

---

**Planning and Transport (City Centre Area)  
Sub-Committee**

6 April 2006

Report of the Director of City Strategy

**Millennium Pedestrian and Cycle Route  
Bishopthorpe Road Crossing**

**Purpose of Report**

- 1 This report advises of the outcome of advertising a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for proposed no waiting at any time restrictions at the junction of Bishopthorpe Road, South Bank Avenue and Butcher Terrace.

**Background**

- 2 In late 2004, Officers prepared a scheme to install traffic signals at this junction to enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross Bishopthorpe Road. However, during consultation with local businesses and residents, it became apparent that there was a great deal of concern over the loss of parking resulting from the necessary no waiting at any time restrictions.
- 3 In view of the local reaction, further options were examined during early 2005. A scheme based on refuge islands appeared to offer the best compromise between safety and loss of parking. The proposed scheme is shown on the plan in Annex A.
- 4 Later in 2005, this proposal was sent out for consultation to the same parties as before. Again, objections were received in connection with the loss of parking.
- 5 Members considered a report on 5 January 2006, which included the consultation feedback. Members felt that the objectors' concerns were outweighed by the potential benefits of the scheme, and therefore approved the scheme in principle. Authorisation was also given for Officers to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the introduction of the proposed double yellow lines.

## TRO Advertisement

- 6 The TRO was publicised on 25 January 2006 for three weeks via site notices displayed at the junction, and by an advertisement in the York Evening Press.
- 7 Following the TRO advertisement, two letters of objection were received. The issues raised, with an Officer response, are set out below.
- 8 *Issue A:* the proposed parking restrictions would have a serious effect on the businesses at the junction, because it would make it more difficult for passing trade to park close by.
- 9 *Officer Response:* the waiting restrictions would mean that customers and clients would need to park a little further away from some of the business premises. However, some visitors to these businesses are currently parking in unsafe locations very close to the junction in contravention of Highway Code guidance. The proposed restrictions seek to strike a balance between the optimisation of safety, traffic movements, and the retention of parking space. It is also worth noting that concerns have previously been raised about the parking situation in this area and, as part of the Annual Review of Traffic Orders, the junction is programmed to have waiting restrictions considered irrespective of the proposed refuge scheme.
- 10 *Issue B:* there is a lot of student accommodation in the area, particularly on the side roads off Bishopthorpe Road, with up to four cars per house. Where will they all park if the restrictions are introduced?
- 11 *Officer response:* the Highway Code recommends that parking should not take place within 10m of a junction, and this is all the current proposal seeks to introduce down the side roads. The remaining parking spaces along the side roads are not included in this Order. Officers have made a great deal of effort to minimise the loss of parking resulting from this scheme. Indeed, beyond the areas where people should not park under the Highway Code rules, the net parking loss for the whole scheme is only four spaces.

## Options

- 12 The options available to the Sub-Committee would appear to be as follows:
  - 1 Over-rule the TRO objections and approve implementation of the refuge scheme, as shown in **Annex A**.

- 2 Amend the TRO proposals in light of the objections received, and approve implementation of the modified refuge scheme.
- 3 Do not proceed with the TRO in view of the objections received, and abandon plans to implement the proposed refuge scheme.

## **Analysis of Options**

The options are discussed below:

### *Implement The TRO*

- 13 Implementing the TRO, as advertised, would provide the clear sight lines required to enable safer crossing of Bishopthorpe Road by pedestrians and cyclists, and stop traffic flow being impeded by vehicles being parked too close to the refuges. It could also be argued that the proposed restrictions at the junction are needed on safety grounds regardless of the refuge scheme.

### *Implement An Amended TRO*

- 14 Officers are of the opinion that the proposed waiting restrictions are the minimum possible needed to ensure the refuge scheme operates safely and efficiently. Officers cannot envisage any alternative or compromise proposal that would satisfy the purpose of the scheme, while at the same time reduce the loss of parking, and so this option is not recommended.

### *Do Nothing*

- 15 Officers consider that some parking controls are essential to protect sight-lines at the refuges, and ensure traffic flow is not impeded. Therefore, rejection of the TRO proposals would in effect mean abandoning the whole scheme. This would fail to deliver the desired help for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Bishopthorpe Rd, and is therefore not recommended.

## **Financial Implications**

- 16 Subject to Members approving the scheme, including the TRO, funding will be sought from within the 2006/07 Transport Capital Programme to implement the scheme.

## **Legal Implications**

- 17 The City of York Council, as highway authority for the area, has powers under the following Acts and associated Regulations to implement the measures in this report:
- The Highways Act 1980
  - The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984
  - The Road Traffic Act 1988

## **Human Resources (HR) and other implications**

- 18 The proposed scheme complies with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act, in that there would be better provision for access and road crossings. There do not appear to be any implications for Crime and Disorder. The proposed measures would encourage sustainable forms of transport.

## **Recommendations**

- 19 That Members:
- a) note the contents of the report;
  - b) approve the implementation of the TRO, and the other elements of the refuge scheme shown in Annex A, subject to the allocation of funding in 2006/07.

### **Contact Details:**

**Author:**  
Tom Blair  
Feasibility Engineer  
Engineering Consultancy  
Tel: 553461

**Chief Officer responsible for the report:**  
Damon Copperthwaite  
Acting Assistant Director (City Development  
and Transport)

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

### **Background Papers**

Minutes of the Planning and Transport (City Centre area) Sub-Committee 5 January 2006