / On-street westbound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains 1.8m footway width on north side with a 1.7m pinch point. • Offers widest cycle track that is an average of 1.6m • Creates a continuous link on north side of Hospital Fields Road from New • Footpath to Fulford Road junction and offers pedestrian priority. • Uses 'Dutch kerbs' to slow vehicles turning in/out of access roads • High Cycle of Level Service (CLoS) audit score 	<p>can result in parking or driving violations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This design has increased design complexities, which increase the risk of delays and cost increases
Design 4 - Footway level demarcated cycle lane eastbound / On-street westbound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates continuous link on north side of Hospital Fields Road from New Walk path to Fulford Road junction • Offers pedestrian priority. • Uses 'Dutch kerbs' to slow vehicles turning in/out of access roads • High Cycle of Level Service (CLoS) audit score 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow cycle track average of 1.5m wide • Northern footway average is 1.7m, with a 1.5m pinch point. • This option proposes for pedestrian / cyclists to be on the same level, potential to create conflicts between road users

Cost Appraisal

94. A high level cost estimate of the proposed design have been prepared.

Designs	Indicative estimated costs*
Design 1 - Light segregation eastbound / On-street westbound	£ 305,432
Design 2 - Kerbed segregation eastbound / On-street westbound	£ 405,454
Design 3 - Stepped cycle eastbound / On-street westbound	£ 482,241
Design 4 - Footway level demarcated cycle lane eastbound / On-street westbound	£ 446,949

95. * The above scheme costs include scheme design and development, preliminaries (construction, utilities, and temporary traffic management) and a 25% risk contingency.

96. It is to be noted these costs are based on the best information available at the time and does not include inflation. The costs will be revised and more accurate cost estimates will be developed during the Detailed Design stage.

97. Design 1 provides the most cost effective solution that meets the requirements of the scheme objectives, with Design 3 being the most expensive solution.

98. The cost of the proposed designs are within the budget available for the project.

Local Transport Assessment

99. A Cycle Level of Service Assessment (CLOS) detailed within the Local Transport Note 1/20 guidance was undertaken of the proposed options.

100. A scheme with 70% score is deemed to meet guidance. The existing scenario was assessed based on the scoring criteria within the guidance. The existing scenario scored 56% which is deemed a fail as it did not meet the threshold and a critical fail. The critical fail is due to the existing

carriageway lane widths, in which cyclists are required to cycle on carriageway in lanes within the critical range of between 3.2m and 3.9m.

Option	Cycle Level of Service (CloS) Audit Score
Existing Layout	56% - FAIL
Design 1 - Light segregation eastbound / On-street westbound	78% - PASS
Design 2 - Kerbed segregation eastbound / On-street westbound	82% - PASS
Design 3 - Stepped cycle eastbound / On-street westbound	82% - PASS
Design 4 - Footway level demarcated cycle lane eastbound / On-street westbound	82% - PASS

101. A copy of the CLOS assessment can be found in Annex I.

102. It is to be noted there was little difference in the scoring assessment of the Cycling Level of Service.

103. Design 1 scored higher on 1 no. criteria within the directness criteria's of the CLOS assessment, whereas Designs 2 to 4, scored higher for 2 no. criteria's within the safety criteria's.

Options

104. Option 1 – Approve the recommendation to proceed with one of the proposed preliminary schemes options to detailed design and construction of the scheme, as described within this report, and in line with the preliminary scheme drawings shown in the Annex for the Hospital Fields Road scheme.

105. Option 2 – Do not approve the progress of the scheme to detailed design and construction.

Analysis

Option 1

106. There is sufficient budget with the capital programme to deliver a scheme. Analysis of the proposed preliminary scheme are detailed within the section above.

Option 2

107. This option represents a decision to not approve the scheme to progress to detailed design and on the ground implementation.

108. This option will result in not delivering the improvements to the east-west cycle route as outlined in the project initiation documentation.

Council Plan

109. The Proposed scheme will encourage active travel.

110. Undertaking the scheme contributes to meeting a key outcome 'Getting around sustainably' key of the Council Plan.

111. The scheme meets the key priorities of the Council Plan in providing a greener and cleaner city.

Implications

- **Financial**

114. The estimated costs of the recommended and alternative options outlined within the report are all within the allocated capital budget for this scheme.

- **Human Resources (HR)**

112. There are no HR implications

- **Equalities**

113. The Council needs to take into account the Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other

prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions).

114. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out and is annexed to this report at Annex J.

115. As identified in this report, the Council has taken into account guidance, legislation and policy in producing the options for consideration in particular:

- a. Inclusive Mobility guidance 2021 (Department for Transport)
- b. Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycling Level of Service assessment
- c. Manual for Streets 2007 (Department for Transport and Ministry for Communities, Housing and Local Government)

116. In this report Officers have identified that there are considerations to be made in respect of users of the footway, cyclists and HGVs. There is a balance to be struck in considering the needs of these various stakeholders. The Council will need to demonstrate why a particular option has been chosen and that it is not an unreasonable decision for the Council to take when all factors are considered. The Local Transport Plan sets out a 'Hierarchy of Transport Users' which should also be referred to.

- **Legal**

117. The proposals would require an amendment to the relevant Traffic Regulation Order. The provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 would apply.

118. The statutory consultation process for Traffic Regulation Orders requires public advertisement, which is formally notified to key stakeholders including local Ward Members, Town and Parish Councils, Police and other affected parties. It is a statutory requirement for the Council, as Highway Authority, to consider any formal objections received within the statutory advertisement period of 21 days.

119. The Council has discretion to amend its original proposals if considered desirable, whether or not in the light of any objections or comments received, as a result of such statutory consultation. If any objections

received are accepted and/or it is decided to substantially modify the original proposals, then those affected by the proposed modifications must be consulted further.

120. Any public works contracts required to implement the Hospital Fields Road project must be commissioned in accordance with a robust procurement strategy that complies with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and (where applicable) the Public Contract Regulations 2015. Advice should be sought from both the Procurement and Legal Services Teams where appropriate.

- **Crime and Disorder**

121. There are no Crime and Disorder implications.

- **Information Technology (IT)**

122. There are no Information Technology implications.

- **Property**

123. There are no implications.

- **Other**

- **Highway Implications**

124. Constructing the Hospital Fields Road scheme will cause a level of disruption on the adopted highway, with an associated level of delay and disruption to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. Such works will be scheduled and planned to minimise this disruption, and sufficient information and notice will be given to affected parties.

125. If implemented, the enforcement of the 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions will fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load.

- **Risk Management**

126. Projects within the Active Travel Programme are managed in line with the Corporate Risk Management Strategy. This involves action by assigned Project Managers to identify, manage, and mitigate specific risks to delivery.

Contact Details

Author:

**Shoaib Mahmood
Project Manager
Transport**

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

**James Gilchrist
Director of Transport, Environment and
Planning**

Report **Date** [Insert Date]
Approved

Specialist Implications Officer(s) List information for all

Financial:

Patrick Looker
Finance Manager
01904 551633

Legal:

Cathryn Moore
Legal Manager
01904552487

Wards Affected: Fishergate Ward

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Background Paper 1 -

November 2022 Executive Decision -

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=733&MIId=13292&Ver=4> (Item 49)

Annexes

Annex A – Proposed Preliminary Design 1

Annex B – Proposed Preliminary Design 2

Annex C – Proposed Preliminary Design 3

Annex D – Proposed Preliminary Design 4

Annex E – Public Consultation Questionnaire

Annex F – Public Consultation Feedback
Annex G – York Cycle Campaign Representation
Annex H – York Civic Trust Representation
Annex I – LTN 1/20 Cycling Level of Service Assessment
Annex J - Equalities Impact Assessment
Annex K – Hospital Fields Road Project Outline

List of Abbreviations Used in this Report

CYC	–	City of York Council
DfT	–	Department for Transport
ATP	–	Active Travel Programme
ATF	–	Active Travel Fund
LTN	–	Local Transport Note
CLoS	–	Cycling Level of Service