

## **Decision Session – Executive Member for Transport**

**19 July 2022**

Report of the Director of Transport, Environment and Planning

### **Active Travel**

#### **Summary**

1. This report presents updated information on the progress of the Active Travel Programme, including recommendations for decisions relating to individual projects within the programme.
2. The Executive Member is asked to approve the addition of 3 new schemes to the programme following the news of a partially successful grant funding bid to the Department for Transport.
3. An update on the overall programme timescales and budget is included, with a proposal on how to manage the available funds.
4. The report recommends that the Navigation Road Experimental Traffic Regulation Order is made permanent, following a trial period and the outcome of a consultation process.
5. Feasibility work is presented for the City Centre Bridges scheme and the report recommends a decision is made to proceed to consultation, detailed design and implementation.
6. An update is provided for the A1237 Active Travel scheme, with the outcome of the feasibility work indicating that the project as it currently stands is not viable. The report explores the reasoning behind this outcome and proposes to reassign the available resources to other projects within the programme. Further safety-focussed work is proposed to be pursued through a separate programme.
7. Similarly, the Heslington to Wheldrake path scheme has progressed to a later stage of feasibility, with the outcome strongly suggesting that the objectives cannot be achieved within the available budget. A

recommendation is made to reassign the available resources to other projects within the programme and progress the existing feasibility through the upcoming LCWIP work (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan).

8. Feasibility work has been completed for the People Streets at Ostman Road scheme. This report highlights the key outcomes of this work and makes a recommendation on the next steps for the scheme.

## **Recommendations**

9. The Executive Member is asked to:

- 1) Approve the Project Outline for the 'City Centre Cycle Parking Improvements' scheme attached in Annex 1.

Proceed to undertake Feasibility work to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation. (Option 1)

Reason: To provide clarity on the objectives and scope of the proposed scheme.

- 2) Approve the Project Outline for the 'People Streets at Clifton Green Primary School' scheme attached in Annex 2.

Proceed to undertake Feasibility work to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation. (Option 1)

Reason: To provide clarity on the objectives and scope of the proposed scheme.

- 3) Approve the Project Outline for the 'People Streets at Badger Hill Primary School' scheme attached in Annex 3.

Proceed to undertake Feasibility work to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation. (Option 1)

Reason: To provide clarity on the objectives and scope of the proposed scheme.

- 4) Decide to make the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order relating to Navigation Road cycle scheme permanent. (Option 3)

Reason: To successfully conclude the Navigation Road trial scheme.

- 5) Confirm that the proposals presented for the City Centre Bridges scheme align with the approved Project Outline, and decide to proceed with consultation, detailed design and implementation. (Option 5)

Reason: To support progress towards implementation of a solution.

- 6) Support the approach to managing the programme budget laid out in Section 75 of this report. Note the programme budget summary attached in Annex 5. (Option 6)

Reason: To ensure an appropriate balance is reached between obtaining value for money and the expeditious delivery of schemes.

- 7) Note the outcome of the feasibility work for the A1237 bridge scheme and decide to reassign scheme resources to the wider Active Travel Programme, subject to DfT support.

Consideration of longer term active travel provision is to be considered as part of the Outer Ring Road works.

Shorter term options to improve safety are to be explored through the separate Safety Scheme Review process within the Transport Capital Programme. (Option 7)

Reason: The scheme has been determined to not be feasible due to reasons laid out within section 90.

- 8) Note the reported position on the Wheldrake to Heslington scheme and decide to reassign resources to the wider programme, subject to DfT support.

Progression of existing feasibility work is to be considered as part of the development of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. (Option 9).

Reason: The scheme has been determined to be unaffordable within

current budgets, due to the reasons laid out within section 106.

- 9) Note the outcome of the feasibility work for the 'People Streets at Ostman Road' scheme laid out in section 125 and decide to seek further funding before proceeding to implementation.

Seek Active Travel grant funding support at the next round of bidding.

Progress with detailed design work on Design Option 1 presented within Annex 8. (Option 11)

Reason: Feasibility work indicates that whilst a practically achievable scheme has been identified, there is currently insufficient budget to deliver the scheme.

### **Brief Update on 'Very High Priority' Schemes**

10. Refer to Annex 4 for a brief update on the overall programme. The table includes a column showing the priority of each scheme. This section gives a brief update on the progress of those schemes determined to be of 'Very High Priority'.
11. University Road Minor Pedestrian Works – This scheme is due for construction in August. Final arrangements are underway.
12. A19 Cycle Scheme – Outputs from the feasibility work are due w/c 11<sup>th</sup> July. This information will be reviewed and the intention is to undertake consultation thereafter, timescales dependant upon the specific content of the feasibility work and its implications.
13. A1237 Bridge Scheme – Feasibility work is complete and this report covers this scheme in more detail, including a recommendation on how to proceed.
14. St Georges Field Crossing – Feasibility work is complete and is currently being reviewed. The next stage will be to either undertake a consultation or to seek a decision on the next steps. There are dependencies upon the nearby Castle Gateway scheme that strongly impact what action will be taken.
15. City Centre Bridges – Feasibility work is complete and this report covers this scheme in more detail, including a recommendation on how to

proceed.

16. People Streets at Ostman Road – Feasibility work is complete and this report covers the scheme in more detail, including a recommendation on how to proceed.
17. Hospital Fields Road Cycle Improvements – The first outputs of the feasibility work have been received, including outline design proposals. These are currently being reviewed and evaluated. The intention is to undertake a consultation when this work has been fully completed.
18. Fishergate Gyratory Scheme – Sustrans have provided their proposals on how this route could potentially be improved for Active Travel. This is currently being reviewed and Officers are evaluating what further activity needs to be completed prior to a consultation process on these proposals.
19. Wheldrake / Heslington Scheme – Feasibility work has not been completed for this specific route, however feasibility has been completed for a very similar route with some overlap (Heslington / Elvington). Officers believe the work that has been completed on this route includes sufficient information to infer certain conclusions on the Wheldrake / Heslington Scheme. This report covers these conclusions and includes a recommendation on how to proceed.
20. Acomb Road Cycle Scheme – Feasibility work has not yet commenced as we continue to undertake a procurement process to obtain design and feasibility support. This process has taken longer than anticipated, partly due to granting extensions to potential bidders. The transport consultancy industry is under a resourcing pressure at present and granting extensions to the bidding process is sometimes necessary to ensure that we receive sufficient numbers of compliant and affordable bids.

## **Project Outlines**

### **Background**

21. In March 2022 the Authority was informed of the outcome of its most recent bid to the government for Active Travel Fund support. The government approved £150k of funding for Cycle Parking Improvements and £200k of funding for People Streets schemes at Clifton Green

Primary School and Badger Hill Primary School.

22. Further information on the content of this bid can be found in Background Paper 2.
23. To ensure that these schemes are delivered in line with the expectations of both the Government and the Executive Member, a Project Outline is presented as part of this report. Once approved, officers will proceed with feasibility work in line with the agreed objectives and scope.

## **Options**

24. Option 1 – Approve the proposed Project Outlines for the ‘City Centre Cycle Parking Improvements’, ‘People Streets at Clifton Green Primary School’ and ‘People Streets at Badger Hill Primary School’, as per Annexes 1, 2 and 3.

Proceed to undertake feasibility work on each scheme to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation.

25. Option 2 – Do not approve the proposed Project Outlines and undertake further work to refine the proposals in line with the government funding grant conditions.

## **Analysis**

### **Option 1**

26. City Centre Cycle Parking – This project outline describes a scheme to improve the provision, availability and quality of cycle parking within the extended footstreet area of the city centre.
27. The scope of the scheme is defined such that it meets both the authority’s commitments to the government within the associated bid, and also CYC’s strategic objectives in relation to promoting modal shift.
28. People Streets Schemes – The project outlines describe schemes to improve the walking and cycling routes around the vicinity of two primary schools. The proposals are similar to the scheme that has progressed through feasibility at Ostman Road and is presented within this report.

29. It is noted that £200k is available for both these new schemes, however recent feasibility work has shown that ~£700k would be needed to implement a similar scheme at Ostman Road.
30. The intention is therefore to progress these schemes through feasibility as far as is possible, such that sufficient information can be presented for a decision on the best way forward.
31. Officer resource is in place and ready to start feasibility work on these schemes commencing immediately after a decision is made. It is not currently proposed to assign these schemes a formal priority, however this can be undertaken if required.

## Option 2

32. Should the proposed outlines not be approved, officers will take away feedback and attempt to revise the proposals for reconsideration at a future session.
33. Should the decision be to modify the proposals to broaden or reduce the scope of works then officers will assess the impact of these changes. Due to the fact that these schemes are government funded, the Authority must ensure it complies with the grant funding conditions which apply to this work.
34. If proposed alterations can be incorporated without impacting grant funding conditions or introducing other such risks then this will be undertaken and the schemes will progress without coming back to a future session. Otherwise, a further report will be brought back to highlight these risks and propose a way forward.

## **Navigation Road TRO**

### **Background**

35. The Executive Member for Transport approved the implementation of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (“ETRO”) in Navigation Road in June 2020 as part of the implementation of the Navigation Road Cycle Scheme.
36. This report sets out the results of the consultation, alongside the assessment of the impacts of the ETRO with a view to making a decision about making the TRO permanent.

## Consultation

37. The consultation was available between 2 May and 27 May 2022, open to all wanting to share their views on the trial.
38. The online questionnaire received 150 responses from residents and businesses. The responses received can be found in Annex 7.
39. Key points to summarise from the consultation include:
  - a. 52% of respondents indicated that the trial had a positive impact on movement on Navigation Road whilst 42% of respondents stated that the trial had a negative impact.
  - b. 11 responses received were from local businesses. 27% of the businesses responded the trial had a negative impact, with 45% stating a very negative impact on their business. 18% of business reported a positive impact, and 9% stated the trial had a very positive impact.
  - c. The main reasons stated for opposing the trial were: causes congestion / slow traffic, doesn't reduce traffic / forces it elsewhere, causes more air pollution due to congestion, longer journey times, negative effect on surrounding roads, need to drive further now / direct routes cut off.
  - d. The main reasons stated for supporting the trial were: reduced traffic, improved safety for cyclists and better environment for pedestrians.
  - e. The experience of cycling on Navigation Road improved with the trial, 72% of responses of those that cycle on Navigation Road, stated that they feel safer due to the trial in place.
  - f. The experience of walking on Navigation Road improved with the trial, 48% of responses of those that walk on Navigation Road stated that they feel safer due to the trial in place.
  - g. 39% of motorists that responded stated that the trial had a very significant impact on their car use habits, with 10% stating car journeys have been reduced since the trial. 33% stated their



methods of travelling have altered due to the trial.

## Options

40. Option 3 - Decide to make the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order relating to Navigation Road cycle scheme permanent.
41. Option 4 – Do not make the Traffic Regulation Order relating to Navigation Road cycle scheme permanent and begin work to understand what would be required to revert the site back to how it was pre-implementation.

## Analysis

### Option 3

42. Traffic surveys were undertaken before implementation (1 month) and post implementation (6 months) The following information was captured:
  - a. Walmgate queue length comparison
  - b. Pedestrian flow comparisons
  - c. Cycle flow comparison
  - d. Vehicle flow comparisons (excluding cycles)
43. It is clear from survey work that the scheme has not had a dramatic effect on the local road network, however there is a limit to what can be inferred from the data. It is proposed that the scheme continues to be observed for a longer period of time to ensure that the scheme impacts have not been inaccurately monitored.
44. It was noted that on Saturdays queue lengths on Walmgate are generally slightly better or similar to the baseline, on Sundays queues are in general slightly worse than baseline, on Tuesdays queues are shorter than the baseline.
45. Pedestrian flows have increased on both parts of Navigation Road and significantly on the section where the new one-way motorised vehicle restriction is in place. These increases are seen throughout the week.
46. Cycle flows initially dropped on weekdays on both sections of Navigation Road but have now surpassed the pre-implementation levels. Flows on Saturdays and Sundays have not followed the same trend.

47. Compliance with the restrictions is generally good over the 12 hour survey periods. Delivery mopeds have been observed using the contra-flow cycle lane, though compliance is sufficient to suggest that additional enforcement is not required.
48. There are sufficient funds available within the budget to make this TRO permanent and to undertake further monitoring of the scheme.
49. The separate 'Foss Islands Road / Navigation Road Local Safety Scheme' is currently facing delays due staff resourcing issues, however that has no impact upon completion of this scheme.

#### Option 4

50. If the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order is not made permanent then it will expire in March 2023, at which point motor vehicles will again be permitted to travel along Navigation Road in both directions. This is the default outcome if no further action is taken.
51. Before this happened it would be necessary to undertake work to ensure that the highway layout is safe, including potential removal of the 'wands' and other measures that have reduced the width of the carriageway.

### **City Centre Bridges**

#### **Background**

52. The outline of this scheme was approved by the Executive Member at the February '22 Executive Member Decision Session (See Background Paper 3)
53. The City Centre Bridges consist of Ouse Bridge, Skeldergate Bridge and Lendal Bridge. These bridges provide critical access through the city over the River Ouse for pedestrians, non-motorised users (NMU's) and motorised vehicles users.
54. The aims of the project are to address safety and amenity issues for cyclists, specifically focussing on reducing conflicts between cyclists and motor vehicles relating to 'close / unsafe overtaking'.

#### **Consultation**

55. External consultation has not yet occurred for this scheme. It is possible that undertaking a consultation on these proposals will not be productive due to the very minor nature of the works, covering only minimal signing and lining. These proposals are proportionate to the limited £15k budget.
56. It is expected that should the scheme go out to consultation that the bulk of the responses will be to suggest that more ambitious alternative proposals are explored and that the works are significantly expanded in scope.
57. The recommendation is to proceed with a limited consultation prior to implementation, and to manage expectations on what can be achieved within the available budget.

## **Options**

58. Option 5 - Confirm that the proposals presented for the City Centre Bridges scheme align with the approved Project Outline and decide to proceed with consultation, detailed design and implementation.
59. Option 6 – Do not approve the proposals.

## **Analysis**

### Option 5

60. Refer to Annex 11 for the Feasibility report relating to this scheme. The content of this report will not be replicated here, however key points will be highlighted and addressed to support a decision.
61. Recommendations include:
  - a. Liaise with North Yorkshire Police to carry out a driver education programme on the dangers of close passes to cyclists.
  - b. Apply to the Department for Transport for Signs Authorisation to use the “Give Cyclists Space” sign for all bridges. If authorisation is granted, then the design of these signs will be taken forward and implemented.
  - c. Design road markings using cyclist symbols (Diag 1057) for Ouse Bridge and Lendal Bridge. The Lendal Bridge road markings would be installed following the maintenance and resurfacing works of the

bridge.

62. North Yorkshire Police have already created 'Operation Close Pass', whereby plain clothed police officers collect evidence of unsafe overtaking and take action. It is therefore proposed that officers engage with NYP to offer assistance in potentially carrying out this operation on or nearby the city centre bridges.
63. The feasibility report has identified a potentially suitable sign that can be used to raise awareness and discourage close overtaking. Special permission is required from the Department for Transport to use this sign on the Highway. Work has commenced to seek this permission. The recommendation is to complete this work and the implement this signage on the bridges, as described within the report.
64. The feasibility report also suggests the implementation of road markings to further raise awareness and discourage close passing. It is recommended that this is pursued in line with the attached report.
65. Motor vehicles closely overtaking cyclists is intimidating, potentially dangerous and a contributing factor preventing people to consider using their bike.
66. Skeldergate Bridge, Ouse Bridge, and Lendal Bridge all have narrow carriageways. In order to change to the width of the carriageways or introduce segregated cycle facilities, the existing pavements would need to be narrowed, or extreme structural changes to the bridges would need to be undertaken. This cannot be achieved within the £15k of this scheme and therefore these solutions have been ruled out.
67. Over the last five years, five accidents have been reported that involved cyclists on the three city centres bridges. Of these accidents, two were on Lendal Bridge, two on Ouse Bridge, and one was on Skeldergate Bridge. These accident data suggest that there is little difference in the safety of the bridges for cyclists.

None of the accidents reported over the last five years involved a car unsafely or closely overtaking a cyclist. This suggests that close/unsafe overtakes are not a primary cause of accidents on the three bridges of interest.

This does not undermine the purpose of the scheme however, as close passing does still discourage cycling journeys even if it does not appear

to be reflected in injury accidents on the bridges.

68. Table 1. Figures for City Centre Bridges

<b>Bridge</b>	<b>Road Width (metres)</b>	<b>Two-way vehicle Journeys (24hrs)</b>	<b>Two-way Cyclist Journeys (24hrs)</b>	<b>Vehicles that were Cyclists</b>	<b>AM Cyclists (%)</b>	<b>PM Cyclists (%)</b>
<i>Skeldergate</i>	7.25	22,000	680	3%	n/a	n/a
<i>Ouse</i>	7	10,000	1,300	12.8%	30.4%	32.8%
<i>Lendal</i>	7	13,300	2400	18%	26.5%	25.5%

69. Local Transport Note LTN 1/20 outlines that roads with a two way daily traffic flow of over 6,000 vehicles should separate vehicles and cyclist traffic by, for example, a fully kerbed cycle track, stepped cycle track or on-carriageway light segregation. All of the above would likely require assigning ~3m carriageway space to provision of these facilities.

Each bridge has a carriageway cross section of 7.25m or less, so it is not possible to develop new segregated facilities compliant with LTN 1/20 without removing traffic lanes, removing pedestrian footpaths, or reconstructing the bridges. It is for this reason that an LTN 1/20 compliant solution has been found to be not feasible.

70. Skeldergate Bridge does have cycle lanes at present, but these are below the current LTN 1/20 minimum width guidelines of 1.5m as they are less than 1m wide. The bridge is the widest of the three (7.25m), but the designer does not recommend to implement 1.5m cycle lanes on the bridge given this would still lead to substandard vehicle lane widths which would introduce its own safety issues.
71. The designer considered the use of double white lines. These prohibit drivers from entering the carriageway used by opposing traffic. In order to implement “No Overtaking” restrictions on the city centre bridges, an approved Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be required. However, these orders were ruled out by the designer because they are not seen as suitable or enforceable on these specific bridges. This is also the case for “No Overtaking” signs. Therefore, the designer did not recommend further investigation of these options

72. Speed reduction from 30mph to 20mph was considered, however the designer did not recommend that this is a suitable solution for such a short section of road. This could be an effective change as part of a wider 20mph zone within the city centre, but would have to be explored separately.
73. Figure 1 – Proposed Sign to raise awareness



74. These proposals are affordable within the currently available budget.

## **Programme Budget Summary**

### **Background**

75. Annex 5 contains an overall budget summary for the programme covering original funding, spend in previous years, and remaining budget. The recommendations contained within this report make reference to the current budget assignment for the programme and for individual projects.
76. The February 2022 EMDS Active Travel Programme report highlighted the issue that there is insufficient budget within the programme to deliver every scheme.
77. A decision was made to make decisions on individual projects as and when sufficient information becomes available to make this decision, without waiting for cost estimates to be available for every project on the programme. This is the approach that has been taken to date.
78. This report expands on this approach and lays out budget considerations relevant to the decisions presented within this report.

### **Options**

79. Option 6 - Support the approach to managing the programme budget laid out in this report. Note the programme budget summary attached in Annex 5.
80. Option 7 – Do not support the proposed approach to managing the budget and attempt to work up an alternative approach.

## **Analysis**

### Option 6

81. Please refer to the programme budget summary attached as Annex 5.
82. This summary shows that sufficient funds are available to progress the recommendations presented for Navigation Road and City Centre Bridges schemes. This funding is provided from the Local Transport Plan government funding rather than specific Active Travel Fund government funding.
83. This summary shows that a total of £1.127M of primarily government grant funding is shared across 6 schemes, many of which are very significant in ambition and scope. This includes the A1237 Bridge Scheme, Wheldrake / Heslington Path scheme, and the People Streets at Ostman Rd schemes, which are presented for decision within this report.
84. Of this sum, £128k has been spent in previous years across all six schemes. This includes commissioning of feasibility work and associated costs.
85. This summary demonstrates that there are insufficient funds within the programme to implement the Wheldrake / Heslington scheme where high level cost estimates are current in the range of ~£3M.
86. To increase the chances of delivering schemes on the ground, it is proposed to consolidate the budget from schemes that are shown to not be feasible in practical or budgetary terms. This is reflected within the recommendations for each individual scheme.
87. Due to the fact that a portion of this funding is from the Active Travel grant, This approach requires support from the Department for Transport, and this will be sought through direct communication.

88. Initial conversations have been undertaken between officers and representatives of the DfT and Active Travel England. No formal agreement has yet been reached, however officers are confident that we can satisfy the requirements of the funding body.
89. The People Streets at Ostman Road scheme is also part of this £1.227M budget, however it should be noted that the government did not grant the Authority with funding to specifically deliver this scheme. It is therefore important that separate funding is sought to deliver this scheme so that the government grant funding can be shown to have been spent in line with the grant conditions.

## **A1237 Bridge Scheme**

### **Background**

90. This scheme originated from a bid to government for Active Travel Fund support. This partially successful bid is attached as Background Paper 1.
91. In February 2022, the Executive Member for Transport approved the project outline attached in Background Paper 5 for the scheme to convert the outline bid into a defined piece of work.
92. Feasibility work has been completed and this report lays out the conclusion of that work, including recommendations to divert limited resources to other schemes within the programme and pursue a more limited piece of work through the Safety Scheme Review.

### **Options**

93. Option 7 - Agree to reassign resources to the wider programme, subject to DfT support.

Consideration of comprehensive Active Travel Provision is to be explored as part of the Outer Ring Road works.

Shorter term safety interventions to be considered as part of the separate Safety Scheme Review.

94. Option 8 – Do not agree to reassign resources, and attempt to explore alternative ways to achieve significant Active Travel improvements.

### **Analysis**



## Option 7

95. Feasibility work for this scheme has been completed and is attached as Annex 10. The content of the report will not be replicated here, but key points will be highlighted and addressed to support a decision.
96. The primary conclusion of this work is that the scheme is not viable and the objectives cannot be achieved within the currently approved scope.
97. The key reason that the scheme is not feasible relates to practical engineering considerations of implementing civil construction works on the bridge. The feasibility report finds:

*“The bridge decks preclude the construction of any intrusive works including a stepped or segregated cycle track as this would impact on the integrity of the bridge structure and the side-inlet drainage provision. This along with the constrained width severely restricts the options available within the current highway corridor. It is therefore not considered feasible to produce an active travel scheme within the existing corridor that provides a safe, smooth, and attractive facility for pedestrians and cyclists [...]”*

98. Rather than simply return the remaining funding to the government it is proposed that officers attempt to obtain support from the DfT to keep the funding within the programme, to increase the chances of successful delivery of the remaining schemes.
99. There are currently plans for the Outer Ring Road project to extend to this area of the ring road. Whilst it is not possible to make any decisions at this point on the detail of the Outer Ring Road scheme at this location, it can be stated that any such scheme would appropriately consider active travel provision as part of its proposals. This is seen as the most likely viable route to substantially improving active travel provision at this location.

## Option 8

100. This option rejects the proposal to reassign resources and represents the decision to pursue alternative means to achieve the current objectives of this scheme, prior to any work on the Outer Ring Road scheme.

101. There are currently no identified potential routes to achieve this, and this option is therefore not recommended.
102. The feasibility report attached as Annex 10 does suggest pursuing a potential new bridge over the river and rail line to provide a dedicated active travel facility. This is not supported or recommended for a number of reasons.
103. Undertaking work to explore the creation of a new bridge would present new risks to the existing Outer Ring Road project in terms of any potential Compulsory Purchase processes and is therefore not supported.
104. Without undertaking any feasibility on a new bridge it can be safely assumed that costs would be in the multi-million pound range. This is clearly outside of the budget of the current programme.
105. Pursuing more limited safety improvements is already proposed as part of Option 7.

## **Wheldrake / Heslington Scheme**

### **Background**

106. There has been an ambition to provide a high quality active travel corridor between the villages of Wheldrake and Heslington for many years. Previous studies have explored potential options for implementation, but have generally identified significant challenges relating to costs and land ownership issues.
107. City of York Council received grant funding to explore this scheme once again in the 'Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2' round of bidding, see Background Paper 1.
108. In February 2022 the Executive Member approved the outline of this piece of work, which can be found in Background Paper 4.
109. In parallel, CYC have been working with Sustrans to undertake a similar piece of feasibility on a route between Heslington and Elvington. This piece of work has recently concluded and provides a lot of information that is relevant to this scheme.

110. This report lays out the conclusions that have been reached based on this report and other work completed to date.

## **Options**

111. Option 9 - Agree to reassign resources to the wider programme, subject to DfT support.

Pursue the existing feasibility work instead via the forthcoming LCWIP.

Continue to engage with upcoming developments in the local area to ensure that active travel provision is considered appropriately.

112. Option 10 – Undertake further feasibility work now, with a view to progressing the scheme as far as possible.

## **Analysis**

### **Option 9**

113. Sustrans have undertaken a feasibility study covering a potential active travel route between Heslington and Elvington (not Wheldrake), refer to Annex 9. The content of the report will not be replicated here, however key points will be highlighted and addressed to support a decision.

114. This feasibility report does cover a significant section of route that is relevant to the Heslington / Wheldrake route and some reasonable assumptions can be made based on this report.

115. This report gives a high level cost estimate in the order of £4M for provisions of a route between Heslington and Elvington.

116. Whilst costs would clearly not be the same for a route between Heslington and Wheldrake, it is reasonable to assume that costs would be in the same order of magnitude, especially as a significant part of the route is the same.

117. Based on these estimates, there is insufficient budget within the programme to deliver this scheme. Even if all other schemes within the programme were closed down and their funding diverted to this scheme there would still be insufficient budget to implement a scheme on the ground.

118. Initial conversations have been undertaken with relevant landowners on the routes to understand the land ownership implications. The detail of these conversations cannot be reported publicly due to data protection considerations, however land ownership issues do continue to be a secondary significant barrier to scheme feasibility.
119. It is recommended that officers attempt to obtain support from the DfT to keep the funding within the programme and re-assign it to other schemes to increase the chances of successful delivery of the remaining schemes.
120. Further work on this scheme is proposed to be undertaken via the forthcoming LCWIP.
121. It should also be noted that opportunities exist to achieve potential benefits through upcoming large scale developments in the local area, including consideration of active travel provision. This will be pursued as part of this option.

## Option 10

122. This option involves pursuing the scheme further and commissioning a detailed piece of feasibility work on this specific route.
123. A cost estimate has been obtained through an expression of interest process and this is estimated to cost approximately £265k.
124. This is not seen to be a cost effective use of the funds and is therefore not recommended.

## **People Streets at Ostman Road**

### **Background**

125. High volumes of traffic along Ostman Road at peak school pick-up and drop-off times, especially outside Carr Infants and Junior schools, has been identified as an issue that impacts the safety of children and parents as they make their way to school. There is also a desire to encourage modal shift away from motor vehicles onto more sustainable modes of transport.
126. In 2020, Sustrans carried out a one day trial in which temporary build-outs were placed outside Carr Junior school during peak times to discourage parents from parking outside schools and make the roads

safer for children. The trial was popular amongst parents and residents interviewed.

127. A successful grant funding bid was made to the Department for Transport to take this further, with the bid text stating:

“After a successful trial of a people street concept at Carr Junior School in association with Sustrans last year we are including changes to Ostman Road in Acomb as a pilot scheme in this application for potential future rollout across the city” , refer to Background Paper 1.

128. In the February 2022 Executive Member Decision Session, the Executive Member for Transport approved the Project Outline for this scheme (Background Paper 6), turning the broad bid text into a firm scheme for officers to progress.

129. Feasibility work has now been completed and a summary report can be found in Annex 8.

130. This report concludes that none of the proposed options are affordable within current budgets, however the recommendation is to seek additional grant funding at the next round of Active Travel funding to allow the scheme to progress to delivery.

## **Consultation**

131. An electronic consultation has been carried out with local ward councillors for Acomb and external stakeholders. Targeted external stakeholders included residents and businesses on and in the immediate vicinity of Ostman Road, and parents and staff affiliated with Carr Infant and Junior Schools.

132. Refer to Annex 7 for a summary of the consultation responses received.

133. The majority of respondents (53%) used the street to drop off and collect children from school. Cars were the most prevalent mode of transport used by respondents (43%), with walking the second most common mode (39%) and cycling third (12%).

134. Asked about the conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, the responses indicated that the current provision is not good. Most respondents agreed that action needed to be taken to improve pedestrian safety and amenity

on Ostman Road.

135. The purpose of this scheme is to encourage people to walk and cycle to school by improving conditions. 40% of respondents said they would walk / cycle instead of driving if conditions improved. 36% of respondents were undecided on this question, and 25% of respondents indicated they would not change modes even if conditions were improved.
136. This feedback suggests that there is a real possibility of influencing people's behaviour and that there is a level of support for interventions to re-prioritise the roadspace. There were however several concerns relating to how that would be achieved.
137. In terms of potential changes to restrictions there was no single option that gained majority support, with a restriction on peak time parking being the most popular (47%). 24% of respondents did not support any form of additional parking restrictions.

Other pieces of key feedback included:

138. There were several doubts that parking restrictions would be enforced, with concerns raised that those restrictions that are currently present are not effectively enforced. This is a valid concern that will be investigated in more detail at the next stage of the scheme, however officers are confident that an effective enforcement arrangement can be implemented.
139. A common piece of feedback was that parking restrictions would move traffic and parking to neighbouring streets. This is likely correct; based on the consultation feedback officers believe a certain portion of motorists would still drive even if conditions were improved for pedestrians and cyclists. This should be seen as one of the primary downsides of this scheme and officers are not able to offer a complete mitigation to this issue. As with all parking restrictions in the city, there would be an unavoidable level of traffic redistribution.
140. On this point, a common piece of feedback was that a number of respondents indicated that they had no alternative to driving, whether due to their work schedule or other related practicalities. This is understood and it should be understood that this scheme will significantly disbenefit some motorists.

141. Several consultees responded with specific feedback relating to their disability. It should be noted that there were a significant number of these responses that are not included within the attached annex due to the fact that they contained personal data. These responses will be given special consideration here.
142. This feedback generally indicated that they didn't feel they would be able to access the school at all if restrictions on parking were introduced, either due to mobility related disabilities or due to the specific disabilities of their children, for example learning disabilities. The impact on these users is different to the impact on general motorists and is potentially much more significant.
143. It is therefore proposed that when the parking restrictions are turned into a formal Traffic Regulation Order that exemptions are considered to ensure that users with disabilities appropriately considered. The feedback from this consultation process has been especially helpful in this regard and further more targeted consultation and assessment of any impacts on this issue will be undertaken prior to implementation.
144. Another common point raised by residents of Ostman Road and neighbouring streets was a feeling that they should have some form of priority or special consideration on the street by merit of being a resident. The primary purpose that this is usually achieved is by means of a residents parking scheme, however this is not being proposed in this case.
145. There were several responses that suggested removal or diversion of bus services would improve the situation because buses often get caught up in the traffic and contribute to the congestion.
146. It is accepted that buses do get caught up in traffic and block the street on occasion, however officers do not support the idea of solving this issue by restricting bus access. Public Transport is senior to car borne commuting on the Council's Road User Hierarchy, and therefore it is proposed that a more strategically consistent approach is to restrict the motor vehicle side of the issue rather than the buses.

## **Options**

147. Option 11 - Note the outcome of the feasibility work for the 'People Streets at Ostman Road' scheme laid out in this report, and decide to seek further funding before proceeding to implementation.

Seek Active Travel grant funding support at the next round of bidding.

Progress with detailed design work on 'Design Option 1' described in the attach Feasibility report, in advance of receiving additional funding.

## Analysis

### Option 11

148. The attached Feasibility report (Annex 8) explores 3 preliminary design options that each achieve the objectives of the scheme, but have slightly differing features and cost estimates.

### 149. Cost Estimates Table – People Streets @ Ostman Road

	<b>Design 1</b>	<b>Design 2</b>	<b>Design 3</b>
Feasibility work <i>(already incurred)</i>	£35,974	£35,974	£35,974
Further design and development	£58,794	£64,873	£83,308
Construction	£419,959	£463,380	£595,055
Risk margin	£191,501	£211,302	£271,345
<b>Total</b>	<b>£706,228</b>	<b>£775,529</b>	<b>£985,682</b>

150. As per the programme budget summary (Annex 5), there are insufficient funds within the budget to deliver any of the proposals. It is therefore recommended that additional funding from the next round of government Active Travel grants is sought prior to implementation.

151. Such a bid would be more likely to be successful if CYC could present a 'shelf-ready' scheme with most of the work complete, instead of a broad outline of intentions. The work that has already been completed goes a long way to achieving this, however progressing a specific design proposal to the detailed design stage would go even further to achieving this aim.

152. Officers are recommending that Design Option 1 within the attached report is progressed to detailed design immediately following this decision session. This option achieves the objectives of the project and is the cheapest of the proposals, which will go some way to improving the chances of receiving additional funding.



153. The traffic regulation order that is proposed to be included within the detailed design is a peak-time no-parking zone. This is the restriction that received the most support in the consultation process (see Section 7) and officers are confident that it can be implemented in a way that will achieve the objectives of the scheme.
154. Trialling a traffic restriction prior to any built environment changes is not being offered as an option. Advice from the Principal Designer indicates that the built environment changes are an essential part of the scheme in terms of achieving the objectives, and a trial without the physical changes would not be successful, nor would it provide any valuable learning.
155. Recorded personal injury accident data shows there was one incident in this location, 'slight' in severity, recorded between 01/01/2017 and 31/12/2021. The incident occurred between a moving vehicle and a parked car. This does not represent a significant trend that can be directly addressed, however design proposals were still created with safety as a priority consideration. Also, despite there not being a significant safety issue recorded on the street, the objectives of encouraging modal shift remain pertinent.
156. Replication of the 2021 Sustrans trial design layout was considered however it was found that this layout could not be implemented permanently to a high standard due to the fact that the carriageway is constructed of jointed concrete, therefore making such a solution extremely cost-prohibitive.
157. The recommended design solution includes the following features:
- Gateway markings to indicate a changed priority space and to make restrictions more visible.
  - Introduction of a peak-time parking restriction between gateway features.
  - Replacement of concrete footway with improved surface to allow implementation of a shared space facility.
  - Planting features, benches and public realm improvements to make the route more desirable for active travel users, to encourage modal shift.
  - Installation of 2 new parallel pedestrian and cycle crossings.

Installation of benches and planting to improve public realm, therefore encouraging modal shift.

Renewal of existing road cushions and speed tables.

158. Implementation of the proposed changes requires the removal of a number of trees. It is proposed to replace these trees, and in greater number.
159. Existing conditions and all design proposals scored Amber on the LTN 1/20 Junction Assessment Tool (JAT). This is due to the only significant junction change being the continuous footway. However, due to the quiet nature of the street, the proposed facilities are considered appropriate.
160. Due to the fact that this scheme is intended to be funded through a government grant, the requirements of LTN 1/20 are especially relevant. Officers are confident that the proposed solution does offer a significant improvement, and that the reasoning provided to Active Travel England via the bid process will be sufficient to address this issue.
161. Existing conditions on Ostman Road scored below the 70% pass threshold at 66% on the LTN 1/20 Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) assessment. Design 1 would increase this score to a pass score of approximately 76%.
162. Surveys carried out on Ostman Road revealed that the majority of pedestrians cross near to the school entrances where there is currently a high occurrence of illegal parking. The TRO restricting parking within the gateway features will reduce the number of parked vehicles, clearing the road and making it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross.
163. Parallel crossings will make it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross the road, as they will be given priority.
164. The enhanced buffer will further separate children from the road, making it easier for parents to safely walk or cycle them to school.
165. Traffic flows along Ostman Road are considered low, meaning that cyclists can use it as an on-street quiet route in line with LTN 1/20 standards. The widened shared footway on the north and south sides of the road also offer space for children to cycle safely beside their parents.

## Option 12

166. This option still proposes to seek additional funding to implement one of the three preliminary design solutions, however involves undertaking further work to determine which option should be taken forward to detailed design.
167. It is thought that stakeholders may want to offer additional input on the detail of the proposals and that a further consultation could enable this.
168. This can be undertaken, however timescales mean that it is unlikely a 'shelf-ready' bid could be proposed to the government if this stage is added to the process, thus reducing the likelihood of receiving grant funding.

## Council Plan

169. "Getting Around Sustainably" is one of the key objectives of the Council Plan. The Active Travel Programme directly influences the outcome of this objective by pursuing tangible built environment improvements that strongly influence the way in which people travel around the city.

## Implications

- **Financial**

The Active Travel programme is funded from a combination of grant funding and council resources allocated through the capital programme. The recommended options within the report maintain the programme within the available budget. This is in line with the previous decision to prioritise schemes once costs were known for individual schemes. Where schemes cannot be delivered DfT confirmation will be needed before the grant funding can be reallocated.

- **Human Resources (HR)**

There are no HR implications

- **Equalities**

Refer to the attached Equalities Impact Assessment (Annex 12)

- **Legal**

It is the duty of a local authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:

- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
- (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.

Local authorities have a duty to take account of the needs of all road users, take action to minimise, prevent or deal with congestion problems, and consider the implications of decisions for both their network and those of others.

If the decision is made to give permanent effect to the temporary traffic order in this report, the decision maker should consider the criteria contained within section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in particular the duty to make decisions to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

- **Crime and Disorder**  
There are no Crime and Disorder implications
- **Information Technology (IT)**  
There are no IT implications
- **Property**  
There are no Property implications
- **Other**  
Highway implications are addressed in the body of this report.

## **Risk Management**

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

## Contact Details

**Author:**  
**Christian Wood**  
**Smart Transport Programme**  
**Manager**  
**Transport**  
**01904 551 652**

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**  
**James Gilchrist**  
**Director of Transport, Environment and**  
**Planning**

**Report**  **Date** 08/07/2022  
**Approved**

Shoaib Mahmood  
Transport Project Manager  
Transport

James Williams  
Transport Project Manager  
Transport

Nigel Ibbotson  
Transport Project Manager  
Transport

Beth Old  
Transport Project Manager  
Transport

Richard Milligan  
Transport Project Manager  
Transport

## **Specialist Implications Officer(s)** List information for all

**Financial:**  
Jayne Close  
Finance  
01904 554 175

**Legal:**  
Heidi Lehane  
Legal  
01940 555 859

**Wards Affected:** [List wards or tick box to indicate all]

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

## **Background Papers:**

Background Paper 1 - EATF Tranche 2 Application  
Background Paper 2 - ATF Tranche 3 Bid August 2021  
Background Paper 3 - Project Outline – City Centre Bridges v2.0  
Background Paper 4 - Project Outline – Wheldrake to Heslington v1.0  
Background Paper 5 - Project Outline – A1237 Scheme v1.0  
Background Paper 6 - Project Outline – People Streets at Ostman Road

## **Annexes**

Annex 1 – Project Outline – City Centre Cycle Parking  
Annex 2 – People Streets at Clifton Green PS  
Annex 3 – People Streets at Badger Hill PS  
Annex 4 - Active Travel Programme v6  
Annex 5 - Active Travel Programme Budget Summary Jul-22  
Annex 6 – Consultation Summary - Navigation Road v1.0  
Annex 7 – Consultation Summary – People Streets at Ostman Road  
Annex 8 – Feasibility Report – People Streets at Ostman Road  
Annex 9 – Feasibility Report – Heslington to Elvington  
Annex 10 – Feasibility Report – A1237 Bridge Scheme  
Annex 11 – Feasibility Report - City Centre Bridges v3.0a  
Annex 12 – Equalities Impact Assessment – People Streets at Ostman Road  
Annex 13 – Equalities Impact Assessment – Navigation Road

## **List of Abbreviations Used in this Report**

CYC – City of York Council  
DfT – Department for Transport  
ATE – Active Travel England  
LTN 1/20 – Local Transport Note 1/20  
ETRO – Experimental Traffic Regulation Order  
TRO – Traffic Regulation Order  
LCWIP – Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan  
NYP – North Yorkshire Police