

Meeting:	Executive Member for Transport Decision Session
Meeting date:	11/03/2025
Report of:	Director of Environment, Transport & Planning
Portfolio of:	Cllr Kate Ravilious, Executive Member for Transport

Decision Report: Riverside Path Improvement Scheme

Subject of Report

1. The riverside path is a key route on the York cycle network and is well used by pedestrians and cyclists, connecting the west of the city with the city centre and the Scarborough Bridge river crossing. The Riverside Path Improvement Scheme focuses on the section of the path that runs from the junction of Kingsland Terrace and Jubilee Terrace to Scarborough Bridge.
2. This report outlines the preliminary scheme proposed for the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme, providing an overview of its key features and objectives.
3. This report provides a detailed summary of the feedback and insights gathered during the public engagement process. It highlights the concerns, suggestions, and general sentiment of stakeholders.
4. This report aims to outline the necessary steps and approvals required to advance the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme to the next stages of the project governance process. It seeks to secure authorisation to proceed to detailed design and construction, planning permissions, and any other essential resources or endorsements needed to move forward with the project implementation.

5. In addition, this report will also report the findings of a key dependency to this project with regards to the Riverside Embankment Structural Review (Annex B), which evaluates the current condition of the embankment and outlines the potential risks and challenges, not only to the future of the embankments ongoing stability, but also any associated impact to the Riverside Path Improvements Scheme. This report seeks to facilitate a decision on the embankment's future maintenance plan and any impact/interaction with the proposed Riverside Path improvements.

Benefits and Challenges

6. The benefits of delivering the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme are that it aligns with Council Local Transport Strategy Vision for 2024 as indicated in the “Policy Basis for Decision” section of this report. This alignment supports several key documents, including York Council’s Local Transport Strategy 2024-2040, York Council’s Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (2024), the Council Plan for 2023-27, the York Climate Change Strategy (2022-2032), and the Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2022-2032).
7. Delivery of the scheme aligns with the bid made by City of York Council to the Active Travel England Funding Tranche 4 Grant Funding submission which was successful in May 2023.
8. At present, flooding across the area leaves the riverside path impassable for an average of 9 days each year, resulting in abandoned journeys and additional journey times for users who must seek an alternate route. End to end users will experience a journey time delay depending on their end destination. With 2,500 daily users impacted by these flooding events, the affordable scheme intends to increase the number of days the route is passable by an average of 4 days (with an average of 5 days remaining impassable).
9. The scheme looks to enhance provision for pedestrians and cyclists along the existing Riverside Path, catering for all users including those with mobility impairments. The scheme will upgrade and improve the layout for cyclists and pedestrians, not just along the Riverside Path but also the existing highway extent of Jubilee Terrace which leads to and from the Leeman Road area. Key areas for consideration include widening and segregating the existing path; lighting improvements; additional seating; improved surfacing; and reduction of the impact of flooding events by raising the path at

its lowest points. These improvements will provide an enhancement that enables use of the route all year round.

10. The location of the scheme means that key stakeholders including the Environment Agency and Network Rail must be consulted on any intended revision to the construction/layout of the path. For both stakeholders, defined processes are in place to obtain the relevant permissions for works to take place and CYC has no control of the speed at which these processes can be completed.

Policy Basis for Decision

York Council's Local Transport Strategy 2024-2040

11. The Riverside Path Improvement scheme aligns with the Council's Local Transport Strategy Vision for 2040. York's Local Transport Strategy 2022 to 2040, sets out the council's vision to reduce carbon emissions from transport by 71%, and to create a city that is open and accessible to everyone, with affordable and healthy transport wherever anyone lives.
12. Policy 2 of City of York Council's Local Transport Strategy 2024/2040, places walking at the top of the transport hierarchy followed by cycling, public transport and then disabled car drivers and passengers, vehicular traffic. The strategy also states that the 2040 aspiration is to have built a comprehensive network of lit, well-maintained walk, wheel and cycle routes around York.

York Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (2024)

13. The Riverside Path Improvement Scheme is a strategic link within the cycling network. The project is seen as second tier priority within the York Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (2024). The Riverside Path Improvement Scheme serves as a crucial component of the broader cycling network, enhancing connectivity and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians alike.
14. The Riverside Path Improvement Scheme increases the number of days the route is passable by circa four days on average, reducing disruption and improving reliability for active travel users. This helps to lessen the impact of flooding on the Riverside Path, supporting better accessibility along a key active travel route.

Council Plan for 2023-27

15. The proposals included in this report relate to the Council Plan for 2023-27 and its four core commitments of Equality, Affordability, Climate and Health.

Equality

16. The scheme aligns with the City of York Council's core commitments by creating a safe, accessible, and inclusive space that provides equal opportunities for all residents and visitors to travel, exercise, and enjoy the city. By improving lighting, widening the path, and reducing conflicts, the scheme aims to improve the user experience of the path for people of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds in order for them to benefit from the city's active travel infrastructure and to enhance opportunities for travelling independently.
17. Active travel infrastructure improvements enable more people to travel independently, particularly those who cannot drive or do not have access to a car. By providing safer and more accessible walking, cycling, and public transport connections, these enhancements empower individuals with greater freedom and mobility, reducing reliance on private vehicles and fostering inclusivity.

Affordability

18. The Riverside Path Improvement scheme supports the City of York Council's core commitments by improving an accessible, low-cost travel option that benefits all residents, particularly those most impacted by the cost-of-living crisis. By improving the path's safety, lighting, and usability, it encourages opportunities for walking and cycling, reducing reliance on more expensive motorised transport. This helps communities save on travel costs while building on their strengths by fostering healthier, more connected neighbourhoods.

Climate

19. The proposed improvements to the Riverside Path align with the ambitions of the Climate Change Strategy (2022 – 2032) to reduce emissions associated with transport. Reducing conflicts, improving lighting, reducing closures due to flooding and widening the path encourage walking and cycling along the route.

20. The improvements to the Riverside Path will promote increased use of the route, supporting greener delivery methods, and potentially creation of green jobs.
21. The York Climate Change Strategy aims to reduce the distance travelled by motorised vehicles. Enhancing the Riverside Path by reducing conflicts, improving lighting, and widening the path will support greater use of active travel modes, supporting the strategy's goal to enable active travel.
22. Improving the Riverside Path will enhance the attractiveness of the route for active travel mode users with the aim of increased usage of the Path, in turn resulting in improved health and wellbeing for York Residents which meets City of York Council Climate Change Strategy and the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Health

23. By improving infrastructure to provide more attractive options for the use of Active Travel modes, this will aid in the CYC Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2022 – 2032) ambitions in “Becoming a health generating city”.

Financial Strategy Implications

24. The scheme will be fully funded utilising allocation from the following resources; Active Travel England Funding award of £1.1m from Tranche 4 of the Active Travel Fund – Local Authority Funding, £500k from Agreed allocation from York Central budget , £80k from S106 developer contributions secured by the Council from York Central and £20k contribution from Riverside Path funding.

Active Travel Fund 4 Grant Funding	£1,053,000
Active Travel Fund 4 Grant Funding – Revenue	£49,000
Agreed allocation from York Central budget	£500,000
York Central S106 Contributions	£80,000
Assumed Recouped Funding (<i>to be determined</i>)	£20,000
Total Scheme Funding	£1,702,000

25. The total scheme cost is estimated at £1.7m. A high-level cost estimate has been prepared by the schemes Principal Designer as part of the preliminary design process and includes a reduced contingency risk allowance of 10%.
26. It should be noted that some estimates are provisional, and as the scheme and design advance, cost estimates will have a greater degree of certainty.
27. The following table summarises the main cost elements for the Scheme.

Costs to date	£279,908
Detailed Design costs (estimate)	£162,000
Internal costs	£142,892
CAVAT (Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees)	£45,000
Third Party Costs (Network Rail + Environment Agency)	£22,200
Construction Cost	£938,000
Risk Contingency (10% of Detailed Design and Construction)	£112,000
Total Scheme Cost	£1,702,000

28. The proposed scheme design results an increased amount of adopted highway (circa 6700 m²) therefore this would need to be considered as part of future highways maintenance planning with associated costs being a public expense.
29. The preliminary design for the scheme also proposes to remove 3 trees along the route of the path, therefore as per the Arboricultural Policy for City of York Council (2017), a compensation value for removal of public tree has been accounted for in the table above. This value needs to be calculated using the recognised valuation system CAVAT (Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees).
30. The cost estimate for the scheme includes provisions for planting five new trees as a compensatory measure to offset the loss of existing trees.

31. To acknowledge that additional value engineering may be necessary to align the project with the allocated budget. This process may involve reviewing design elements, materials, and construction methods to identify cost-saving opportunities. Any proposed adjustments will be carefully assessed and impact on the scheme objectives and reported to Director of Environment, Transport, and Planning (paragraph 37).
32. The risk contingency has been reduced to 10%, which presents a potential affordability risk for the proposed scheme. As a result, value engineering may be required to ensure the project remains within budget.

Recommendation and Reasons

33. The Executive Member is asked to:
34. Approve one of the following options:
 - a) Option 1: progress the Riverside Path Improvement scheme to detailed design and construction, based on the scheme proposals and preliminary design inclusions set out within the “Options Analysis and Evidential Basis - Affordable Scheme” section of this report (beginning at paragraph 91) and take no action in relation to the Riverside Path Embankment Stability issue, noting the impact this may have on the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme and acknowledging the risk of the embankment instability identified within the recent Riverside Path Embankment Stability Report of 2024 (included at Annex B).
35. Option 2: progress a separately resourced and funded project to identify and confirm the remedial works required to improve Riverside Embankment stability, as set out within the “Options Analysis and Evidential Basis – Riverside Embankment Stability” section of this report and Annex B, and provide recommendations to a future Executive Member Decision Session and progress the Riverside Path Improvement scheme to detailed design based on the scheme proposals and preliminary design inclusions set out within the “Options Analysis and Evidential Basis - Affordable Scheme” section of this report (beginning at paragraph 91) but delay construction until the dependency on the Riverside Embankment Stability issue is fully determined and resolved.

36. Approve the procurement of a Principal Contractor and Principal Designer for the Riverside Path Improvement scheme and delegate authority to the Director of Environment, Transport & Planning (in consultation with the Director of Governance and the Head of Procurement) to take such steps as are necessary to procure, award and enter into the resulting contracts but note that, in the event Option 2 is approved and the identification of the remedial works required results in the construction costs being in excess of the Key Decision threshold, a further report will be presented to a future Executive meeting.
37. Delegate authority to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning to proceed with all necessary technical work, including preparation of a detailed design, investigation and conduct of diversions of statutory-undertakers apparatus to enable the works in regard of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.
38. Delegate authority to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning to approve the final design to be delivered for the Riverside Path Improvement scheme unless the scheme objectives or cost tolerances cannot be met without significant alteration to the preliminary design in which case a further report will be submitted to a future Executive Member Decision Session
39. Delegate authority to the Director of Environment, Transport, and Planning, in consultation with the Director of Finance, to carry out any necessary value engineering to ensure the Riverside Path Improvement scheme remains within budget.
40. Approve the submission of any relevant planning application(s) required to deliver the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme affordable solution and delegate authority to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning to do so.
41. Approve the advertisement of an amendment to the Traffic Regulation order to introduce 'Prohibition of cycling' restrictions on the Aldborough Way access ramp to the Riverside Path as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.
42. Approve one of the following options in respect of traffic management on Jubilee Terrace and approve any statutory consultation which may be required for the chosen option:

- a) Introduce 'No waiting at any time' restrictions on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme; or
- b) Introduce 'No Waiting 8 am – 6 pm Monday to Saturday' restrictions on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme; or
- c) Take no further action and do not introduce any waiting restrictions on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.

Background

- 43. In December 2022 a public engagement was undertaken to seek feedback from local residents and users of the Riverside Path to understand their priorities and concerns about the existing path and gather feedback on potential options for path improvements.
- 44. On 21 March 2023, a report went to Executive Member for Transport Decision Session. The following recommendations were made:
 - a) To note the results of the Riverside Path Consultation, the initial feasibility work undertaken by AECOM and the current funding gap.
 - b) Reason: To understand the options for improving the route and the priorities for the local residents.
 - c) To approve the progression of Option 2 to deliver the scheme on a phased basis commencing with the higher priority affordable items (lighting & CCTV) and undertake further development work within the current budget.
 - d) Reason: Progressing with Phase 1 of the path upgrade (lighting and CCTV) allows progress to be made on-site whilst further work is undertaken on the feasibility of the full scheme.
- 45. In May 2023, the Council was awarded the Active Travel England grant funding for £1.1 million.
- 46. The scheme was developed after the initial public consultation undertaken in December 2022, with various iterations presented to the Project Board in November 2023. The scheme that aligned with

the scheme objectives and technical feasibility was advanced to the preliminary design stage.

47. The preferred scheme cost estimate was £1.932 million, which incorporated full resurfacing of the existing path, incorporating new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings on Jubilee Terrace and substantial footpath elevation to address flooding impacts. However, this option was deemed unaffordable due to budget constraints.
48. To address this, the Principal Designer undertook value engineering to refine the scheme. During an informal briefing with Councillors and the Executive Member for Transport on September 9, 2024, an affordable alternative was presented by the Principal Designer.
49. This revised affordable scheme reduced the resurfacing scope for the existing path by 50% and limited the footpath elevation to 250mm. The affordable scheme intends to increase the number of days the route is passable by an average of 4 days (with an average of 5 days remaining impassable). These changes eliminated the need for works on the boundary fence and the Network Rail embankment to the rear of the fence, significantly reducing costs while meeting the core project objectives.
50. The affordable scheme was reviewed during the briefing. The Executive Member for Transport and the Head of Service instructed that the affordable scheme be progressed and presented with the public at the Public Engagement event to inform this Executive Member Decision paper.
51. A preliminary review of flood risk requirements, conducted in consultation with the Environment Agency (EA), has confirmed that a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) will be required for the proposed development.
52. At this stage, it is not feasible to submit a full permit application. Consequently, comprehensive flood and environmental risk assessments have not yet been completed. This presents a potential risk that constraints related to the proposed path, Floodplain Compensation Storage, or both, could be identified that might prevent the EA from approving a FRAP application. For instance, significant environmental constraints could emerge during the environmental risk assessment, and if deemed unacceptable by the EA, these would necessitate suitable mitigation measures to

progress the scheme. The FRAP application will be undertaken at Detailed Design stage for the Riverside Path Improvement scheme. The Risk is being managed through the schemes risk register and is currently deemed to be of medium impact with a low probability of occurring.

53. Meetings have been conducted with Network Rail regarding the proposed scheme to raise the path at low points in the Riverside Path to align with the Scarborough Bridge underpass as a method of increasing the number of days the path remains accessible during flooding. Such work would necessitate modifications to the existing boundary fence which runs along the riverside path and the embankment behind it with the embankment designated as Network Rail land. This process would require adherence to Network Rail's technical approval process, including entering into a Basic Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail who have provided a cost estimate for their technical assurance process. Combined with the costs of replacing the fence, conducting works on third-party land, and accounting for unknown risks, the overall expense was deemed significant. As a result, a reduced path-raising solution was proposed and adopted as the affordable scheme.
54. As the proposed footpath / cycleway works are located in close proximity to Network Rail infrastructure, this will require a Form G "Combined Certificate of Approval in Principle, Design and Check for Design Check Category I Permanent Works" to be submitted via Network Rail's Outside Parties process. This will allow Network Rail to scrutinise the proposed works before they grant approval, to satisfy themselves that the proposals will have no detrimental effect on the embankment.
55. The riverside embankment located to the west of Scarborough Bridge and extending for a length of 260 metres is currently in a state of disrepair. Until 2021, the embankment was leased from Helmsley Group, however at an Executive Decision Session in April 2021, it was agreed the land would be purchased and brought under the land ownership of City of York Council.
56. As part of the land purchase, a dilapidation survey of the embankment was undertaken by a third party survey contractor in 2021, which identified the need for remedial work to address the embankment's condition. No action was taken in response to the findings of this report when received.

57. Recognising the need for an updated assessment, the Riverside Improvement Scheme project commissioned Mason Clarke to provide an assessment of the embankment's condition and to understand the impact on the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme project and potential risks associated with not addressing the necessary repairs in the following time frames; short term (1- 3 years), medium term (3 – 5 years), long term (5yrs +). A copy of the report can be found in Annex B - Riverside Embankment Stability Report, November 2024. The Contractor was asked to summarise remedial actions and provide high level cost estimates for the following;
- a) Works required to make the embankment safe (minimal interventions) in preparation for Riverside path construction.
 - b) Works required to the embankment to optimise the lifespan of the proposed new Riverside path to be constructed.
58. In addition to improving accessibility and resilience for active travel users, the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme aligns with York's wider flood resilience strategy. The project supports the objectives of Ousewem, a City of York led project funded by Defra as part of the £200 million Flood and Coastal Innovation Programmes which is managed by the Environment Agency. Ousewem is an innovative flood resilience project identifying and delivering nature-based solutions (NbS), including natural flood management (NFM) to reduce flood risk in vulnerable North Yorkshire communities, spanning Yorkshire's Swale, Ure, Nidd and Ouse (SUNO) catchments. This project is in partnership with North Yorkshire Council, JBA, Natural England, Yorkshire Dales Rivers Trust, and the University of York.
59. As part of this wider effort, the Riverside Path will form a key section of the "York River Walk" an initiative designed to connect communities with York's flood and climate resilience work. Through educational elements along the route, this walk will highlight the role of upstream land management in reducing flood risk, while also supporting biodiversity, tree planting, and carbon reduction efforts. By integrating flood awareness into an accessible, well-used route, this initiative will help engage residents, visitors, and stakeholders in the city's long-term climate adaptation strategy.

Consultation Analysis

60. A public consultation on the proposed preliminary design for the Riverside path improvement scheme was undertaken between the 6th November and the 1st December 2024 which offered the general public an opportunity to view preliminary design drawings for the Riverside Path scheme online and complete a survey response.
61. Three engagement events were held to provide the public further opportunity to view plans and discuss the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme with members of the project team.
62. The engagement events were held on the following:
 - Tuesday 12 November, 2.30 pm – 7 pm at St Barnabas Church
 - Thursday 14 November 5.30 pm – 6.30 pm – Online event
 - Thursday 21 November 2.30 pm – 7 pm at St Barnabas Church
63. A summary of the results of consultation is included in Annex C.
64. The consultation was split into three sections based on the preliminary design proposal.
65. Section A covers the extent of Jubilee Terrace which connects Kingsland Terrace to Cinder Mews,
66. Section B1 covers the western end of the existing active travel pathway which runs alongside a wide expanse of grassed area for around 400 metres.
67. Section B2 covers the eastern end of the existing active travel pathway which runs along the top of an existing pitched stone revetment through to Scarborough Bridge for around 300 metres.

Section A

68. 64.4% of responses believe the design proposed for Section A, meets the scheme objectives in enabling active travel by reducing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

- 69. 63.4% of responses believe the design proposed for Section A will help improve walking, wheeling and cycling access to the riverside path.
- 70. 62.4% of responses believe the design proposed for Section A will enhance opportunities for walking, cycling and other forms of active travel.
- 71. 58.7% of responses support the proposed design for Section A

Section B1

- 72. 90.6% of responses believe the design proposed for Section B1 meets the scheme objectives in reducing conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
- 73. 90.1% % of responses believe the proposed design for Section B1 enhances opportunities for walking, cycling, and other forms of active travel.
- 74. 94.4% support the design (in Section B1) in providing a segregated path for pedestrians and cyclists whilst maximising capacity and retaining the existing tree line.
- 75. 88% support the lighting provisions proposed in Section B1
- 76. 86.8% support the proposed design in Section B1
- 77. 78.7% supported the resting areas proposed in Section B1

Section B2

- 78. 93.4% supported raising the level of the footpath to reduce impact of flooding.
- 79. 92.3% supported the design in improving visibility through the bridge.
- 80. 86% supported the proposed design for Section B2
- 81. 77.6% agreed that the proposed design to widen and realign the shared-use path near Scarborough Bridge improves visibility through the underpass.

Overall

82. 85.6% supported the full design proposed for the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.

Conclusion

83. Section B1 and B2 received the most support, scoring 86.8% and 86% of support from the responses. Section A received 58.7% support.
84. 34% of the responses in the free-text box for Section A focused on themes related to parking concerns, displacement of parked vehicles from Jubilee Terrace to other areas around Leeman Road, and general parking comments.
85. 23% of the responses in the free-text box for Section B1 highlighted themes of safety and lighting.
86. 31% of the responses in the free-text box for Section B2 addressed themes concerning cyclist and pedestrian interactions.

Active Travel Review

87. Active Travel England were asked to undertake an external design review of the preliminary design proposal. ATE Inspectors carried out this review using the latest ATE design guidance and Scheme Review and Design Assistance Tools to check the quality of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme proposals.
88. The existing route of the Riverside Path achieved a score of 44% in ATE's street/ path tool check, with the preliminary design proposal (Annex E – Riverside Path Improvement Scheme General Arrangement Drawing) receiving an increased scored of 73%.
89. The review identified a policy conflict in Section B2 of the preliminary design with regards the inclusion of a “shared path” in the immediate area of the Scarborough Bridge underpass that may affect the safety of active travel users.
90. The ATE inspector recognised the spatial constraints that dictates the use of shared space in this area providing the following comment:

- a. *“Shared-use provision affects the attractiveness and desirability of the route, particularly for pedestrians and people with disabilities. Cyclists would not be separated from pedestrians leading to potential conflict between people walking, wheeling and cycling. Consider options to separate use to offer a higher level of service and legibility for all users. However, given that constraints appear to dictate that shared use is the only means of providing a continuous cycling facility this may not be significant. Route usage should be monitored to assess any conflicts at peak times and to ensure provision is suitable as the wider active travel network is developed over time.”*

- 91. The Riverside Path Improvement project’s Principal Designer has provided the following comment in response to the policy conflict highlighted by the ATE review:
- 92. The fixed infrastructure, including the bridge and close proximity to the embankment, limits the possibility of separating pedestrian and cyclist traffic. Consequently, a shared-use path is the only viable option to maintain a continuous route.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis - Affordable Scheme

Preliminary Design Section A

93. The proposed design for Section A focuses on several key improvements. It formalises Blue Badge parking to meet current design standards and best practices, enhances road signage and markings, and introduces parking restrictions. A review of the chicane barriers will be carried out during the detailed design stage. The design aims to reduce conflicts between parked vehicles and the traveling public while also decreasing traffic volume and traffic speed through the implementation of the stated measures.

Description of the Changes

94. Prohibition of existing informal parking and removal of existing sub-standard disabled bays outside of St Barnabas Church through the introduction of a new Traffic Regulation Order (double yellow lines).
95. Removal of existing sub-standard disabled bays offset by the formalisation of 2 No. new disabled bays outside of the Vicarage in accordance with dimensions set out in Department for Transport's Inclusive Mobility design guidance
96. Improved signage and Road Markings to reinforce the carriageway is an area of shared space.

Reasoning

97. The assessment of the existing path identified a conflict with kerbside parking activity. To mitigate this, measures are needed to address the issues arising from parked vehicles, the narrow width of the road, and the interactions between multiple user groups—cyclists, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic—to ensure smoother and safer flow and to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles, in line with our transport hierarchy.
98. The ATE Street Check assessment of the proposed scheme design inclusions on Jubilee Terrace indicate an improvement in comparison to the existing layout.

Impact on Pedestrians

99. The removal of parked vehicles and an associated reduction in the number of vehicles proceeding in this length of carriageway will provide a wider and less heavily trafficked area for pedestrians to move through, allowing a smoother access/egress point for the Riverside Path.

Impact on Safety and on School Children

100. Removing parked cars outside the church and at the junction with the access road will improve sightlines for school children, allowing them to cross safely without obstructed views. Additionally, keeping the area clear of parked cars will enhance visibility of cyclists approaching from the riverside path, reducing the risk of conflicts near the school.

Impact on Cyclists

101. Removal of parking in the area provides a safer environment for cyclists within the carriageway and mitigates against conflicts between motorists and cyclists.
102. There will be less kerbside parking activity which will increase safety for cyclists by reducing such instances as car doors being opened into the path of oncoming cyclists, or parked cars pulling out. It is assumed the full carriageway width will be available therefore there will be more room for cyclists and pedestrians to use the shared space which will extend through the area.

Impact on Motor Vehicles

103. Vehicle access to the Vicarage will remain. Gated access to the field at the east end of Jubilee Terrace is proposed to be retained, with additional 'KEEP CLEAR' markings and double yellow lines proposed around the access to avoid instances of parking which restricts emergency / maintenance access.
104. Currently there is no road marking to prevent vehicular parking and blocking the gated access. It is to be noted the gated access is required for emergency service and maintenance vehicles to access the Riverside Path.

Impact on Parking

105. At present, there are no formalised parking bays on Jubilee Terrace, however there is space for an estimated 8 vehicles to park on the stretch of Road and these parking opportunities would be removed as a result of the design proposal for this area. Two blue badge parking bays are currently situated on Jubilee Terrace to the immediate frontage of St Barnabas Church and the scheme relocates these blue badge parking spaces c. 60 metres east of their current location to an area outside the Vicarage for accessibility purposes. The location outside the Vicarage has been selected to provide disabled parking facilities in accordance with Department for Transport's Inclusive Mobility Guidance as the existing blue badge bays either side of the Church entrance gate do not adhere to this guidance.
106. Furthermore, removal of bays from outside the church reduces kerbside activity in the narrowest section of Jubilee Terrace, with the exception of blue badge holders (see para 106).
107. If a Traffic Regulation Order is introduced along Jubilee Terrace, The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Order has an Exemption for vehicles being used in connection with a wedding or funeral at premises adjacent to that road.
108. Vehicles displaying a blue badge (including time clock) are eligible to park on waiting restrictions for a maximum of 3 hours.

Key theme from Public Consultation

109. 320 responses were provided in the free text box.
110. Out of the 320 responses received, 34% of the comments received, the key theme raised was the loss of parking outside the church. Some of the comments highlighted the potential impact of reduced parking on local residents and the church community.
111. The church has expressed concerns about potential impacts on its services and operations, while local residents worry it may lead to vehicles being parked outside their properties in other areas of Leeman Road.
112. A number of Comments (14%) were received that supported the removal of parking in this section outside the church, however

respondents raised concerns regarding how this parking restriction could be enforced, and how this might displace vehicles onto nearby streets. Multiple comments expressed concerns that the double yellow lines could be misused during school pick-up times with others calling for stronger measures to deter vehicle movement in this section.

113. Several respondents suggested extending the existing footpath outside the church. This proposal aimed to keep pedestrians off the road and away from vehicular traffic and cyclists. Some suggested introducing clear demarcation on the carriageway to define where cyclists should ride, helping to minimise potential conflicts.

Decision

Scheme Design

114. Option 1 - Proceed with the affordable scheme as presented during the public consultation. Advertise no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) to the length of Jubilee Terrace outside the church as part of a formal Traffic Regulation Order process. This option meets the Department for Transport's Inclusive Mobility Design Guidance, and supports the objectives within our Transport Strategy.
115. Option 2 –Respond to concerns raised around loss of car parking and either retain the existing carriageway layout in this section or propose alternative revisions to be investigated as part of a future detailed design process
116. Option 3 – Do not proceed with improvements to this section.

	Benefits	Risks
Option 1 – Proceed with affordable scheme as proposed in the GA drawing at Annex E	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meets scheme objectives• Reduced conflict on Jubilee Terrace between active travel modes and motor vehicles• Improved safety and accessibility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shared Space for active Modes is retained rather than separated space being introduced• Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process, may attract local resident objection – risk of delays.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves Active Travel England (ATE) score results • Potential to increase future funding opportunities with ATE as delivered a good scoring scheme • Aligns with ATE guidelines / best practise. • Ensures timely implementation without additional delays to the project timeline. 	
Option 2 – Amend scheme Remove proposed Parking restrictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses parking concerns raised by some local residents and St Barnabas Church representatives as part of public consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perception that motor vehicles and associated parking is prioritised by CYC over active travel <p>Conflicts with the Local Transport Strategy 2020-2040. (Hierarchy of transport priorities and enabling travel by active travel modes.)</p>
Option 3 – Do not proceed with improvements to this Section	<p>Creates potential further funding for improvements to made in sections B1 and B2 of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces probability of challenges to Traffic Regulation Order process • Maintains the status quo for car parking in the area and responds to concerns raised by some local residents and St Barnabas Church representatives as part of public consultation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address the conflict in this section • Increase usage of the Path will exacerbate the issue of conflict between different users • Scheme scope is reduced, potentially leading to a reduced scoring of the scheme from ATE • Does not provide blue badge parking to current design standards / guidelines. • Fails to prioritise active travel over vehicle travel and doesn't support objectives within our Local Transport Strategy

Officers Recommendation

117. Officers recommend proceeding with Option 1 of Section A, the affordable scheme as presented during the public consultation. This option represents a balanced and cost-effective approach to improving safety and accessibility along Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.
118. The proposed changes, including the introduction of double yellow lines and the formalisation of Blue Badge parking bays, aim to reduce conflicts between different user groups—pedestrians, cyclists, and motor vehicles. By removing informal parking and introducing stricter parking regulations, the scheme will significantly improve sightlines for pedestrians and school children, reduce congestion, and create a safer, more accessible environment for all users of the shared space.
119. In particular, the formalisation of two new Blue Badge bays outside the Vicarage ensures compliance with the Department for Transport's Inclusive Mobility guidelines in regards to, improving accessibility for blue badge holders. The proposed blue badge bays are located circa 60m away from the existing bays. The removal of sub-standard disabled bays outside the church, while potentially contentious, addresses the need for a safer and more accessible design, with the relocation of the Blue Badge parking offering a more accessible alternative. Vehicles displaying a blue badge (including time clock) are eligible to park on waiting restrictions for a maximum of 3 hours.
120. The improvements to road signage and markings will help define the shared space and reinforce pedestrian and cyclist safety. The removal of parking and the associated reduction in traffic volume and speed will create a less heavily trafficked space, which is beneficial for school children and pedestrians using the Riverside Path.
121. Public consultation highlighted concerns about the loss of parking, particularly from St Barnabas Church and its visitors, and local residents. The proposed restrictions aim to improve safety, even if this may result in some displacement of parking onto nearby streets.
122. While Option 2—amending the scheme to retain parking restrictions—could address concerns from the church and residents, it would not fully reduce the conflict between different user

groups or meet the scheme's objectives in terms of improving safety and accessibility.

123. Option 3, not proceeding with improvements to this section, would leave the current issues unresolved, increasing the likelihood of continued conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and parked vehicles due to the increased attractiveness of the route attracting more users.

Traffic Regulation Restrictions

124. Option 2a – undertake the Statutory Consultation to Advertise a proposal for ‘No waiting at any time’ restrictions on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.

125. Option 2b – undertake the statutory consultation to Advertise a proposal for ‘No Waiting 8am – 6 pm Monday to Saturday’ restriction on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.

126. Option 2c – Do not advertise any restrictions.

	Benefits	Risks
Option 2a - ‘No waiting at any time’ restrictions on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures clear access for pedestrians and cyclists, reducing conflicts with parked vehicles. Reduces traffic flow and conflict between different users. Improves safety along Jubilee Terrace by removing parking which improves sight lines for pedestrians and school children crossing the road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme moves parking for residents and church visitors away from the immediate vicinity of the church. However, parking is still available, albeit located further away, which could potentially lead to objections to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). May lead to displaced parking on nearby streets, causing congestion elsewhere. Requires enforcement to ensure compliance.
Option 2b – Single Yellow line with timed restriction Monday to Saturday 8am – 6 pm restrictions on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows for clear access for pedestrians and cyclists, reducing conflicts with parked vehicles during peak hours. Reduces traffic flow and conflict between different users during peak hours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still allows some parking, which may still cause conflict and reduce effectiveness. Requires enforcement to ensure compliance. Doesn't comply with our adopted transport hierarchy where pedestrians and cyclists are given greater priority than motorists.
Option 2c – No restrictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains the status quo for car parking in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not address conflict between different user groups.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not improve safety concerns for pedestrians / school children crossing Jubilee Terrace at Junction of the school. • Doesn't comply with the CYC transport hierarchy.
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Officers Recommendation

127. Officers recommend proceeding with Option 2A, which implements a 'No waiting at any time' restriction on Jubilee Terrace as part of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme. This option ensures clear access for pedestrians and cyclists, reduces conflicts with different users, and improves safety by enhancing sight lines, particularly for school children crossing the road. While it may lead to objections from residents and church visitors due to reduced parking availability, and could result in displaced parking on nearby streets, it is considered the most effective solution to enhance safety and accessibility and prioritise active travel modes. Enforcement may be required to maintain compliance and mitigate potential issues.
128. Option 2B, is a less restrictive measure, and we have not gathered feedback as part of the TRO process. If the TRO is advertised and other groups advocate for a stricter restriction, it cannot be implemented since a less restrictive measure has been advertised. While it is possible to reduce restrictions after the TRO advertisement, increasing them is not permitted.
129. Option 2C, maintains the status quo for car parking in the area, however it does not meet the scheme's objectives in terms of improving safety and accessibility and reducing conflict.

Preliminary Design Section B1

Description of the Changes

130. Provision of a new fully segregated 3m wide two-way cycle track extending from the eastern end of Jubilee Terrace to the point at which the existing path narrows on the approach to Scarborough Rail Bridge (~660m in total). New cycle track to run parallel to the existing path but on the river (field) side of the existing tree line.

131. Partial resurfacing the existing path and formalisation as a 3 metre wide pedestrian footway.
132. Introduction of three seating and cycle parking areas accessible from both pathways and consisting of hard standing areas for use year round
133. Improved provision of street lighting to illuminate both the footpath and the Cycle Track
134. Removal of one poorly formed tree/collection of bushes.

Reasoning

135. To maximise capacity, preserve the existing tree lines, and minimise conflicts between path users, the proposed scheme for this section includes creating a separated cycle path to the north of the existing tree line. The existing path would be repurposed as a pedestrian pathway, as it provides the most direct route between the access and egress points at either end of the path.
136. A single tree with branches encroaching cycle path is proposed to be removed. The tree is a poorly formed collection of stems from ground level with negligible future value.
137. The planting of 5 new trees to mitigate the tree loss along the extent of the scheme provides an opportunity to increase the quality, diversity and resilience of trees in close proximity to the Riverside Path.
138. The segregated path provides desirable width of the cycle track facilities in accordance with LTN1/20 Table 5.2.
139. Given the proposals to raise the level of the footpath in Section B2, the overall volume of land available to store flood water during a flood is reduced. To compensate for this, an area of land near Water End has been identified as an alternative location to provide this storage. The profile of the ground level will be lowered which will look like a dip in the field.

Impact on Pedestrians

140. The full width of the existing path will be repurposed as a pedestrian footpath increasing capacity and removing conflict with cyclists and

other path users. The footway resurfacing proposed will be at targeted locations where the existing surface is of a poor standard.

141. The lighting will be improved with dual headed lighting between the existing path and new cycle path.

Impact on Cyclists

142. The new, two way cycle track will provide additional capacity for cyclists to use the route and significantly reduce the potential for conflict with pedestrians in this section of the riverside path. The cycle track surface is proposed to be finished in a contrasting colour to the footpath to provide a clearly identifiable separation between the footway and cycle track for all users.
143. The proposed TRO restricting cycles from using the existing access ramp connecting the riverside path with the Aldborough Way estate will mean that cyclists moving through the estate will need to join the riverside path further west of the existing location within the Jubilee Terrace section of the route.
144. Lighting provision will be improved with dual headed lighting situated between the existing path and new cycle path.

Key Theme of Public Consultation

Path Orientation and Design Justification

145. The orientation of the path was a point of feedback during the consultation process and was also raised during in-person discussions. The current plan is to retain the existing path adjacent to the wall as a footpath while constructing a new path to serve as the cycle track.

Principal Designer's response

146. Several considerations influence the current proposal to position the cycle track on the riverside rather than adjacent to the wall. Although both configurations are feasible, the current proposal to locate the cycle track on the riverside side of the footway is supported by the following rationale:

Width Constraints

147. Placing the cycle track along the wall side of the route would reduce its effective width. According to LTN 1/20, a 0.5m buffer is required between vertical features over 600mm and cycle tracks (Table 5.3). Consequently, the cycle track would have an effective width of 2.5m, narrowing to 2m at pinch points, particularly near Scarborough Bridge. This configuration would fail to meet the width requirements outlined in Table 5.2 of LTN 1/20 for accommodating cycle flow demand. Additionally, widening the cycle track at pinch points would necessitate further tree removal.

Direct Route

148. The existing alignment is the most direct route for pedestrians. If this path were designated as a cycle track, pedestrians accustomed to using it may continue to walk along it, leading to potential conflicts and requiring a significant behavioural shift.

Cost Implications

149. Designating the existing route as a cycle track would require complete resurfacing, leading to increased overall project costs, likely to compromise an affordable solution

Accessibility Concerns

150. Positioning the pedestrian footway on the far side of the tree line would create additional safety and accessibility challenges. Pedestrians using the Aldborough Way ramp to access or exit the area would need to cross the cycle track to reach the footway. This could lead to increased potential for conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists, particularly in high-traffic periods, and may compromise the overall safety and efficiency of the route.
151. The ramp was also assessed against LTN 1/20 standards. It is too narrow to accommodate the design vehicle for cycling, particularly around the 180-degree bend, and the straight sections are also insufficiently wide for cyclists and pedestrians to pass safely. While the ramp does not currently restrict cyclists, the proposed design introduces a "no cycling" provision on the ramp for safety and compliance reasons.

Decision

152. Option 1 – Proceed with the affordable scheme as presented during the public consultation. Advertise a prohibition to cyclists using the ramp connecting the Aldborough Way estate with the Riverside Path as part of a formal Traffic Regulation Order process.
153. Option 2 – Incorporate key public engagement feedback and propose alternative revisions to be investigated as part of a future detailed design process
154. Option 3 – Do not proceed with improvements to this section.

	Benefits	Risks
Option 1 – Proceed with affordable scheme as GA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a cost-effective solution.• Reduces conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.• Improves lighting and capacity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May not fully address all public feedback.• The restriction of cyclist access via the ramp could be contentious.
Option 2 – Amend scheme incorporate public feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses public concerns and incorporates feedback gathered during consultation.• Potentially increases public satisfaction and alignment with community needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requires further design work, increasing time and cost.• May delay implementation.• Currently exceeds budget constraints and would necessitate cost optimisation measures / value engineering.
Option 3 – Do not proceed with improvements to this Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No additional expenditure or time.• Preserves the existing environment without changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Misses the opportunity to improve safety and capacity.• Conflicts between users remain unresolved.• Risk of having to return ATE funding due to failure to implement the proposed scheme.

Officers Recommendation

155. Officers recommend proceeding with **Option 1 (Section B1)** – the affordable scheme as presented during the public consultation. This option provides a cost-effective solution that aligns with the overall goals of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme, including improving safety, reducing conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians, and enhancing the overall capacity and usability of the path. By implementing the segregated cycle track and repurposing the existing path as a pedestrian footway, the scheme maximises the available space, preserving the existing tree lines while ensuring that both cyclists and pedestrians have dedicated areas, significantly reducing potential conflicts.
156. Furthermore, the proposed improvements to lighting and the creation of seating and cycle parking areas will enhance the user experience for all path users, making the space more accessible and safer year-round.
157. To ensure safety and compliance with the proposed design, cyclist access to the Aldborough Way ramp will be restricted through the use of 'cycling prohibited' signs. The existing ramp is narrow with a significant bend that does not meet design standards. Allowing cyclists to continue using the ramp would require them to cross the proposed pedestrian path to access the new cycle path, which could potentially lead to conflicts between users.
158. Amending the scheme to incorporate public feedback (Option 2) such as the orientation of the path would lead to increased costs potentially pushing the scheme out of affordability, additional design work, and potential programme delays, which may impact the delivery.
159. Not proceeding with improvements (Option 3) would forgo the opportunity to address ongoing safety and capacity issues with the existing path, leaving conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists unresolved, and could lead to the return of ATE funding due to the failure to implement the planned improvements.

Preliminary Design Section B2

Description of the Changes

- 160. Introduction of a 4.5 metre wide, kerb line separated stepped cycle track and footpath running along the top of the existing riverbank revetment
- 161. Introduction of an area of shared space 30m west of Scarborough bridge where cyclist and pedestrian separation ends
- 162. Raising of the existing footpath level by 250mm at 3 separate locations
- 163. Introduction of seating and cycle parking public realm space to the west of Scarborough Bridge
- 164. Improved provision of street lighting to illuminate both the footpath and the Cycle Track with a key focus on the illumination of the Scarborough Bridge underpass
- 165. Removal of two ash trees required to facilitate the new path development.

Reasoning

- 166. Within this section of the path, the available space at the top of the riverbank does not allow for the total separation of the cycle track and the footpath therefore a side by side design is proposed. The existing path is proposed to be widened to 4.5 metres and apportioned as a 2.5 metre wide bi-directional cycle track and a 2 metre wide footpath, separated by a 60mm high splayed kerb and with contrasting surface types.
- 167. The scheme aims to address the poor visibility through the narrow Scarborough Bridge underpass, whilst also meeting the scheme aims in reducing conflict.
- 168. Separation of cyclists and pedestrians will end 30 metres to the West of Scarborough Bridge where the area will be designated as shared space as path users approach/emerge from the narrowest point of the route at the Scarborough Bridge underpass. The area of shared space will be significantly wider than the existing location

of the path, resulting in clearer lines of sight through the underpass in an attempt to improve safety.

169. Removal of two ash trees are required to facilitate the new path development.

Impact on Flooding

170. Based on existing flood data, raising the path by 250mm at existing low points is expected to reduce the number of days the path is inaccessible from, an average of 9 days per annum to an average of 5 days, increasing accessibility by an average 4 days per annum (based on average number of days of flooding).
171. As per discussions with Environmental Agency, due to reduction of flood volume within the Flood Zone it is necessary to provide a like for like compensation in an alternative location.

Impact on Trees

172. The design proposes that two ash trees are removed to provide the space required for the segregated cycle path, and to protect the path from potential root uplift. As previously indicated in this report, the introduction of a minimum of 5 new trees to replace those removed as part of any future construction works is currently proposed.

Impact on Pedestrians

173. Where there is insufficient space to segregate on the approaches to Scarborough Rail Bridge (west and east sides), a localised section of shared use footway / cycleway is proposed amounting to ~55m in total. The shared use is to be supplemented with appropriate signing and tactile surfacing
174. Improved amenity for path users through the provision of additional seating and planting within the grassed area immediately to the west of Scarborough Rail Bridge, along with additional seating at regular intervals along the route.

Impact on Cyclists

175. Where the new segregated cycle track and the existing path converge to the west of Scarborough Rail Bridge, the two-way cycle track is proposed to be reduced to 2.5m.

176. Cycle parking is proposed.

Key Theme of Public Consultation

Cyclist and Pedestrian Interaction at proposed area of Shared Space

177. Consultation responses included numerous comments on cyclist and pedestrian interaction due to the shared space proposed at the Eastern end of the route. There were concerns regarding the narrowness of the Scarborough Bridge underpass, the current speed of cyclists of moving through the underpass and the lack of a requirement for cyclists to dismount whilst moving through the underpass.
178. Multiple comments from the public engagement events and the survey feedback suggested cyclists should be made to dismount whilst moving through the underpass. It was reported that historically signs requesting cyclists to dismount were present on the parapets of Scarborough Bridge when approaching westbound.
179. During the public engagement sessions, representatives from the project team highlighted that asking Cyclists to Dismount has implications for members of the cycling community who are using cycles as accessibility aids and therefore may not be able to dismount.
180. Additionally the enforcement of such a prohibition would be difficult to apply.

Footpath Level Raising

181. Several comments raised that the path raising was minimal where others were happy to see the path raising proposed.
182. The Principal Design limited the footpath raising to 250mm due to the fact that any further raising would require additional works to the boundary fence and Network Rail embankment which would increase costs significantly making the scheme unaffordable.

Safety and Lighting

183. Queries and concerns were raised regarding the lack of CCTV in the scheme and particularly within this section due to the anecdotal

instances of crime and anti-social behaviour observed from the public observed during late hours.

184. A preliminary feasibility assessment of CCTV was reviewed, including a review of historical crime records. The findings indicated that the level of crime was low given the year period and this may not have provided a justified intervention. The high costs associated with the design and installation of CCTV systems rendered the proposal financially unviable therefore this was not pursued in the affordable scheme.
185. It was raised that improved lighting is required within the Scarborough Bridge underpass as well as improved lighting along the full extent of the path.

Place making

186. There was a concern raised that the benches would exacerbate the anti-social behaviour at the location of Scarborough Bridge.

Decision

187. Option 1 – Proceed with the affordable scheme as presented during the public consultation.
188. Option 2 – Incorporate key public engagement feedback and propose alternative revisions to be investigated as part of a future detailed design process
189. Option 3 – Do not proceed with improvements to this section.

	Benefits	Risks
Option 1 – Proceed with affordable scheme for Section B2 of the General Arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides improved segregation of cyclists and pedestrians.• Reduces the number of flood-related path closures by raising path levels.• Enhances lighting and safety at critical areas, including the Scarborough Bridge underpass.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May not fully address public concerns about cyclist speed and shared space.• Excludes CCTV installation due to cost constraints, potentially leaving some safety concerns unaddressed.• Removal of two ash trees may draw criticism

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces additional seating and cycle parking for better user experience. • Ensures the route is accessible for all cyclists and pedestrians 	despite mitigation efforts.
Option 2 – Amend scheme incorporate public feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses public concerns by revising shared space design or adding features like additional signage or traffic calming measures. • May improve satisfaction by tailoring the scheme to address the public's needs and preferences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires additional time and resources for further design and consultation. • Could lead to increased costs and may make the scheme financially unviable. • Would require careful cost optimisation / value engineering to remain within budget. • Principal Designer and ATE are both unable to provide a satisfactory alternative to the use of Shared Space in the immediate area around the Scarborough Bridge underpass therefore a separated solution may not be achievable • Interventions such as barriers and cyclist dismount signs are likely to be in breach of the Equalities Act and could lead to legal challenge.
Option 3 – Do not proceed with improvements to this Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No immediate cost or resource investment. Avoids the removal of trees and potential environmental criticism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misses the opportunity to improve safety and user experience in the area. • Fails to address concerns about flooding, lighting, and user conflicts, leaving current issues unresolved. • Risk of having to return ATE funding due to failure to implement the proposed scheme.

Officers Recommendation

190. Officers recommend proceeding with **Option 1 (Section B2)** — the affordable scheme as presented during the public consultation. This option delivers a practical and cost-effective solution that aligns with the overarching goals of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme by enhancing safety, improving accessibility, and reducing conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.
191. The proposed design includes a 4.5m-wide segregated cycle track and footpath, raised path sections to mitigate flood-related closures, and improved lighting to enhance visibility, particularly at the Scarborough Bridge underpass.
192. Additionally, the introduction of seating and cycle parking will improve the overall user experience, making the path more functional and accessible throughout the year. While concerns were raised regarding cyclist speed in shared spaces, the absence of CCTV, and potential antisocial behaviour near Scarborough Bridge, the proposed scheme strikes a balance between safety, usability, and financial feasibility.
193. **Option 2**, which involves amending the scheme to incorporate further public feedback, would increase costs, potentially making the project unaffordable and delaying implementation.
194. **Option 3** - choosing not to proceed with improvements, would leave existing safety and accessibility challenges unresolved and could result in the loss of ATE funding due to the failure to implement the proposed enhancements, ultimately missing the opportunity to improve the Riverside Path for all users.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis – Riverside Embankment Stability

195. Option 1 – Take no action
196. Noting the current condition of the embankment has a negative impact on current use of the riverbank and is likely to have impacts in the future on the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme. Acknowledge the risk of the embankment instability identified within the recent Riverside Path Embankment Stability Report (November 2024) Annex B but proceed with the full delivery (design and construction) of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme, understanding that any failure of the embankment could directly affect the path and that construction of the path may result in land movement which further deteriorates the embankment stability and subsequent lifespan of both the path and embankment.
197. Option 2 – Parallel Delivery
198. Mandate a separately resourced and funded project with a brief to identify the need for remedial works to improve Riverside Embankment stability, generating recommendations for how this can be achieved in a report which will be brought before a future Executive Member Decision Session. Undertake detailed design work for the Riverside Path improvement Scheme but delay construction until the dependency on the Riverside Embankment Stability issue is fully determined and resolved. Deliver both Projects in parallel with delivery timelines to be aligned to provide one, robust, future proofed solution.

Officers Recommendation

199. Officers recommend Option 2 – Parallel Delivery as the preferred approach. This option enables the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme to progress without delay, while also addressing the Riverside Embankment Stability issue. By delivering both projects in parallel, the timelines can be aligned, ensuring a cohesive and future-proof solution. The parallel delivery model includes a detailed discovery phase to assess the full extent of embankment stability issues and how they may impact the construction of the Riverside Path. This approach ensures that both projects are developed with a comprehensive understanding of their interdependencies, allowing for effective risk mitigation. Additionally, it facilitates the identification of funding and resources required for both projects,

ensuring neither is delayed due to the uncertainties around the embankment's condition.

200. As part of project take on for embankment stability, a detailed discovery stage will need to be undertaken to understand the full magnitude of issues faced along the extent of the river embankment adjacent to the proposed Riverside Path Improvement Scheme, to better determine the level of dependent risk/mitigation between both schemes and both remedial options. Therefore no recommendation is provided regarding which remedial option should be progressed.
201. Riverside path improvement scheme project has a key dependency on the Riverside embankment stability outcomes with a key focus to understand how any proposed construction methodology for the Riverside Path would be impacted by the current condition of the embankment.
202. Any decision made with regards to the riverside embankment stability needs to consider how the works will be funded and resourced, and understand the impact and implications of such on the Riverside Path in greater detail.
203. Based on the high level cost estimate of the do minimum option recorded in Annex B - Riverside Embankment Stability Report, November 2024, a CRAM funding bid has been submitted for consideration as part of the 25/26 budget setting process. A total award of £600k has been requested which would be split across two tranches, £200k in 25/26 to support all works up to Detailed Design and £400k in 26/27 for delivery of the scheme on site.
204. The funding already in place for the delivery of the Riverside Path Improvement scheme is from a variety of sources and is focused purely on this scheme. It is unlikely that significant works to address the issue of Riverside Embankment Stability could be funded using these existing funding awards however, if the CRAM funding bid is unsuccessful then discussion with the relevant parties would likely be required.
205. Resource to support a separate project to address Riverside Embankment Stability would require input from the asset owner due to the technical nature of the issues to be addressed. Whilst Project Management resource could potentially be offered from the existing Riverside Path Improvement scheme, technical officers would be required from CYC's Flood/Public Realm/Property departments to

offer support in identifying the most suitable options to resolve the issues at the site.

	Benefits	Risks
Option 1 - Proceed with affordable Riverside Path Improvement scheme without addressing Riverside embankment stability issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional funding required Scheme can proceed immediately without further delays, project timelines held Avoids the need for further design or planning, streamlining the process. Maintains momentum and public confidence in the overall project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High risk of embankment failure Ongoing safety issues/environmental damage. In event of failure, impact to Riverside Path may result in path damage /closure Abortive work could result in wasted time, effort, and resources if the embankment later requires repair. Limited/no funding to address repairs if instability worsens requiring emergency interventions. long-term costs for both schemes likely to escalate CYC reputational damage due to perceived negligence in addressing foundational issues.
Option 2 – Parallel Delivery Riverside Embankment Stability to mandated as a separate project with both Projects delivered in parallel. (Riverside Path Improvement Scheme and remedial actions for Riverside Embankment Stability Issues)	<p>Enables a coordinated approach, aligning the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme with embankment stability efforts.</p> <p>Provides a clear plan to manage the interdependencies between both projects.</p> <p>Removes the risk of damaging the new path by resolving stability issues in parallel.</p> <p>Reduces potential long-term costs by integrating solutions early in the process.</p> <p>Builds confidence among stakeholders by addressing both concerns simultaneously.</p> <p>Allows for a robust review and comprehensive analysis to determine the most appropriate solution, whether partial or full reconstruction of the</p>	<p>Service Line accountability for Embankment stability still to be determined</p> <p>Embankment Stability has not been approved as a funded scheme – Lack of budget/Project Resources</p> <p>Challenges with securing CRAM funding</p> <p>Dependent Projects Increases project complexity, requiring effective management and coordination between teams.</p> <p>Overall Riverside Path project timeline would be impacted by any delays in the embankment work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays in identifying and agreeing on a Project Owner/Accountable Officer may slow project progress.

	<p>embankment, ensuring the long-term stability of both projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that the Riverside embankment stability issue is formally addressed, reducing the risk of proceeding with other projects that might be impacted by unresolved embankment concerns. Encourages a structured and coordinated approach by making embankment stability a dependency, potentially leading to better project outcomes in the long term. Clarifies accountability by assigning a responsible party (Project Owner/Accountable Officer), streamlining decision-making and progress. <p>Enables progress on the Riverside Path Improvement scheme, keeping the project active.</p> <p>Mitigates the risk of damaging the new path during embankment construction works.</p> <p>Maintains some stakeholder engagement and confidence by showing proactive steps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependency on embankment stability could stall other projects until these issues are resolved. Coordination challenges and additional funding requirements might arise if embankment issues prove to be more complex than anticipated. <p>There may be uncertainty or delays in progressing the project due to a lack of clarity on the financial implications of addressing embankment stability.</p> <p>Lack of clarity on how embankment stability issues will be resolved.</p> <p>Detailed design work could become abortive if impact of embankment adjustments requires significant re-design.</p> <p>Delays the commencement of the Riverside path construction.</p> <p>Any delays in the embankment works due to site risks or issues could impact the overall Riverside path project timeline.</p> <p>Delays to the Riverside Path could have an impact on funding</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Organisational Impact and Implications

206. ***Financial***

The total scheme cost is estimated to be delivered with £1.7m budget available. A high-level cost estimate has been prepared by the schemes Principal Designer as part of the preliminary design process and includes a reduced contingency risk allowance of 10%. This level of contingency presents affordability risk for the proposed scheme. Some estimates are provisional. There is a risk that cost will be greater than expected. The cost will be carefully monitored and any increases above the budget would require value engineering to reduce the costs or alternative budget will need to be found across the Transport Capital programme.

The proposed scheme design results an increased amount of adopted highway (circa 6700 m²) would need to be considered as part of future highways maintenance planning and covered from Highways budget.

207. ***Human Resources (HR)***

There are no HR implications contained within this report. However, should any additional resource be required by the Council to deliver the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme and/or future maintenance this would be established and resourced in accordance with council policy.

208. ***Legal***

Planning of the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme is considered Permitted Development, under Part 9 (Development relating to roads) Class A (development by highways authorities) of Schedule 2 to the "The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015."

The appropriation of public open space land currently owned by the Council for a change in its use or purpose will need to comply with Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972. A decision paper will be presented to the Executive to seek approval for advertising the proposed appropriation.

The proposed changes to parking restrictions and enforcing the prohibition of cyclists on the ramp must be undertaken in

accordance with the statutory consultation process as set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

The contracts for the proposed works and services will need to be drafted with support from Legal Services.

209. *Procurement*

Any proposed works or services will need to be commissioned via a compliant procurement route under the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and where applicable, the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (soon to be Procurement Act 2023 from 24th February 2025). All tenders will need to be conducted in an open, fair, and transparent way to capture the key principles of procurement. Further advice regarding the procurement routes, strategies and markets must be sought from the Commercial Procurement team.

210. *Health and Wellbeing*

The scheme has been subject to a Road safety audit and Equalities Impact Assessment process to ensure that vulnerable road users are accounted for.

The scheme seeks to improve active travel for pedestrians and cyclists, this will reduce barriers to those wishing to walk and cycle along the Riverside Path. This will therefore help aid in improving the health and wellbeing of residents of York.

Public Health fully support the scheme.

211. *Environment and Climate action*

The proposed improvements to the Riverside Path align with the ambitions of the Climate Change Strategy to reduce emissions associated with transport. Reducing conflicts, improving lighting, and widening the path encourage walking and cycling along the route.

Preliminary design for the scheme proposes the removal of 3 trees along the route of the path. However, as per the Arboricultural Policy for City of York Council (2017), a compensation value for removal of public tree has been accounted for using the recognised valuation

system CAVAT (Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees) and will ensure a minimum of 5 new trees replace those that are removed.

Consideration should be given to minimise the embodied carbon emissions associated with delivery of the scheme.

212. *Affordability*

The report has positive implications for those on low wages to secure wider access to spaces where more affordable ways of travelling such as walking and cycling can be enjoyed.

213. *Equalities and Human Rights*

The Council recognises, and needs to take into account its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions).

The EIA at Annex A demonstrates that the proposals have positive implications for older and disabled in terms of improving access, and in improving safety of spaces for women and girls, and other vulnerable groups. Low income groups are covered under 'Affordability' implications above.

214. *Data Protection and Privacy*

Data protection impact assessments (DPIAs) are an essential part of our accountability obligations and is a legal requirement for any type of processing under UK data protection and privacy legislation. Failure to carry out a DPIA when required may leave the council open to enforcement action, including monetary penalties or fines.

DPIAs helps us to assess and demonstrate how we comply with all our data protection obligations. It does not have to eradicate all risks but should help to minimise and determine whether the level of risk is acceptable in the circumstances, considering the benefits of what the council wants to achieve.

The relevant data protection work was carried out for the consultation which identified the data protections risks, as well as the mitigations either in place or that needed to be put in place, to minimise these known risks. However this will be reviewed following the approved recommendations and options from this report and a further DPIA completed if required.

215. *Communications*

The communications team has provided support to this project for both phases of consultation.

As a result of this decision session further work will be needed to support the project team and to share updates with the local community, this will be especially important if this project moves to construction phase.

216. *Economy*

With nearly 2.5k daily users, the Riverside Path is a key active travel commuter route connecting residents to the city and railway station. By increasing the number of days the path is passable during flooding, and improving the layout to make it safe and more accessible, it will better support residents travel plans as they move to and from work and study.

Risks and Mitigations

There is a risk of failure of the embankment stability. This has been documented in Annex B the Riverside Embankment Stability Report.

It is to be noted that the risk contingency which has been applied to the cost estimate for delivery of this scheme has been reduced to 10% to bring the scheme into affordability.

A project risk register is in place for the Riverside Path Improvement Scheme. It is a live document that is regularly updated to track risks related to design, construction and post construction. The register ensures potential risks are identified early, mitigation measures are in place, and risks are managed throughout the project. Regular updates and reviews will be conducted by the project team to ensure all risks are effectively managed throughout the lifecycle of the scheme.

Wards Impacted

The Riverside Path is situated in Holgate Ward however the route provides an off road cycle link between wards across the West of the authority area and the city centre

Contact details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

Author

Name:	Shoaib Mahmood
Job Title:	Transport Project Manager
Service Area:	Place
Telephone:	
Report approved:	Yes/ No
Date:	27/02/25

Co-author

Name:	James Gilchrist
Job Title:	Director of Transport, Environment and Planning
Service Area:	Environment, Transport and Planning
Telephone:	Please insert
Report approved:	Yes/ No
Date:	27/02/25

Background papers

All relevant background papers must be listed.

A 'background paper' is any document which, in the Chief Officer's opinion, discloses any facts on which the report is based, and which has been relied upon to a material extent in preparing the report. See page 5:3:2 of The Constitution.

Annexes

All annexes to the Decision Report must be listed.

- Background paper: Active Travel Programme Update, Executive Member for Transport, March 2023
- Annex A - Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)
- Annex B - Riverside Embankment Stability Report, November 2024
- Annex C - Riverside Path Improvement Scheme Consultation Report Dec 2024
- Annex D - Active Travel Review
- Annex E – Riverside Path Improvement Scheme General Arrangement Drawing
- Annex F – Riverside Path Improvement Scheme Public Consultation November 2024