

In respect of this item, Councillor Waller (Executive Member for Economy and Strategic Planning) will substitute for Councillor D’Agorne (Executive Member for Transport) because he has declared a prejudicial interest.

Report of the Assistant Director Transport, Highways and Environment

FS-17-23 Bikehanger Pilot scheme

Summary

1. This report summarises the results of the pilot scheme, and asks the Executive Member to consider the views raised in objection to the proposal through a petition, and the comments of support, prior to making a decision on whether to make the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) permanent.
2. Subject to the decision on the ETRO the Executive Member is also asked to consider the retention of the cycle shelter for rental by the residents.

Recommendations

3. The Executive Member is asked to approve:

Option 1 – Consider the objections/representations and approve making the ETRO permanent, thereby allowing continued rental of the secure cycle parking.

Reason: To continue to provide secure cycle parking for residents and help reduce the number of thefts of cycles.

Background

4. In April 2018, as part of the ward scheme programme, officers were

requested to investigate and install a Bikehanger cycle shelter as part of a free trial at a location on Heslington Road within the Fishergate ward.

5. Ward Members had identified, through discussion with residents, that a number of cycles had been stolen from private properties. As a result of these thefts, members promoted the provision of secure cycle parking on-street.
6. The shelter was provided by Cyclehoop Limited for an initial trial period of 6 months and was installed in September 2019. Bikehanger shelters have been extensively installed in a number of the London Boroughs and in cities such as Edinburgh and have proven very successful.
7. During the trial period, the ward team agreed to fund the installation and cover the costs of Officer fees in arranging the works. If the trial is deemed to have been successful and the Executive Member decides to make the ETRO permanent to allow the continued provision of the secure cycle parking through use of the Bikehanger shelter, the Council will be required to purchase the shelter. Cyclehoop will continue to manage the rental scheme and maintain the shelter.

Consultation

8. The initial consultation, prior to commencement of the trial, sought the views of internal officers before formally consulting with affected frontages.
9. Whilst officers raised no significant issues about the proposal, concerns were raised about:
 - the visual impact of the shelter,
 - the logic of the rental scheme,
 - if the supplier was to provide mitigation measures in the form of green screening / planting to improve the street aesthetics, and
 - if the size of the shelter would impact on the passage of other vehicles such as buses at what is already a pinch point location.
10. Letters were delivered to affected residents on Heslington Road (Annex A), and only three responses were received. Two were supportive and one was in objection to the proposals.
11. Those supporting the proposal referred to incidents when their cycles had been stolen and agreed that secure parking would be of benefit

and be welcomed by many of the residents.

12. One business owner objected to the proposed scheme, raising several issues as outlined in Annex B. The objection was later withdrawn following discussion between the ward member and the Objector.

Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO)

13. Approval had previously been given to introduce an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for a short section of Heslington Road. The effect of this order was to create a secure parking area for pedal cycles for the duration of a trial to determine the viability of providing such a facility.
14. The experiment can last for a maximum of 18 months, although there is potential for it to be made permanent after 6 months of operation if the trial is considered a success or to suspend the experiment depending on circumstances.
15. The ETRO was advertised from 25th September 2019. Residents were advised of the experiment by letter, and were given the opportunity to comment on or object to the proposals. No responses were received during the initial stages of the advertisement period.
16. Further letters were delivered to residents in late February 2020 advising of the pending conclusion of the initial 6 month trial period and reminding residents of the chance to offer comments on the trial.
17. Three responses have been received during the advertisement period of the ETRO:
 - One queried how the shelter was benefitting anyone when it is removing parking spaces. The resident considers the shelter should be removed.
 - The second was supportive of the measures, praising the facility and stating that “storage in these tiny terraces is so limited the installation of the bike hanger has given [the resident] the opportunity to get a bike”.
 - The third response came in the form of a petition (outlined below) objecting to the proposal.

Petition

18. The petition, which was hand delivered, is signed by 21 residents and business owners. It is claimed by the petitioner that more would have

signed the petition if the risk of coronavirus hadn't been present.

19. A copy of the reasons for objection are provided in Annex D. In total 17 reasons were given, and the author has provided responses to these concerns below.
20. Reason 1: Dangerous.

Officer response:

Various locations were considered for the cycle shelter and the chosen location was deemed to be the most suitable. The arrangement has been reviewed by Road Safety Audit before and after installation and this identified the need to install additional bollards to protect the shelter from damage. Only two bollards were installed, one either end of the shelter. This was also to prevent inconsiderate and unsafe parking on the Fitzroy Terrace end of the shelter.

Reason 2: Failed in its unique selling point:

Officer response:

The purpose of the installation is to provide secure cycle parking for residents who have applied to use the facility. The feedback from the supplier is that the rental of the shelter spaces has had 100% uptake throughout the trial period and therefore it is meeting the objectives. The provision of additional cycle facilities for general use was not part of the remit of this project.

Reason 3. Loss of amenity:

Officer response:

The shelter in itself takes up the equivalent of 1 car space although the installation of the bollards take up additional space. The layby is unrestricted and therefore the spaces are not assigned to any particular use. As such there was never any guarantee (before or after installation of the shelter) that space would be available for deliveries.

Reason 4. Not in keeping with the local area:

Officer response:

Heslington Road is an urban residential street and is a distributor road serving several other residential streets, as well as being a link to other areas of York. The shelter is installed in locations such as London and Edinburgh in streets of a similar nature.

Reason 5. Size:

Officer response:

As mentioned above, the footprint size of the shelter is comparable to 1 car. With the bollards, the available layby length is reduced further, however there is still approximately 30m of unrestricted layby available.

Reason 6. Alternative cycle stands:

Officer response:

The scheme brief was to trial the use of the Bikehanger shelter and the purpose is to provide secure parking for cycles due to a number of thefts from private property. The shelter is locked and is only accessed by anyone who has a key. The shelter is also resistant to vandalism.

Providing Sheffield style stands would provide additional spaces for cycles but these would be less secure than the bikehanger. There is little scope to site Sheffield stands in footways in the immediate area without compromising footway space and hindering passage for pedestrians.

Reason 7. Utilisation:

Officer response:

Up to the time of writing this report, the supplier advised that the uptake on rental of the spaces has been 100% throughout the initial trial period.

Reason 8. Location:

Officer response:

As mentioned above, Heslington Road is an urban residential street and is a distributor road serving several other residential streets, as well as being a link to other areas of York. The location of the shelter has been carefully considered amongst others and deemed to be the most suitable.

The objector has stated that the shelter should be relocated away from its current position, implying that they would not object if it is relocated.

Reason 9. Hindrance to several local businesses:

Officer response:

The layby in which the shelter has been positioned is unrestricted and is available for use by any road user. It is not specifically assigned as a loading bay and some 30m of bay still remains available for use. If the businesses strongly consider that there is inadequate space afforded for business use, then consideration should be given to implementing a TRO to make the bay for loading use only. Commuter parking has been singled out as a problem within the area and, at this point, the lack of restriction within the bay allows such parking.

Reason 10. Severe hindrance to the adjacent business of Zidane's:

Officer response:

See response in item 9.

Reason 11. Severe hindrance to Zidane's outside seating:

Officer response:

The shelter does not impede on the forecourt area of Zidane's. Whilst it is positioned in the highway in front of the business, the officer does not consider this obtrusive or an obstruction. The reason for its positioning is explained above and below.

Reason 12. Positioning:

Officer response:

The position of the shelter is such that the door opens up over the footway to afford safe access to the shelter. If the shelter had been positioned further towards Fitzroy Terrace the presence of a boundary wall would have reduced the available width of footway to an unacceptable amount. In the position chosen, there is adequate space within the footway to allow the door to be opened and the cycles placed within the shelter. Use of the private forecourt is not prevented by the owner and is not encouraged by the Council. At the same time, the Council does not have any control over whether pedestrians pass over the forecourt.

Reason 13. Hindering the re-letting of empty business premises:

Officer response:

The bikehanger cycle shelter is a unique item of street furniture within York. However, it is no different than, for instance, siting a bus shelter

outside a property. The views of residents and businesses are sought in the same way and are considered along with the benefits of the installation. The layby in which the shelter has been placed is unrestricted and is not assigned as a loading bay. Space for loading is not guaranteed even if the shelter was not in place.

Reason 14. Safety:

Officer response:

The provision and siting of the shelter has been reviewed by independent road safety audit during design and after installation. It is not deemed to be as hazard.

Reason 15. Restricting private property owners use of their land:

Officer response:

The owner is not being prevented from altering the use of their frontage. Erecting a wall, for example, would need to satisfy planning requirements and would severely impact on the use of the forecourt for seating, etc. If the owner decided to erect a wall, the positioning of the shelter would need to be reviewed.

Consent to place street furniture on the public highway is not required from frontages.

Reason 16. Rainwater flow:

Officer response:

The base of the shelter is elevated above road level and as such does not prevent the passage of rainwater to the adjacent gully.

Reason 17. Filth:

Officer response:

The shelter would be routinely cleaned and maintained on a six-monthly basis by the supplier. Any maintenance over and above the scheduled work would be undertaken as required.

Road Safety Audit

21. A road safety audit was undertaken prior to installation. This identified 3 minor concerns. These were:

1. Parking could occur in the short space between the shelter and the existing parking restrictions, increasing the potential for the shelter to be struck.
 2. The shelter installation within the layby will result in vehicles manoeuvring near to the shelter increasing the risk of strike.
 3. No details were provided at the time of the audit showing the reflective strips which were to be placed on the shelter. The audit requested the reflectors to be of the correct colour.
22. Items 1 and 2 were resolved by the installation of bollards at either end of the shelter. Reflectors were provided to highlight the shelter.

Options

23. Option 1: To consider the objections/representations and approve making the ETRO permanent, thereby allowing continued rental of the secure cycle parking.
24. Option 2: – To uphold the objections and conclude the ETRO without making the order permanent and hence remove the cycle shelter facility.

Analysis

25. Cyclehoop have advised that throughout the trial period the spaces within the shelter have been shelter has been fully rented at all times.
26. Making the ETRO permanent would allow the cycle shelter to be retained and thereby continue to provide secure cycle parking for residents, meeting the objective of the scheme.
27. It would also encourage the provision of such shelters elsewhere within the cycle, providing additional secure cycle parking for residents in other wards.
28. A decision to not make the ETRO permanent and not to retain the shelter would not meet the objective such that secure cycle parking would no longer be made available to residents and there would be further risks of cycle theft as a consequence.

Council Plan

29. The following explains how the proposals relate to the Council's outcomes, as set out in the Council Plan 2019-2023 (Making History, Building Communities) and other key change programmes:

Key priority - An open and effective council:

The proposal meets the needs of residents by providing secure cycle parking in an area where cycle thefts had been taking place.

Key priority – Getting around sustainably:

The provision of secure cycle parking at a reasonable rental cost will encourage the use of cycles and thereby go a little way to help cut congestion, pollution and carbon emissions.

30. Ward members have advised that the success of this trial will lead the way to encourage the introduction of additional bikehanger shelters in other wards throughout the city.

Implications

31. The following implications have been considered:

• **Financial:**

The shelter has been provided by Cyclehoop free of charge during the trial period. However, the council had to pay for the installation of the shelter at a cost of £1580 during 2019/20 and will need to purchase the shelter should the trial be successful at a further cost of £2850 + VAT. This would be funded through the ward process.

Some additional works were undertaken as a result of the safety audit to install bollards adjacent to the shelter to afford it further protection from damage during the trial.

Including fees, the total amount incurred to date has been £8k.

The ward team have funded the trial and will pay for the purchase of the shelter.

The rental of the spaces within the shelter are managed by the supplier. All income from the rental scheme is received by the supplier. The total cost of rental per space per year is currently £50 + VAT. No

further costs would be borne by the Council.

Maintenance of the shelter will continue to lie with the supplier if the issues are related to faulty parts and not caused by vandalism or damage. Two scheduled maintenance visits will occur each year. Each shelter has a 10 year warranty.

- **Human Resources (HR)** - There are no HR implications.
- **Equalities** - There are no One Planet Council / equalities implications.
- **Legal** - The TRO will need to be made permanent in order to continue the service being provided. The rental scheme will be managed by the supplier, with no involvement from the Council.
- **Crime and Disorder** - There are no crime or disorder implications.
- **Information Technology (IT)** – There are no IT implications.
- **Property** - There are no property implications.
- **Other** – none.

Risk Management

32. In compliance with the Council’s risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendation in this report have been identified and described in the following points, and set out in the table below:

33. Authority reputation – this risk is in connection with the public perception of the Council if the recommended scheme is not continued and secure parking of cycles provided, and is assessed at

Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Authority reputation	Minor	Possible	9

Contact Details

Author:

David Mercer
Acting Transport Projects
Manager,
Transport

Tel No.01904 553447
david.mercer@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Assistant Director Transport, Highways and
Environment

Report Date 09.07.20
Approved

Wards Affected: Fishergate

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes:

Annex A – Consultation letters and plan
Annex B – Objection
Annex C - Notice of Making of ETRO
Annex D - Petition

Abbreviations

ETRO – Experimental Traffic Regulation Order.