
Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy

6th April 2010

Report of the Director of City Strategy

PROPOSED NARROW CYCLE LANE TRIALS - MUSEUM STREET / LENDAL BRIDGE, AND GILLYGATE

Summary

1. This report advises the Executive Member of feedback from consultation on proposals to introduce narrow cycle lanes on Museum Street/Lendal Bridge and Gillygate. The proposals are intended to improve facilities for cyclists on these narrow roads, where queuing traffic often obstructs the progress of cyclists riding on their nearside. The proposals are to be introduced on a trial basis in order to evaluate their effectiveness. If successful, proposals for other locations on the Inner Ring Road with similar characteristics may follow.

Recommendations

2. Following feedback from consultation, Officers recommend that **Option 2** be approved for implementation on a trial basis. This would introduce a slightly revised scheme to that originally consulted on for Museum Street/Lendal Bridge, as shown in **Annex D**. On Gillygate the proposals as originally consulted on would be implemented, as shown in **Annex B**.

Reason: Officers consider that these proposals will benefit cyclists, as they will improve the passage for cyclists on the nearside of queuing vehicles. The proposed measures would also contribute towards the aims of the Council as a Cycling City.

Background

3. Encouraging more people to cycle has been a long-standing priority for the Council, and this work has recently been given a huge boost by our successful bid to become a 'Cycling City'.
4. On these roads queuing traffic can be a particular problem for cyclists, as it only takes one driver to be positioned too close to the kerb to prevent cyclists from riding past on the nearside. This can be frustrating for them and may lead to delays, dangerous manoeuvres being attempted, or cycling on the footway. There has been a long-term desire to seek a resolution to this problem, particularly since gaining Cycling City status.
5. Currently on such roads, there is not enough space to provide cycle lanes at the standard 1.5 metres on one or both sides of the carriageway. The narrow footways also mean that options to provide facilities for cyclists are very limited.

This problem was carefully considered as part of developing the Council's Cycling Infrastructure Standards and it was concluded that the use of narrow cycle lanes could be a possible way forward. The idea is to provide 1.0 metre wide cycle lanes and reduced traffic lane widths (down to a minimum of 2.0 metres) to encourage queuing traffic to be positioned away from the kerb, leaving sufficient space for cyclists to get by. However, as the cycle lanes will be advisory, vehicles will be legally allowed to enter them, and it is accepted that situations will arise when large vehicles such as HGVs and buses straddle both the traffic and cycle lanes.

Proposals

Museum Street (Over Lendal Bridge)

6. For a large proportion of the day, traffic regularly queues in both directions along this length, which means that traffic speeds are generally low. Hence, it is proposed to provide 1.0 metre width advisory on-road cycle lanes for the full length of Museum Street in both directions (i.e. between the junctions with St. Leonard's Place and Rougier Street), which would leave approximately 2.15 metre wide traffic lanes. The proposals are shown in **Annex A**.

Gillygate

7. On Gillygate, traffic only tends to queue back significantly in one direction, approaching the junction with Bootham. Therefore, it is proposed to provide a 1.0 metre width advisory on-road cycle lane along the full south side of Gillygate, travelling towards the junction with Bootham. On the northern side, a shorter length of cycle lane is proposed approaching the junction with Lord Mayor's Walk, extending just beyond the Portland Street junction mouth (still retaining the two lane approach for traffic). The northeast bound section without any cycle lane provision is the section where traffic does not tend to queue on a regular basis. The proposals for Gillygate are shown in **Annex B**.
8. The intention is to implement both schemes on a trial basis, in order to assess the effectiveness of the measures. If successful, similar proposals may be brought forward for other sections of the Inner Ring Road, such as:
 - Station Road;
 - Ouse Bridge/Bridge Street/Low Ousegate;
 - Lord Mayor's Walk.

Consultation Feedback

9. External consultation has taken place with the Police, cycling organisations and relevant councillors. Comments were received as follows, and Officer responses provided for each:
10. **The Police** support the proposals for Gillygate, and consider that it could work quite well and be beneficial to cyclists. However, for the Museum Street/Lendal Bridge proposal, they have quoted an extract from Rule 140 of the Highway Code, which states: "Do not drive or park in a cycle lane marked by a broken white line unless it is unavoidable". This means that if a bus or large vehicle enters the bridge area and there is no opposing traffic, they should avoid entering the cycle lane. Should a vehicle then approach from the opposite

direction, which would necessitate them moving in towards the nearside, they would probably enter the cycle lane, causing potential danger to cyclists, who may then become trapped between the vehicle and the kerb. Consequently, they are not sure that the Lendal Bridge scheme would be capable of delivering a safe option.

11. **The Cyclists' Touring Club** consider that the proposals would be of limited benefit, and perhaps slightly ease the passage of cyclists during peak time queuing, except past wide vehicles. One concern with advisory lanes is that some drivers expect cyclists to stay in them, and not deviate to avoid hazards like gullies. Where the lane is narrow, e.g. 1.0 metre, this scenario may be worsened. Therefore, it would be helpful to examine the carriageway edges in the scheme area, and determine whether there are any gullies or similar items that could cause regular weaving by cyclists towards the carriageway centre. If problems are identified, they should be addressed. The Museum Street carriageway width is locally restricted in the vicinity of the Museum Gardens entrance by a central pedestrian refuge. They consider that there are 'pinch point' risks for cyclists in this area, and question whether the advisory lanes should be discontinued past the refuge.
12. **The York Cycle Campaign** are wary of proposals to install such narrow cycle lanes and consider that they are often worse than useless. Firstly, they encourage those cyclists who do not know better to take up a position on the road where they are at greater risk (under the National Cycle Training Standards, cyclists are trained to ride in a safe position in the carriageway, which is usually at least 1.0 metre from the kerb edge). Secondly, they encourage aggressive behaviour by drivers towards cyclists who do know about the benefits of appropriate positioning on the road, and ride outside of the lanes.

Lanes narrower than 1.5m would only be acceptable under LTN2/08 (conformance was a prerequisite of the Cycling Demonstration Town bid) if they are feeder lanes to get cyclists past queuing traffic to facilities such as Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs). On that basis, the Gillygate proposals are just about acceptable, as are the lanes on Museum Street/Lendal Bridge northbound and Lendal Bridge southbound, as traffic queues are frequent. However, these stretches see a high density of pedestrians on the footways, and if cyclists ride in such narrow lanes their handlebars will overhang the footway, with potential for conflict.

They also have concerns for the proposals on Museum Street southbound. Encouraging cyclists to ride so close to the kerb edge where there is likely to be both encroaching traffic from the left (emerging from Lendal), and traffic looking to overtake despite the pedestrian refuge, could be very dangerous. They consider that a narrow lane can't be justified here because queuing traffic is much less likely.

In summary, they would not like to see the proposals implemented as described, and have suggested three alternative proposals, as follows:

- Don't install cycle lanes - Not providing a facility may be the least worst option and there seems a significant case to support this.

- Install 1.5m lanes - Since some vehicles are inevitably going to have to encroach even on the 1.0m lanes in congested conditions, is it a problem to have wider advisory lanes?
- Don't call them cycle lanes - The proposed lanes are unusual in that they are more about getting congested traffic to align itself a little from the kerb rather than the safety of cyclists in moving traffic. As such they aren't really cycle lanes in the conventional sense. They are also too narrow to be conventional cycle lanes. This suggestion therefore involves: not referring to the facilities as 'cycle lanes'; not putting cycle logos on them, and not using coloured tarmac; marking the 'lanes' out with narrower dashed lines than normal to emphasise the distinction from conventional cycle lanes. It seems likely that drivers are likely to naturally align themselves with these markings in congested conditions. This avoids many of the concerns outlined above, as drivers will not expect cyclists to stick to them, cyclists won't feel they have to cycle within the lane, and in addition, are less likely to get annoyed with wide vehicles blocking them.

Ward Member Views

13. Ward Members Looker and Watson from Guildhall, and Fraser, Gunnell and Merrett from Micklegate were consulted by e-mail on 13th January and asked for their comments. Feedback from the local Ward Councillors is summarised below, as follows:
14. **Cllr Looker** – Supports the proposals, but has concerns over the level of encroachment by buses, and if possible, would like the scheme to include measures to assist cyclist movements from Museum Street into Duncombe Place.
15. **Cllr Watson** – Does not support the proposals because he considers that both roads are too narrow to accommodate such cycle lanes safely.
16. **Cllr Merrett** – Has some concerns about vehicle encroachment into the cycle lanes, particularly on the uphill section approaching Lendal Bridge, where cyclists may stray outside the lane markings. However, he is generally supportive of the proposals, and considers that overall, this would be helpful for cyclists in terms of recognising what goes on and trying to maintain a reasonable gap for cyclists so that they can get past on the left, rather than overtaking traffic on their right. He also pointed out that these roads are the sorts of essential gaps in the system that the December 2008 residents' survey said put them off cycling, and need to be addressed.
17. **Cllr Gunnell** – No response has been received at the time of writing this report.
18. **Cllr Fraser** – No response has been received at the time of writing this report.

Other Member Views

19. Cllr Andy D'Agorne (Green), Cllr Ian Gillies (Conservative) and Cllr Ruth Potter (Labour) were consulted by e-mail on 13th January and asked for their comments.

20. **Cllr D'Agorne** – Is generally supportive of the proposals, but considers that when entering Gillygate from Clarence Street (travelling westbound) the road is wider to start with, so the initial section of cycle lane should not be required. In addition, he considers that the cycle lane should be wider (for example 1.2 metres) as you approach the signal controlled junctions at either end of Gillygate, rather than having to have one on both sides the whole length of the road where there isn't room. He also points out that loading vehicles would obstruct cycle lanes, and that if not already, this should be restricted to hours between 9.30am - 3pm, or after 6pm to reduce the risk of obstruction to the lanes at peak times.

He also considers that a cycle lane on the corner under the city wall rounding the bend on the approach to Lendal Bridge would greatly assist in alerting drivers of large vehicles the need to consider cyclists as they negotiate the bend.

21. **Cllr Gillies** – Does not support the proposals because he is concerned about cyclists' safety, given the likely problems associated with the encroachment of large vehicles, particularly on the uphill section approaching Lendal Bridge, where cyclists may stray outside the lane markings. This situation would be exacerbated when two large vehicles pass at the same point. He also questions the motivation behind the proposals, and if there is a history of accidents, would like to see the details.
22. **Cllr Potter** – Supports the proposals and considers that some designated space for cyclists on Lendal Bridge and the beginning of Museum Street would be of benefit, given that randomly positioned traffic queues currently holding cyclists up would be less frequent, with no negative effect on vehicular traffic, and that when the traffic sets off there will be fewer cyclists in the traffic queue to negotiate. On Gillygate, a concern is raised about the way that the road narrows on the approach to the signals at the Bootham junction, which might result in increased encroachment in to the cycle lane and create danger for cyclists. She has requested that this should be considered in the detailed design.

Officer Responses

23. The key issues resulting from consultation feedback are summarised below, followed by an Officer response:
- Potential danger to cyclists in the narrow cycle lanes when vehicles encroach, especially when traffic has to suddenly move closer to the nearside due to oncoming vehicles;
- Officer response:** Officers consider that the proposals should generally improve safety for cyclists by encouraging vehicles to align themselves closer to the centerline, thereby leaving a more consistent gap on the nearside for cyclists to bypass queuing traffic. There should be no requirement for any vehicles to 'suddenly' move further across to their nearside, as it is not anticipated that vehicles would actually encroach into the opposite traffic lane unless carrying out a specific overtaking manoeuvre. Indeed, at most times of day drivers would encounter oncoming traffic in the opposite lane and would therefore be forced to stay on their side of the centre-line. It is accepted as part of making these proposals that some wide vehicles (especially buses and HGVs) may need to straddle the cycle feeder lanes, but this is not thought to pose a danger to cyclists. In free-flowing traffic conditions, it is likely that the drivers of such vehicles would follow behind cyclists, as they do now, and not attempt to

overtake. It is also extremely unlikely that cyclists would attempt to undertake a slow moving or stationary bus or lorry if an adequate gap to pass safely did not exist.

- Potential danger to cyclists who may not have sufficient space within the narrow cycle lanes to avoid hazards like gullies or poor road surface conditions, and may move out into the line of traffic;

Officer response: Officers appreciate this concern and have identified some areas where maintenance work would be beneficial and ensure that gullies or a poor road surface condition would not present hazards for cyclists. It is proposed to carry these works out as part of the scheme, although this will increase costs slightly.

- An increased risk of pedestrians being hit by the overhanging handlebars of a bicycle due to cyclists riding closer to the kerb;

Officer response: There should not be any significant handlebar overhang if a bicycle is being ridden down the centre of the cycle lane. If the position of vehicles forces cyclists to adopt a position closer the kerb, they are likely to be moving slowly and will have good visibility of nearby pedestrians. Therefore, it is unlikely that this will be any more of a problem than it is at the moment, and with a degree of common sense on the part of cyclists (and to a certain extent, pedestrians) any such conflicts should be kept to a minimum.

- On Museum Street it could be potentially dangerous to encourage cyclists to ride so close to the kerb edge approaching the Lendal side road, where cyclists could be at risk from traffic emerging from Lendal, and in addition, from drivers attempting to overtake cyclists near or adjacent to the pedestrian refuge;

Officer response: Officers acknowledge the concerns raised above. Having reviewed this part of the scheme, it is proposed that the cycle lane should commence a few metres south of the junction with Lendal. Removing the section of cycle lane between Lendal and Blake Street is not considered to be a significant drawback, given that traffic queues do not regularly extend over this section. The absence of a cycle lane could encourage cyclists to adopt a slightly more central position in the carriageway as they approach the junction with Lendal, thereby addressing the concerns raised. This change to the scheme is shown in **Annex C**.

- The proposed cycle lanes are too narrow to be considered as conventional cycle lanes, and it has been suggested that the proposals would work better if marked with narrower lines and without cycle symbols;

Officer response: The proposed lanes are intended for use as extended cycle feeder lanes alongside queuing traffic to help cyclists access ASLs at signalised junctions. Therefore, it is considered reasonable for them to be termed 'extended cycle feeder lanes' rather than conventional cycle lanes and it is proposed that this term is used when publicising the trial schemes. However, for them to work well, Officers consider it important that they are clearly recognised by drivers as being areas where cyclists will be present. Hence, it is considered appropriate to use standard lane markings and regularly placed cycle symbols.

- Can the scheme include measures to help cyclists make the straight-ahead movement from Museum Street onto the cycle route down Duncombe Place?;

Officer response: In order to assist the straight-ahead cyclist movement, and to indicate where cyclists should position themselves within the ASL, the proposals have been amended. A left turn arrow will be provided on the left hand side of the ASL box, and a straight ahead/right turn arrow on the right hand side of the ASL box. This change to the scheme is shown in **Annex C**. At the present time, it is considered that lengthening the ASL box would not provide any significant benefit, as it is already close to the maximum permitted depth of six metres. In addition, due to the space required by turning traffic, there is insufficient space available to widen the box.

- It has been suggested that the cycle lane should be widened to about 1.2 metres on Gillygate as you approach the signal controlled junctions at both ends, and that the first section of the cycle lane for cyclists entering Gillygate from Clarence Street and Lord Mayor's Walk should be removed to allow for a wider feeder lane on the opposite side approaching the traffic signals;

Officer response: Providing a feeder lane at a width of 1.2 metres at the Bootham end of Gillygate is not considered feasible because this is the narrowest section, and it would reduce the width of the traffic lanes such that new safety issues could arise, for example, a wider cycle lane would result in traffic heading away from Bootham being positioned closer to the adjacent narrow footway, which could increase danger for pedestrians. At the Lord Mayor's Walk end, Officers have reviewed the current proposals, and consider it is essential to retain a cycle lane on the inbound side of Gillygate because traffic regularly extends all the way back to the Lord Mayor's Walk junction. Given the need to retain three traffic lanes, it is not considered feasible to provide more than a 1.0 metre cycle lane on either side of the road.

- Loading vehicles would obstruct the cycle lanes;

Officer response: There are existing loading restrictions, which prohibit loading between 8am to 9.15am and 4pm to 6pm, Monday to Saturday. Officers consider that these restrictions are reasonable, in that they cover the more sensitive peak traffic periods.

- Concern regarding the way that the road narrows on the approach to the signals at the Bootham junction, which might result in increased encroachment in to the cycle lane and create danger for cyclists;

Officer response: Officers are aware that the road narrows on Gillygate on the westbound approach to Bootham Bar between the Gillygate Public House and the Surgery, reducing from about 8.0 metres to just in excess of 6.6 metres. The proposals only provide a westbound cycle lane on Gillygate because traffic does not tend to queue back on the eastbound side. However, with the introduction of the proposals, the narrow traffic lanes should mean that traffic would not be able to overtake eastbound cyclists, particularly when traffic queues in the westbound lane. In addition, although some traffic may need to encroach into the cycle lane on the narrower section, there should still be enough of a gap for cyclists to bypass the queuing traffic.

- What is the justification for the scheme proposals and will it improve road safety?;

Officer response: The proposals are primarily intended to encourage motorists to recognise that cyclists may wish to get past on their nearside, and therefore queue in a position further away from the kerbside. This should increase convenience for cyclists. The proposals should also have some safety benefits

for cyclists. A check of the Police records suggests that a contributory factor in some accidents was a lack of awareness on the part of vehicle occupants and pedestrians of cyclists moving along the inside of queuing traffic. The proposed cycle lanes should improve general awareness of the presence of cyclists. Therefore, the current accident rates have a good chance of reducing following the implementation of the measures. Clearly, there are limitations with the proposals, and should the trial prove to be unsuccessful, the road markings could be removed, and the streets returned to their previous layouts.

Revised Proposals / Further Consultation Feedback

24. The key elements of the revised proposals for Museum Street/Lendal Bridge have been described above within the Officer responses, and are illustrated on the revised plan shown in **Annex C**.
25. These proposals were considered at an Officer In Consultation (OIC) meeting on 9th February. In view of the comments received from consultation and the amendments proposed to address some of the concerns raised, it was decided to refer the proposals to this Decision Session meeting, in order to allow time for further consultation and representations to be made. Notification of this situation was sent to all the previous consultees via e-mail on 11th February, and a summary of the feedback received is set out below:
 - **Cllr D'Agorne** – although seeing logic in the amendments, considers that a short section of cycle lane is needed on entering Museum Street from Duncombe Place and St. Leonard's Place at 1.2 metres width opposite the existing Advance Stop Line (ASL), possibly extending to a position opposite Library Square. In addition, there should be a 1.2 metre wide section in green surfacing opposite the pedestrian refuge and continue past the Lendal junction mouth. This would assist in highlighting the presence of cyclists. Also, additional markings should be considered for the ASL on St. Leonard's Place at the junction with Museum Street;
 - **Cllr Merrett** – endorses the comments made above by Cllr D'Agorne. He also puts forward the idea of introducing a give-way line and signing for vehicular traffic on Museum Street, just in advance of the pedestrian refuge, with the intention of drivers giving way to cyclists and pedestrians at this point. To slow speeds near the refuge, the introduction of a speed table is also suggested, subject to agreement with the emergency services.
 - **Cllr Gillies** - agrees with the amended proposals in general, but remains opposed to the introduction of cycle lanes between Lendal and Rougier Street. Regarding cyclists turning right into Museum Street from St. Leonard's, it would be safer if they could use the advance stop line to get themselves in the appropriate position, and together with relevant hand signals inform other road users of their intentions (which would help to prevent the quick start by motor vehicles who don't know if the cyclist adjacent to the kerb is going to turn right, or go straight on into Blake Street);
 - **Cllr Watson** – considers the diagram in the centre of the plan in **Annex C** depicting how the road space would be used merely highlights the dangers, and remains in objection to the scheme proposals for road safety reasons;

- **Cllr Gunnell and The Cyclists' Touring Club** – agree that additional markings should be considered for the ASL on St. Leonard's Place at the junction with Museum Street to assist right turning cyclists;
- **York Cycle Campaign** – support the amendments made to the proposals;
- **Cllr Potter** - supports the amendments made to the proposals.

Further Officer Responses

26. Officers remain of the opinion that any cycle lane markings provided on the north eastern side of Museum Street could present dangers to cyclists. In addition, the suggestion to provide facilities on this section is not consistent with the purpose of implementing extended cycle feeder lanes because vehicular traffic does not regularly queue on the northern-most section of Museum Street. For these reasons, Officers propose to retain the commencement of the southbound extended cycle feeder lane from the southern side of the junction with Lendal, as shown in **Annex D**.
27. The provision of give-way markings and signing for traffic on Museum Street at the existing pedestrian refuge (at the Museum Gardens entrance) would not be appropriate or permitted under the relevant regulations. The introduction of a speed table at the refuge would also be contrary to the council's Speed Management Plan, which only allows for vertical measures being introduced on Traffic Routes in exceptional circumstances. It would also be difficult to introduce a speed table, or possibly a controlled crossing facility, in this location on a trial basis. Therefore issues concerning traffic speeds and road safety at the refuge should be monitored closely as part of the proposed cycle lane trial to assess if additional measures ought to be considered for future inclusion in any permanent improvement scheme for this area.
28. The suggestion to provide additional markings within the ASL on St. Leonard's Place is considered to be of potential benefit to right turning cyclists, in the same way that the proposals already incorporate similar markings within the Museum Street ASL box for straight ahead cyclist movements. This has been incorporated into the proposals, and is shown in **Annex D**. Also amended at this stage is the reference to widening the ASL box on Museum Street, which upon reflection, whilst only providing minimal benefit on the available width that could be used, could in practice place cyclists in conflict with large right turning vehicles from St. Leonard's Place. Therefore, **Annex D** retains this ASL box at its original width.

Cycling Evaluation Tool

29. The Cycling Evaluation Tool is a means of scoring cycling schemes on a range of criteria so that schemes may be ranked and compared against each other. It was approved at the City Strategy Decision Session on 20 October 2009. The proposed narrow cycle lanes trial scheme has been evaluated using this tool and both sections achieved the same score of +25 (each section was evaluated separately). This compares very favourably with other, similar projects, as shown in the table below:

Scheme	Total points
Beckfield Lane - Boroughbridge Road to Ostman Road - completed section	+16
Crichton Avenue – scheme under construction	+21
Clifton Green - completed scheme	+24
Wigginton Road – proposals approved in principle	+25
Moor Lane Bridge - completed scheme	+26

Options on the Way Forward

30. A number of options are available for consideration:

- **Option 1** – implement the proposals as shown in **Annexes A** (for Lendal Bridge/Museum Street) and **B** (for Gillygate), as consulted upon;
- **Option 2** – implement the revised proposals resulting from consultation feedback, as shown in **Annex D** for Museum Street/Lendal Bridge, and the original proposal for Gillygate as shown in **Annex B**;
- **Option 3** – implement a variation of the proposals to incorporate any changes that may be deemed necessary.
- **Option 4** – make no alterations to the current situation

Analysis of Options

31. **Option 1** would provide some benefit, but through the consultation process Officers consider that the original scheme proposals could be improved to address some safety issues.
32. **Option 2** is considered by Officers to provide the most benefit to cyclists, and the revised proposals are considered to represent the safest means of providing cycling facilities under these circumstances.
33. **Option 3** gives an opportunity to implement a variation of the proposals to incorporate any other changes that may be deemed necessary.
34. **Option 4** would provide no material benefit, and retaining the current layout would do nothing to improve the situation for cyclists on these narrow routes where queuing traffic can often present obstacles to the free passage of cyclists.
35. Based on the above analysis, Officers consider that the scheme proposals offered in **Option 2** present the best way forward.

Corporate Priorities

36. The scheme would contribute to the following Corporate Priorities:

- Sustainable City – the scheme should encourage more commuting Cyclists to use these routes for riding into and away from the city, in preference to using motorised forms of transport.

- Safer City – the scheme would make these roads easier and safer for cyclists to get past queuing vehicles.
 - Healthy City – the scheme should encourage more cycling, which would have a beneficial effect upon peoples' health.
37. The scheme would also contribute to several of the aims of the Local Transport Plan, namely:
- Encourage essential journeys to be undertaken by more sustainable modes where possible;
 - Reduce the level of actual and perceived safety problems;

Implications

Financial / Programme

38. Implementation of the scheme proposals is expected to be achieved during the early part of the current financial year 2010/11. The current estimated cost of implementing both schemes is £10k. This can be accommodated within the Cycling Minor Schemes allocation (£75k), which forms part of the 2010/11 City Strategy Capital Programme.

Human Resources (HR)

39. There are no human resources implications.

Equalities

40. There are no equalities implications.

Legal

41. The City of York Council, as Highways Authority for the area, has powers under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980, and the Road Traffic Act 1984 to implement the measures proposed.

Crime and Disorder

42. There are no crime and disorder issues.

Information Technology (IT)

43. There are no information technology implications.

Property

44. There are no property implications.

Risk Management

45. Physical - there is always a potential for new safety issues to arise whenever an existing highway layout is altered, but risks are minimised through careful design and the road safety audit checking process.

46. Organisation/Reputation - there is a risk of criticism from the public in implementing a scheme to which some people may have objections, but there could also be criticism from potential supporters of the scheme if it is not implemented. Good quality public information should ensure that well informed decisions are made about the scheme and reduce the risk of public criticism.

47.

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Physical	Medium	Possible	9
Governance (Reputation)	Medium	Unlikely	6

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, as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report.

Contact Details

Author:

Jon Pickles, Senior Engineer
Transport & Safety
Tel. No. 3462

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Richard Wood
Assistant Director of City Development &
Transport

Report Approved

Date 15.03.10

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

There are no special implications

All

Wards Affected: Guildhall, Micklegate

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

“York Cycling City” – report to the Meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel on 8 September 2008.

“Cycling Infrastructure within York – Standards, Evaluation Tool, and Cost/Benefit Matrix” - report to the Executive Member for City Strategy Decision Session on 20 October 2009.

“Proposed Narrow Cycle Lane Trial - Museum Street / Lendal Bridge & Gillygate” – OIC Report on 9 February 2010.

Annexes:

Annex A – Original Proposals for Museum Street / Lendal Bridge, as consulted upon

Annex B – Original Proposals for Gillygate, as consulted upon

Annex C – Proposed Amendments for Museum Street / Lendal Bridge following feedback from consultation

Annex D – Final Proposals for Museum Street / Lendal Bridge following feedback from a second stage consultation exercise