

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

JOCKEY LANE PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

Summary

1. This report sets out a revised scheme proposal in response to a land ownership problem that has arisen since the previous scheme was approved.

Recommendation

2. That the Cabinet Member for Transport approves the scheme as proposed in Annex C for implementation, subject to funding being available.

Reason – To address the land ownership problem.

Background

3. The proposed scheme as shown in Annex A was reported to Decision Session on 14th November 2013 and approval was given to implement the works subject to agreement with the landowners of Portakabin's site regarding the transfer of land for use as additional footway area.
4. In response to comments made by ward members during initial consultation, the Cabinet Member also approved changing the speed limit on Jockey Lane from 40mph to 30mph from the gateway adjacent to the Range superstore exit through to Monks Cross. As part of this, new gateways would be installed at the start of dual carriageway and at the north east roundabout adjacent to the entrance to Monks Cross retail centre car park.

5. The introduction of loading restrictions between the bus stop (opposite Sainsbury's loading entrance) and Forge Close was also approved to deter offloading from car transporters.
6. The measures to introduce the speed limit, gateways and loading restrictions have been implemented. However, Portakabin, following a change in management, are not now willing to dedicate the parcel of land required to facilitate the proposed scheme. Portakabin have offered the land under lease to the Council, but expressed that they could withdraw the lease at any time. This would not be acceptable to CYC and as such the introduction of the previously approved scheme is unachievable.
7. As a result of not being able to acquire the land through dedication, alternative options have been developed. This is shown in Annex B and is outlined below. An alternative is shown in Annex D.

Outline Proposals

8. There are two main problems within this section of Jockey Lane. Firstly, there is no facility for pedestrians (and prospective cyclists) to cross the road. Secondly, there is no protection for cyclists wishing to continue off road along Jockey Lane between the two sections of existing off road facilities.
9. The provision of a new controlled crossing is considered to be necessary to safely allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross Jockey Lane to access the off-road facilities being provided. Because of the fact that land adjacent to Portakabin's site is not available via dedication, the proposed crossing has had to be relocated. In the revised scheme, shown in Annex B, this is relocated to a point immediately east of Sainsbury's access. This allows widening of the footway to the south side of Jockey Lane to introduce the new off-road facilities.
10. In order to comply with current CYC highway maintenance practice, the proposals include a change in treatment to the existing road surface leading up to the crossing. Where antiskid surface treatments would usually be used in advance of a crossing facility, a replacement of the existing surface with a higher skid resistant material would improve safety whilst also reducing future maintenance costs.
11. The provision of a Toucan crossing (preferred option) would require a new power supply - usually this would cost in the region of £750 if a

supply source is available. In this location there is no readily available supply for the new crossing. The cost of providing the supply amounts to £15k at this location and this was only confirmed by Northern Power Grid received on 20th October 2014. The increased costs associated with the provision of the power supply would result in the cost associated with providing the scheme exceeding the current allocated budget. Even without this additional cost the latest estimate for this scheme is £140k, which together with the electrical costs exceeds the 2014/15 allocation by £38k (£155k c/f £117k). In light of this, an alternative proposal has been included for consideration (shown in Annex D) and this can be achieved at a cost within budget as the lesser power supply demands can be taken directly from a street lighting column.

Consultation

12. A consultation exercise for the original scheme was carried out in September 2013. This involved Ward Members, Parish Council, party group representatives, local businesses and residents, as well as relevant road user organisations. A number of points were raised by the Parish Council and Ward Members and these were reported to the Cabinet Member Decision Session meeting in November 2013. As noted in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, additional measures were introduced in response to the members' comments.
13. Further consultation has been undertaken for the revised proposals shown in Annex B, and the feedback is outlined below.
14. No external consultation has been undertaken on the alternative option shown in Annex D.

Ward Member Views

15. Councillors Hyman and Runciman have made no additional comments.
16. Councillor Orrell requested confirmation of the extent of the road resurfacing under the proposed scheme and suggested extending the amount of resurfacing up to the traffic lights at Kathryn Avenue.

Officer Response: CYC Highways Maintenance have confirmed that, although no additional surfacing works have been programmed on Jockey Lane, the condition of the road beyond the area covered by the proposed surfacing at the crossing will be reviewed. If any areas are

identified which are in breach of intervention levels, these will be patched and repaired.

Political Party Views

17. Councillor D'Agorne requested that carriageway edge detail be looked at where the proposed cycle/footway crossed two entrances/exits, with the aim of giving cyclists priority or highlighting to drivers that cyclists and pedestrians may be present.

Officer Response: after internal discussion, it is now proposed that the access/egress points along Jockey Lane will be marked out as shown in the drawing in Annex C.

18. Councillors Reid and Steward made no additional comments.

Parish Council Views

19. The Parish Council had no additional comments.

Local Business Views

20. Portakabin requested confirmation that no change is being made to the kerb line outside their Gate G, and raised concerns of queues forming at peak times along Jockey Lane due to the close proximity of two sets of traffic signals.

Officers Response: Portakabin have been advised that the kerb line outside Gate G is not to be altered, and that monitoring of the signals will be undertaken to determine if there is any increase in queuing at peak times.

21. The other businesses had no additional comments.

User Group Views

22. The user groups externally consulted had no additional comments.

Safety Audit

23. The Safety Audit is to be carried out on the revised layout soon. The key points coming out of this will be reported upon as soon as it is available (either in an update of this written report or given orally at the meeting).

Options & Analysis

24. There are four options available:

- i. Implement the revised scheme as proposed and consulted on (Annex B)
- ii. Implement the revised scheme as proposed in Annex B but make further adjustments in response to the consultation feedback (Annex C)
- iii. Implement the scheme as in Option i or ii, but with the revisions to the crossing point as shown in Annex D.
- iv. Do Nothing.

Option (i)

Implementation of the scheme as shown in Annex B would achieve the objectives and provide a safer facility for pedestrians and cyclists to use, linking the two sections of existing off-road facilities. This proposal would be preferred as it complies with current guidance. However an increased allocation would be required to deliver the scheme due to the higher power supply costs.

The measures already introduced serve to make the scheme safer by limiting vehicular speeds and by controlling on-street parking/loading along Jockey Lane.

Option (ii) – Recommended Option

Implementation of the proposals in Annex B, with modifications to address the feedback received through consultation, would still achieve the objectives of the scheme.

As mentioned in paragraph 17, it is proposed that the access/egress points along Jockey Lane will be marked out as shown in the drawing in **Annex C**, although, as mentioned in paragraph 23, the Safety Audit Team has yet to put forward their recommendations.

Paragraph 16 confirms that no additional surfacing works have been programmed on Jockey Lane. However, the condition of the road beyond

the area covered by the proposed surfacing at the crossing will be reviewed and if any areas are identified which are in breach of intervention levels, these will be patched and repaired.

The estimated cost of delivering this option exceeds the original budget for the scheme due to the higher power supply costs. An increased allocation is proposed in the Capital Programme Monitor 1 report which is also being considered at this meeting. Subject to the approval of the revised allocation this option could be delivered in 2014/15.

Option (iii)

Implementation of the scheme as listed in the Options above (i or ii) with modifications to the crossing point as shown in Annex D is achievable within budget, primarily due to being able to take a power supply directly from an adjacent street lighting column.

This alternative type of controlled crossing, referred to as a Tiger, is not a conventional type as included within the Traffic Signs and General Directions (TSRGD) 2002 guidance although it is currently being considered by DfT for inclusion within the revised TSRGD, due to be published in 2015. Although not a currently approved layout, it is understood that the arrangement has been trialled in London and Cambridge. However, it is understood that DfT approval hasn't been given to the trialled schemes.

If approval is needed from DfT to implement such an arrangement, then a more conventional zebra arrangement could be provided until such approval is obtained or until the layout is included in the TSRGD.

Option (iv)

Doing nothing will not achieve the objectives of providing a safe off-road facility for pedestrians and cyclists along this section of Jockey Lane and will not provide the link between the two existing facilities. It will not meet the Council's priorities of promoting use of sustainable transport.

Council Plan

25. The potential implications for the priorities in the Council Plan are:

- i. Get York Moving - If implemented, the proposed measures would encourage walking and cycling by providing real alternatives to the use

of the private motor vehicle for journeys around this area and further afield.

- ii. Protect the environment - A reduction in the use of private motor vehicles would lead to a reduction in carbon emissions.
- iii. Protect vulnerable people – A safer highway environment would benefit the local community.

Implications

26. This report has the following implications:

- **Human Resources** – None.
- **Financial** –
 - The current allocation for the scheme in 2014/15 is £117k. The scheme is funded through the LSTF programme.
 - £11.8k had been incurred in 2013/14 (£7k fees and £4.8k speed limit works) and a further £2.3k has been incurred within 2014/15 for the completion of the speed limit works. The 2013/14 figure does not include £21k of abortive fees incurred progressing the original option.
 - For the reasons outlined earlier, an additional £38k in the 2014/15 budget allocation would be required to deliver the proposed Toucan option, which is estimated at £155k (excluding the additional road surfacing), whilst the alternative (Tiger) option can be provided for £107.5k. As mentioned in paragraph 24, approval for an increased budget allocation to implement the preferred proposal (Option ii) is being sought and proposed in the Capital Programme Monitor 1 report.
 - The revised options include for an amount of surfacing outside the area covered by this project. CYC Highways Maintenance have confirmed that, although no additional surfacing works have been programmed on Jockey Lane, the condition of the road beyond the area covered by the proposed surfacing at the crossing will be reviewed. If any areas are identified which are in breach of intervention levels, these will be patched and repaired. This

surfacing will cost approximately £8,000, funded through the maintenance budget if available.

- **Equalities** – It is likely that the elderly and some disabled people would benefit from these safety improvements.
- **Legal** – The City of York Council, as Highways 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** - None.
- **Land** – None
- **Other** – None.

Risk Management

27. 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:
28. 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 6.
29. Authority reputation – this risk is in connection with public perception of the Council not undertaking a project that has been consulted upon and is assessed at 2.

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

Together these produce a risk score of 8, 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:

Mark Reade
Engineer
Transport Projects
Highways
Tel: (01904) 553519

Chief Officer:

Neil Ferris
Assistant Director
Transport, Highways and Waste

Report
approved:



Date: 02.12.2014

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

There are no specialist implications.

Wards Affected: Huntington and New Earswick

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Background Papers

Report to Cabinet Member Decision Session meeting 14th November 2013 and associated decision.

Annexes

- Annex A General Layout (previously approved scheme)
- Annex B General Layout of proposed scheme
- Annex C General Layout of proposed scheme including amendments in light of the consultation
- Annex D General Layout of alternative “Tiger” crossing