
MEETING	DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITY STRATEGY
DATE	20 OCTOBER 2009
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR STEVE GALLOWAY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

31. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy held on 1 September 2009 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record subject to:

In Minute 22 (Public Right of Way – Amendment to the Decision in Connection with the Scarcroft View Gating Order, Micklegate Ward) the amendment of Councillor Merrett's comments to read "Councillor Merrett stated that this was a private alley and not a public right of way and he requested Officers views in relation to this and the proposals.

32. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - DECISION SESSION

It was reported that there had been six registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Details of these speakers are set out under the individual agenda items.

33. BECKFIELD LANE - EXTENSION OF CYCLE ROUTE

Following the recent introduction of off-road cycle facilities on the east side of Beckfield Lane between Boroughbridge Road and Ostman Road the Executive Member considered a report, which examined the extension of these facilities. The proposed scheme had been developed to maximise the potential for promoting safe and sustainable travel to nearby schools, shops and other local facilities whilst aiming to minimise likely construction difficulties and costs.

The Executive Member referred to the consultation results. The Council's cyclist's post back survey had resulted in 49 out of 68 in favour of the proposals, letters from residents had shown 9 in favour with 12 against and

3 with no strong feelings either way. A petition in opposition signed by 22 households and following publication of the proposals on the website 1 comment had been received in favour and 2 comments in opposition. Since the agenda had been published 2 further responses from residents had been received, one with concerns about access across Beckfield Lane near the shops and across Wetherby Road. Carr Infant School had also indicated support for the proposals.

Officers reported that since the agenda had been published a 12 hour traffic survey had been carried out on Thursday 8 October 2009 south of Knapton Lane. This survey had recorded around 7300 vehicle movement's on-road and 100 on the footway.

Representations in relation to the proposals were received from Mary Fairbrother on behalf of York Blind and Partially Sighted Society. She stated that there were over 1000 members of the Society in York and considerably more residents who had some problems with sight or were vulnerable in relation to their age. She stated that shared use footpaths/cycle tracks were very unnerving for these users. She pointed out that the majority of local residents were opposed the off road facilities and she asked the Executive Member not to support the scheme.

Representations against the scheme were received from Dee Bush, a resident of Beckfield Lane. She confirmed that as a cycling family and resident of the area for a number of years she supported the provision of off road cycle facilities but only where they did not share space with vulnerable pedestrians. She questioned the legality of the scheme and expressed concern at the officer's definition of the word 'highway'. She confirmed that she was strenuously against the proposals and felt the finance for this scheme could be better used elsewhere in the city.

Mr K Bell, a resident of Beckfield Lane also indicated his opposition to the scheme. He felt that the proposals would affect the visual quality of the area and that the scheme was inappropriate and contravened government advice. He stated that a one day traffic study provided insufficient information on which to base the proposals.

Councillor Horton read a written statement from Councillor Simpson-Laing who had been unable to attend the meeting. She pointed out that residents had not supported the first section of the off road cycle facilities on the east side of Beckfield Lane and that this section was not used as intended. She referred to the number of side roads that bisected the extension of the route and pointed out that cyclist would not stop and give way at each one which presented dangers to both themselves, pedestrians and other vehicles.

Councillor Horton confirmed that he had received numerous representations all from residents opposed to the scheme and one in support from a resident of Almsford Road. He stated that he felt the scheme could not be financially justified and raised concerns regarding the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. He felt that the potential conflict with vehicles and the fact that there had only been one minor accident involving

a cyclist in the area over a 3 year period did not justify the costs associated with this scheme.

Officers responded to the comments made by local residents and members.

The Executive Member referred to the increase in numbers cycling in the city, which was 7% over last years figure and was greater on off road cycle paths. He stated that this confirmed his view that off road cycle paths were likely to have the greatest influence over modal choice. He confirmed that one of the main factors in determining the proposal was that at least 25% of cyclists already used footpaths in the area to avoid what they judged to be a dangerous road. In order to address the concerns of residents he confirmed that he proposed some additions to options proposed in the report by officers.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option One – authorise construction of the proposal shown in Annex B of the report;

Option Two – approve an amended scheme (Annex E), plus any other changes to the proposal that the Executive Member considers necessary, for construction;

Option Three – approve a scheme layout from Annex B or E but defer construction work on the scheme at this time, and keep the scheme in reserve for consideration at a later date for potential inclusion in future transport capital programmes;

Option Four – abandon the scheme completely.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member approves:

- (i) The amended scheme as shown in Annex E, of the report, for construction;
- (ii) The layout, and subsequent engineering works, being refined to permit the easy installation of a Toucan crossing near the Runswick Avenue shops on Beckfield Lane at a later date, should this prove necessary;
- (iii) Officers continuing to consider how safety improvements can be made for pedestrian and cyclists crossing Wetherby Road at its junction with Beckfield Lane and
- (iv) Officers being asked to ensure that any “shared use” areas of path being clearly delineated in line with emerging standards specification.¹

REASON: To extend the existing cycle facilities in order to provide a complete cycle route on Beckfield Lane whilst trying to address resident’s

comments and concerns about the original proposals, where possible.

Action Required

1. Undertake the scheme as proposed subject to the refinements as detailed.

SS

34. PETITION CONCERNING THE ERECTION OF BOLLARDS AND CHICANES TO PREVENT SPEEDING ON ETTY AVENUE

The Executive Member considered a report, which advised of the receipt of a petition from residents of ETTY Avenue. The petition requested that the Council take steps to tackle the speed of traffic on ETTY Avenue with the erection of bollards and chicanes.

Officers had confirmed that within the last three years there had been no recorded casualties on this stretch of road relating to the issue raised in the petition. They also reported that ETTY Avenue had been traffic calmed in 1997 and that speed cushions had been provided with Walmgate Neighbourhood forum funding. They stated that there was no update on the information contained in the report.

The Executive Member referred to the results of the traffic survey, which had shown the highest recorded speed as 30mph, which was low, compared to other residential areas. He suggested that if parking arrangements and/or advisory signage was a problem in the area then the Ward Committee could examine the issue.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option 1 - In response to the petition and subsequent data analysis on ETTY Avenue the following proposal should be offered to residents:

A Community Speed Indicator Device and the necessary training should be offered to residents if they wish to monitor traffic speeds.

Option 2 - No further action

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agree to Officers offering residents a Community Speed Indicator Device (SID) and the necessary training to enable the community to monitor traffic speeds on ETTY Avenue.¹

REASON: Engineering measures are not considered appropriate however SID will enable speed to continue to be monitored and drivers will be made aware of the speed at which they are travelling.

Action Required

1. Offer residents necessary training and Speed Indicator Device.

SS

35. PETITION CONCERNING SPEEDING TRAFFIC AT THE ENTRANCE TO WEST BANK PARK FROM THE JUNCTION OF NEW LANE AND HILL STREET

Consideration was given to a report, which advised the Executive Member of receipt of a petition from residents of New Lane and Hill Street. The petition requested the Council to take steps to tackle the speed of traffic on the junction of New Lane and Hill Street, opposite West Bank Park.

Officers had confirmed that there had been no recorded casualties in the last three years on this stretch of road. The seven day speed survey carried out in the summer had shown speeds being recorded as low against the posted speed limit. They reported that the highest speed had been recorded at 62mph in the early hours of 28 June, which Officers had considered the possibility of this being an emergency vehicle.

The Executive Member stated that the survey has shown speeds slightly above 30mph but less than on some other residential roads. He confirmed that vertical traffic calming measures were now restricted to locations where there was a clear potential accident risk and the park entrance would fulfil this criteria.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option 1 - A Community Speed Indicator Device and the necessary training should be offered to residents if they wish to monitor traffic speeds.

Option 2 - No further action

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member agrees to:

- (i) Option One with Officers offering residents a Community Speed Indicator Device (SID) and providing the necessary training to enable residents to monitor traffic speeds in the New Lane and Hill Street area;¹
- (ii) Request Officers to give further consideration to the option of providing a clearer indication, for drivers, of the entrance to West Bank Park, and, as part of this review, to consider whether a 20mph speed limit might be applied to this section of the highway.²

REASON: Engineering measures are not considered appropriate however SID will enable speed to continue to be monitored and drivers will be made aware of the speed at which they are travelling. This will help resolve community issues as well as comply with the Speed Review process.

Action Required

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Offer residents necessary training and Speed Indicator Device | SS |
| 2. Officers to undertake further investigations. | SS |

36. VEHICLE ACTIVATED SIGNS (VAS) POLICY

The Executive Member considered a report, which set out policy guidelines for the use of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) and options VAS installations to assess their effectiveness.

Officers confirmed that there was no further update to the published report. The Executive Member reported that Councillor Hyman had requested that a review of signage should be undertaken in the New Lane area of Huntington. He confirmed that the provision of VAS provided local communities with an opportunity to highlight speeding issues on particular roads.

Officers reported that the options were to accept the proposals as set out in the report amend them or reject them.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member notes the content of the report and approves the following:

- a. That Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding will only be used where the 85thile speed equals or exceeds the signed limit by 10%+2mph (i.e. 35mph in a 30mph limit, and 46mph in a 40mph limit). This would be consistent with the speed enforcement thresholds employed by the police.

Reason: To ensure a consistent approach and targeted use of LTP resources.

- b. Where the LTP funding criteria is not met, a Ward Committee or Parish Council may still wish to fund the installation of a Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS). In this situation, a threshold of 85thile speeds being 10% above the speed limit should be adopted (i.e. 33mph in a 30mph limit and 44mph in a 40mph limit).

Reason: To make sure VAS are used in appropriate areas.

- c. That monitoring of traffic speeds at VAS sites is carried out at approximately 3 months after implementation to gauge initial performance, and then again at around 3 years (or earlier if considered appropriate), along with a review of accident records, to assess the long term effectiveness of the sign.

Reason: To ensure appropriate data is available to enable an informed decision to be made about whether a VAS should be retained (and replaced when required), or redeployed somewhere else.

- d. That the outcomes of this monitoring process and officer recommendations be reported to the Executive Member in respect of LTP funded VAS, and Ward Members in respect of Ward Committee funded VAS, for decisions to be made on the retention or possible re-deployment of the VAS. ¹.

Reason: To ensure that matters relating to VAS deployment are considered by the appropriate body.

- e. That the need for a VAS on New Lane, Huntington be assessed quickly together with the effectiveness of the current sign which is located in Mill Hill. ².

Reason: To follow up a Ward Councillors concerns.

- f. That a trial of the new software, which will record vehicle speeds detected by a VAS, be implemented as soon as the facility becomes available. ³.

Reason: To provide additional data to enable an informed decision to be made about whether a VAS should be retained (and replaced when required), or redeployed somewhere else.

Action Required

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Policy guidelines to be followed when using Vehicle Activated Signs. | SS |
| 2. Assess New Lane/Mill Hill for VAS. | SS |
| 3. Trial software as facility becomes available. | SS |

37. STREET FURNITURE REMOVAL

Consideration was given to a report which sought approval for an annual budget from the Capital Programme to reduce the amount of street furniture on the highway network and for new highway schemes to go through a street furniture audit during the design stage.

Officers reported that, based on a pilot scheme, it was proposed that the current level of signing and associated street furniture, such as poles, was effectively “capped” at the existing level on street. To achieve this outcome they recommended:

- Establishing a budget to fund the removal of redundant street furniture, combine two or more items to one location and in key sensitive areas replace with a higher quality less intrusive piece of equipment.

Based on the information it was suggested that a budget of £10,000 be set aside for improvements to be made the city’s street furniture.

- Produce a basic set of guidelines showing more sensitive methods of signing for distribution to other teams / organisations carrying out work on the highway. In addition, establish a street

furniture audit process for new highway schemes during the design process.

- As the cost of removing a sign was often less than the cost of maintaining a sign there were clear benefits to reducing the burden on the maintenance budget. Hence the need to establish a rapid response to queries on the continued need for signs that had suffered damage or some other mishap. Further work on this area to establish a framework for decision making for officers was needed.

Ron Cooke, made representations at the meeting as Chair of the Local Strategic Partnership. He congratulated officers on the production of an excellent report and expressed his support for the recommendations to reduce the amount of street clutter and improve the street scene in the city.

Officers confirmed that their aim was to reduce any unnecessary street clutter and provide higher quality signs in Conservation Areas but that this would not involve the wholesale removal of signs around the city.

The following available options were considered:

- A. To note the report and take no further action at this time. This was not the recommended option because it did not tackle the issue of street clutter.
- B. To gather additional information for consideration before deciding whether to proceed with the proposals put forward or a was not the recommended option because the proposals put forward were considered to be merely a starting point that could be amended as and when desired or changing circumstances arise.
- C. To implement the proposals outlined above. This was the recommended option.

- RESOLVED: (i) That the Executive Member approves Option C, as set out above and in the Officers report, and that the Network Management Traffic Team be charged with the task of being the lead team implementing the proposals.
- (ii) That a basic set of guidelines be compiled showing more sensitive methods of signing for distribution to other teams / organisations carrying out work on the highway.¹
- (iii) That an annual review report be produced outlining the progress made and areas where further improvements may be feasible.²

REASON: To reduce the:

- amount of street clutter along the city's highway network;

- maintenance burden created by traffic signs and other street furniture;
 - energy consumption and associated cost of illuminated signs;
- and to improve:
- the ability of those with visual impairment difficulties to negotiate their way along the footway
 - the visual aspect of the street scene;

Action Required

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Compile guidelines on the use of street furniture. | SS |
| 2. Produce annual progress report. | SS |

38. A19/A1237 ROUNDABOUT IMPROVEMENTS

The Executive Member considered a report, which set out options for the outline design for proposed improvements to the A19/A1237 roundabout to reduce delays at this location. The report also identified the estimated cost, programme and consultation proposals to enable the scheme to be delivered in 2010/11.

Officers reported that a number of options had been investigated with varying approach and exit lane layouts to address the capacity and safety concerns. It was planned to progress the detailed design based upon either (or a combination) of the following two options, which were considered to have very similar traffic flow capacity. The proposed layouts were shown on plans provided in Annexes 1 & 2 of the report, although it was reported that the actual lane markings indicating right turns may need to be adjusted to meet national standards.

	A1237 (East & West)	A19 North	A19 South	Pedestrian/Cycling Facilities
Option A	3 Lane Entry, 2 Lane Exit	3 Lane Entry, 1 Lane Exit	2 Lane Entry, 1 Lane Exit	A1237 crossing movements via subway. Improvements to A19 crossing at riverside Farm
Option B	3 Lane Entry, 2 Lane Exit	3 Lane Entry, 1 Lane Exit	2 Lane Entry, 1 Lane Exit	Additional pedestrian crossing islands provided on the A1237 West and A19 North Improvements to A19 crossing at riverside Farm

The Executive Member referred to the Officer update which provided pedestrian/cycling counts for the A19/A1237 roundabout. This summarised movements across each arm over a 12 hour period on three dates, details of which were set out as an Annex to these minutes.

Representations were received from Paul Hepworth on behalf of the Cyclists Touring Club (CTC). He pointed out that large unsignalled multilane roundabouts were generally the most hazardous and intimidating for cyclists. He therefore supported Option B in the report, which added central cycle and pedestrian refuges to the scheme.

Councillor Moore, expressed concern that the traffic figures he felt did not reflect the current situation on site. He stated that he opposed the closure of the west bound layby, questioned maintenance of the environmental bund and raised concerns over the enforcement of traffic regulations at the roundabout. He also pointed out that he felt the consultation area was inadequate as it did not include two large estates Holyrood and Rawcliffe Grange and that Eva Avenue and Rawcliffe Villages only means of access was onto Manor Lane.

Officers confirmed that a safety audit had shown that there would be safety issues with vehicles leaving the layby following the upgrading work on the roundabout. They did however point out that, as the layby was well used, they were examining the use of the adjacent Countryside Park as an alternative.

The Executive Member confirmed that the traffic survey appeared to provide further justification for the recommended option to incorporate new crossing islands on the north and west arms of the roundabout. He stated that although there would be some inconvenience for drivers during the works, in the long term, this project would make a significant contribution towards reducing traffic congestion in the city.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member agrees to:

- Approve the further development of the outline layout of the upgraded roundabout as indicated in Option B to address the road safety audit requirements and meet the concerns of local residents and users of the highway in the area,
- Approve the proposed public consultation strategy on the outline layouts as detailed in the consultation section to include an extended consultation area to be agreed with the Ward Members,
- Approve the progression of the detailed design of the proposal incorporating amendments to address the comments raised during the public consultation period (including the justification for a refuge on the A1237 east leg junction and a review of the options for continuing to provide a westbound lay-by on the A1237) and to allow a further report to the Executive Member to be submitted early in 2010 prior to tendering the scheme.
- Authorise the removal of the minimum amount of vegetation from the environmental bund at an appropriate period in the year, in advance of the main contract if necessary, to allow the works to proceed without affecting nesting birds. ¹.

REASON: To progress this upgrade scheme in accordance with the Local Transport Plan to increase the capacity of the roundabout and reduce journey times in the area.

Action Required

1. Undertake consultation and development of proposed works.

SS

39. CRICHTON AVENUE - PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS FOR CYCLISTS

The Executive Member considered a report, which discussed the outcome of detailed design work and public consultation on proposals to improve conditions for cycling along Crichton Avenue.

Officers confirmed that they had been asked to develop preliminary proposals to improve conditions for cycling along Crichton Avenue in March 2009. It was reported that a number of amendments had now been proposed as detailed in Annex B of the report, which included:

- Moving the Toucan crossing away from the Wigginton Road junction;
- Reduced road widening between Burton Stone Lane and Kingsway North;
- On road cycle lanes at the Kingsway North roundabout;
- Retain the existing Pelican Crossing at the western end of Crichton Avenue and
- Burton Stone Lane right turn facility and extended shared use on south side of Crichton Avenue.

It was reported that as a result of feedback through public consultation a number of further amendments had been considered necessary, details of which were explained in the report and identified at Annex C.

Officers confirmed that they had no update in relation to the published report.

The Executive Member confirmed that there had been little response following publication of this scheme. He stated that some detail concerns had been raised by the CTC and Network Rail. He stated that whilst the cost of the scheme was high for a short distance of track that it would form part of the core cycle network.

The Executive Member then considered the following options:

- Option 1 – Support the scheme consulted on (detailed in Annex B of the report);
- Option 2 – Support the amended scheme following consultation (detailed in Annex C of the report), along with any other changes Members consider necessary;
- Option 3 – Reject the proposed scheme.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member approves the scheme shown in Annex C of the Officer report for implementation and asks that Officers ensure that any “shared use” areas of path are clearly delineated in line with the emerging standards specification.¹

REASON: Officers consider that the scheme will provide significant improvements for cyclists using Crichton Avenue, support the Council’s aspiration of providing an Orbital Cycle Route, and contribute to the aims of the Council as a Cycling City.

Action Required

1. Undertake scheme as agreed.

SS

40. CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE WITHIN YORK - PRINCIPLES, STANDARDS AND EVALUATION TOOL

Consideration was given to a report, which considered the design of future cycling infrastructure for the City of York, and presents a set of standards to be adopted. In addition, the report also considered a tool by which a direct comparison of cycling schemes and their relative benefits could be made.

Officers reported that with Cycling City status, York had an extensive programme of planned infrastructure works and it was felt that a document would be advantageous which was aimed at Engineers/Planners, which set out consistent standards, principles and guidance. Extensive consultation had been undertaken to develop the standards.

Mary Fairbrother, representing the York Blind and Partially Sighted Society, reiterated her earlier comments in relation to vulnerable pedestrians and the short length of time given to the Society for consultation. She referred to the Department of Transport’s guidelines in relation to consultation on any proposals involving shared space.

Officers confirmed that this document was proposed for quick reference and not as a technical guide. They stated that Engineers would be expected to consider both pedestrian and vulnerable pedestrians in their safety audit and at the design feasibility stage.

The Executive Member referred to the merits of adopting a set of standards for cycling infrastructure in the city. He stated that paragraph 4.3 of the document sought to continue with the number of unsegregated off street cycle paths and whilst safety would always be of prime concern that this was one area should be judged on its merits. He therefore proposed to hold further discussions in an effort to refine the wording and to ask officers to undertake consultation with organisations representing disability groups.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy:

- (i) Approves the Standards and Principles for designing cycling infrastructure within York, with the exception of paragraph 4.3 (segregation) which is referred back to Officers for further discussion with the Department of Transport and partner organisations with a view to the Director of City Strategy using his delegated authority to substitute a more appropriate wording into the document; ¹.
- (ii) Requests officers to ensure that consultation is undertaken with organisations representing disability groups on any schemes that could impact on their use of the transport network; ².
- (iii) Approves the cycling scheme Evaluation Tool and notes the Cost/Benefit Matrix which will be used to assess the value for money and effectiveness of cycling infrastructure schemes.

REASON: To provide a uniformed approach to designing new cycling infrastructure within York so that consistency can be achieved throughout the network of cycle routes and to provide a mechanism to assess, justify, and prioritise future cycle scheme work programmes.

Action Required

- 1. Use the Standards for designing cycling infrastructure as agreed SS
- 2. Consult with disability groups as necessary. SS

41. CITY OF YORK'S LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 - CONSULTATION STRATEGY

The Executive Member considered a report, which sought approval of the consultation strategy to be adopted for preparing York's Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) to cover the period from 2011 onwards.

Officers reported that the proposed LTP3 Consultation Strategy had been prepared in consultation with the Council's Marketing and Communications team and details of the Strategy were set out in Table 2 of the report. It was pointed out that Table 2 differed from Table 1 as it showed two consultation stages prior to the publication of the Draft LTP3, instead of the single consultation originally anticipated.

The Executive Member confirmed that the consultation process appeared adequate although he pointed out that care would be needed to avoid duplication with the Traffic Congestion Committees questionnaire.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- (i) Note the content of the report, particularly Table 1, which outlines the proposed activities and timescales for

producing LTP3 and Table 2, which outlines the proposed consultation strategy;

- (ii) Approve the consultation strategy proposed at Table 2.
- (iii) Grant delegated powers to the Assistant Director, in consultation with the Executive Member City Strategy, to issue consultation documents for pre-consultations on the Draft LTP3. ¹
- (iv) Request Officers to ensure that there is no duplication, in the consultation process, between the Traffic Congestion Ad-Hoc Scrutiny Committee resident's questionnaire and any actions taken by the Strategy Department in relation to LTP3. ²

REASON: To enable the commencement of consultations required to prepare the city's Local Transport Plan 3.

Action Required

- 1. Issue consultation documents as agreed. SS
- 2. Consultation process examined to ensure no duplication. SS

CLlr Steve Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy
[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 5.40 pm].

Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy, 20 October 2009**Minute 38 - A19/A1237 Roundabout Improvements – Officer Update**

Pedestrian/cycling counts for the A19/A1237 roundabout summarising movements across each arm over a 12 hour period on three dates.

	A19 North				A1237 West				P&R Arm			
	Travelling				Travelling				Travelling			
	East		West		South		North		East		West	
07:00 to 19:00 Counts	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle
Ref	A1	A1	A2	A2	B1	B1	B2	B2	C1	C1	C2	C2
Thursday 1st October 2009	1	3	2	2	1	10	3	12	16	96	13	59
Saturday 3rd October 2009	8	1	11	1	5	1	9	12	19	27	11	23
Sunday 4th October 2009	7	10	4	5	6	2	9	8	14	46	15	30

Note: Very Windy on Saturday

	A19 South				A1237 East				A1237 East Subway			
	Travelling				Travelling				Travelling			
	East		West		North		South		North		South	
07:00 to 19:00 Counts	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle
Ref	D1	D1	D2	D2	E1	E1	E2	E2	In	In	Out	Out
Thursday 1st October 2009	0	7	1	0	1	1	2	3	31	54	27	77
Saturday 3rd October 2009	1	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	28	30	33	28
Sunday 4th October 2009	0	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	36	68	24	57

Note: Very Windy on Saturday

	A1237 Cycle Route			
	Travelling			
	East		West	
07:00 to 19:00 Counts	Ped	Cycle	Ped	Cycle
Ref	NB	NB	SB	SB
Thursday 1st October 2009	22	108	38	135
Saturday 3rd October 2009	28	37	19	61
Sunday 4th October 2009	24	57	36	68

Tony Clarke
Capital Programme Manager
City Strategy
Tel No. 551641

This page is intentionally left blank