

**Decision Session – Executive Member for
Transport**

13 December 2022

Report of the Corporate Director of Place
Portfolio of the Executive Member for Transport

Active Travel Programme – Project Progress

Summary

1. ***St Georges Field Crossing*** - This scheme proposes the installation of a single-stage crossing across the inner ring road section of Tower Street, adjacent to the St Georges Field car park, in order to link cyclist and pedestrian access from the riverside path to the north side of the Inner Ring Road. A solution has been generated that offers this outcome, and the scheme requires Executive Member approval to proceed to the Detailed Design workstage and subsequent construction. This project was proposed in conjunction with, and its success is partly dependent on, the Castle Gateway project.

2. ***Skeldergate Cycle Improvements*** - This scheme proposes the installation of cycle bypasses at the build-outs on Skeldergate, in order to enable cyclists to approach and pass through them without fear of conflict with other road users. A solution has been generated that achieves this outcome, and the scheme requires Executive Member approval to proceed to the Detailed Design workstage and subsequent construction.

Recommendations

3. The Executive is asked to:
 - 1) Approve Option 1 – Approve the proposed St Georges Field Crossing scheme and scheme delivery arrangements described within this report and presented in Annex A of this document.

Reason: This option achieves the scheme objectives and is affordable within assigned budgets. Timing of the installation will be co-ordinated

with the Castle Gateway development. Traffic is predicted to not be significantly impacted, and the single-stage element of the crossing makes transition from pedestrian crossing to 'Toucan' crossing achievable.

- 2) Approve Option 2 – Approve the proposed Skeldergate scheme and scheme delivery arrangements described within this report and presented in Annex E of this document.

Reason: This option achieves the core aim of the scheme, which is to *“improve safety, amenity and accessibility for cyclists on the route along Skeldergate, and to reduce and/or remove conflict at build-outs”*.

Background

4. The Active Travel Programme aims to improve the amenity and safety of active travel forms such as walking and cycling, promoting the adoption of healthier, more environmentally friendly travel.
5. St George's Field Car Park and the riverside path cycle route that links to it are situated south of Tower Street, and the York Castle Museum on the north. Currently, cyclists and pedestrians have no safe and direct way of crossing Tower Street from the car park. Plans are currently in place to develop the Castle Mills area around the museum, and to develop St George's Field Car Park as part of the Castle Gateway project, rendering the need for a crossing more significant.
6. There is concern that conflict between cyclists and other road users at the build-outs on Skeldergate is making cyclist journeys along the route unsafe. Some vehicles have been known to refuse to give way to oncoming cyclists, forcing the cyclist to pass through alongside the vehicle in the remaining insufficient road space or wait in the road. This scheme was launched in response to the previously described occurrences.
7. Feasibility work has been completed for both of the above schemes, and the next step is to move onto Detailed Design and construction for each. For St Georges Field Crossing, further design and construction is planned to be delivered internally. For Skeldergate, further design is planned to be delivered externally through an existing CYC framework, and construction delivered internally.

Consultation

St Georges Field Crossing

8. An electronic consultation has been carried out with local ward councillors for Guildhall and Fishergate and external stakeholders. Targeted external stakeholders included residents and businesses on and in the immediate vicinity of the crossing site, transport groups, equalities groups and industry bodies. Refer to Annex B for a summary of the consultation responses received.
9. The site for the crossing was identified as being located on top of William 1's Dam of the Kings Fish pool. However, construction of this scheme is unlikely to disturb these archaeological remains.
10. External groups expressed a strong preference for using far side pedestrian signals, as they judge them to be more readily visible and feel safer to use.
11. The type of pedestrian signals used will be determined at the detailed design stage. This determination will be made based on consideration of guidance, standards and legislation, as well as a thorough consideration of consultation feedback. Safety will be the priority consideration during the detailed design stage and the scheme will be subject to a formal independent Road Safety Audit prior to construction.
12. The majority of respondents to the survey travelled along Tower Street for leisure (68%) and either walked or cycled (75%). However, this figure does not accurately represent actual traffic flow ratios along Tower Street, and so responses may not be representative of all road users.
13. When rating current conditions on Tower Street, most people judged conditions for pedestrians to be Poor (46%) or Very Poor (37%), and conditions for cyclists to be Very Poor (54%). This indicates that, for Tower Street to be experienced as cyclist friendly and support active travel aims, changes need to be made to make conditions safer and more appealing for pedestrians and cyclists, supporting this scheme's mandate.
14. Most survey respondents Agreed or Strongly Agreed (77%) that they would benefit from the installation of this scheme. Amongst those who responded that they wouldn't personally use the crossing, the majority (53%) Agreed or Strongly Agreed that they would support the scheme

anyway. This indicates that this scheme would benefit from wide public support, and contribute to the programme's aim of promoting active travel.

15. Further comments from survey respondents highlighted the dangers of current conditions, where pedestrians often cross through moving traffic, and that the implementation of a crossing would be much appreciated.

Skeldergate

16. An electronic consultation has been carried out with local ward councillors for Micklegate and external stakeholders. Targeted external stakeholders included residents and businesses on and in the immediate vicinity of Skeldergate, transport groups, equalities groups and industry bodies. Refer to Annex F for a summary of the consultation responses received.
17. The majority of respondents to the public consultation (77%) travelled through Skeldergate for leisure, and only 23% were residents. The majority (79%) of respondents usually travelled through Skeldergate by bicycle. However, this figure does not reflect measured traffic flow ratios along Skeldergate, and so responses may not be representative of all road users.
18. When asked to rate existing conditions on Skeldergate for cyclists, the majority (53%) of respondents rated them as Poor or Very Poor, with only a total of 13% rating them as Good or Very Good. 48% disagreed that cyclists were safe on Skeldergate. This indicates that, for Skeldergate to be experienced as cyclist friendly and support active travel aims, changes need to be made to make conditions safer for cyclists, supporting this scheme's mandate.
19. 46% of respondents agreed that there was conflict between vehicles and cyclists at the build-outs. This indicates that presumptions behind the scheme's initiation, regarding existing conflict at the build-outs, are supported by users.
20. 79% of respondents Agreed or Strongly Agreed that they would benefit from the installation of cycle bypasses at the Skeldergate build-outs, with 7% responding neutral and 15% Disagreeing or Strongly Disagreeing. This indicates that the majority of cyclists (as the majority of respondents were cyclists) would support the scheme, and that active travel would be promoted through its installation.

21. Respondents expressed concerns that if the kerb segregations are not sufficiently visible, they may cause hazards during the dark hours for larger vehicles, such as buses, and pedestrians. Therefore, in Detailed Design the visibility of kerb segregations will be examined.
22. Respondents expressed that the bypasses must be maintained to keep them safe from debris, and that they must be given winter treatment. The design must be such that road sweepers and gritters should be able to service the bypass. Therefore, further research is to be carried out regarding accessibility for road sweepers and gritters and incorporated into the detailed design stage.

Options

23. The following options are available:
24. Option 1 - Approve the proposed St Georges Field scheme option presented in Annex A of this document and detailed in this report, stipulating progression through the Detailed Design workstage and subsequent construction.
25. Option 2 - Approve the proposed Skeldergate scheme option presented in Annex E of this document, stipulating progression through the Detailed Design workstage and subsequent construction.
26. Option 3 - Reject St Georges Field Crossing proposal and stipulate closure of the scheme.
27. Option 4 – Reject Skeldergate proposal and stipulate closure of the scheme.

Analysis

St Georges Field Crossing

Description of Changes (see Annex A for visual representation)

28. The installation of a signalised single-stage pedestrian crossing over Tower Street, adjacent to the St Georges Field Car Park. Once work to complete the Castle Gateway plans in the surrounding areas has been completed, it will be converted into a Toucan crossing, which will add crossing provision for cyclists.

Reasoning

29. Currently no cycle facilities join into the proposed location of the St George's Field / Tower Street signalised crossing. The current highway layout does not allow for mounted cyclist access from the riverside path to the crossing safely and within current best practice. Changes to this area to link the riverside path to the proposed crossing are currently part of a separate 'Castle Gateway' scheme. There are plans within the Castle Gateway project to make that area cyclist accessible. Therefore it is recommended that this crossing be installed initially as a pedestrian only crossing, and upgraded to a pedestrian and cyclist 'Toucan' crossing when the Castle Gateway scheme is delivered.

30. Implementation of a toucan crossing, independent of Castle Gateway plans, would not be a feasible option, as installing cyclist access into the crossing without linkage to cycle paths may result in confusion for users.

31. The existence of a pedestrian crossing in that location would benefit users given the current lack of crossing facilities available in this area. It is a planning constraint of the Castle Mills development to provide a pedestrian crossing in this general location. Therefore, it must be in place before the Castle Mills development and new pedestrian bridge are complete.

32. There is concern that if the crossing is in place it will hinder site access for construction and maintenance vehicles. Therefore, the timing of installation must coordinate with Castle Gateway plans in order to minimise abortive work.

Impact on vehicular traffic

33. Traffic capacity along Tower Street is not expected to be significantly impacted by the installation of the crossing. Additional delays and queueing will occur, but not so much that capacity will be exceeded (see Annex D, Design F).

34. The junction coming out of St Georges Field car park will not be affected, and will be retained as left in / left out only.

Impact on pedestrians

35. Pedestrians will have a safe, signalised crossing point over Tower Street, the benefit of which will be enhanced once Castle Gateway has been completed and the area is more attractive to pedestrians.

36. Pedestrians may have longer wait times at the crossing in comparison to others, to ensure traffic capacity is not jeopardised. However, for the majority of the day pedestrian delay will be minimised.

Impact on cyclists

37. Once the crossing has been transitioned into a Toucan crossing, and the Castle Gateway works completed, cyclists will benefit from a safe, signalised crossing point over Tower Street, linking access from the riverside path to the north side of the Inner Ring Road.

Cost Estimates

Preliminary design <i>(already incurred)</i>	£3,600
CYC internal costs <i>(already incurred)</i>	£5000
Further design and development	£10,500
Construction	£105,000
Risk margin	£21,000
Total	£145,100

Other options not presented for consideration

38. A number of alternative concept designs were considered as part of the feasibility works for this project. These included:

39. Changing the entrance alignment to St Georges Field car park, to allow space to widen the pavement to a safe width for shared pedestrian and cyclist use. This design was deemed not feasible due to the fact that it would cause coaches using the car park entrance to overhang the exit lane.

40. The installation of an additional crossing over the St Georges Field car park entrance, so as to allow the swept path of coaches to be accommodated. This design was deemed not feasible, as modelling showed it would lead to significant delays on the Inner Ring Road and

capacity issues (see Annex D, Design C). There was also concern about road safety, due to forward visibility exiting the car park.

41. Purchase of third party land, to allow for realignment of the St Georges Field car park entrance to accommodate a widened footway and allow coaches to turn safely out of the car park. The purchase of third party land is outside of the scope of this scheme, but may be an option that could be pursued under the wider Castle Gateway plans. However, it would likely carry a high cost due to the additional civil engineer works and likely utility diversions.
42. Purchase of third party land, to allow for the widening of the footway for shared pedestrian and cyclist use. The purchase of third party land is outside of the scope of this scheme, but may be an option that could be pursued under the wider Castle Gateway plans.
43. Installing a staggered crossing, rather than a single-stage crossing. This would result in longer delays for pedestrians and cyclists using the crossing, as they would have to wait at the central island. To accommodate the island, the eastbound carriageway from the Tower Street / Skeldergate Bridge would have to be reduced to 1 lane. For these reasons, the design was deemed not feasible.

Skeldergate Cycle Improvements

Description of Changes (see Annex E for visual representation)

44. Introduction of vehicular give way road markings at buildouts with associated signing.
45. Introduction of 1057 cycle markings along Skeldergate, as shown in Annex E.
46. 1.5m cycle bypass of give way movement at build-outs.

Reasoning

47. Cyclists travelling in one direction are removed from the pinch point at the build-outs, and potential conflict between traffic and cyclists travelling in opposing directions towards the build-out is removed.

48. The reduction of the remaining carriageway width to 3m encourages cyclists travelling with and in the same direction as traffic to take the primary position in the lane, mitigating near pass issues.

49. The introduction of markings and signing to formalise the priority arrangement should draw attention to the requirement to allow opposing traffic and cyclists to clear the build-out before advancing.

Disadvantages

50. Protection is only provided for one direction of cyclists due to width constraints along Skeldergate.

51. Existing width does not allow for a standard cycle lead in lane to the bypass arrangement.

52. High cost due to the removal and reinstallation of kerbs.

Risks

53. Potential utility impact at northern most build-out (subject to statutory undertakers enquiries)

Impact on vehicular traffic

54. Formalised signing means traffic approaching build-outs will have clearer direction on when they should give-way, reducing conflict between vehicles.

55. The cycle bypasses will enable vehicles to pass through build-outs without having to give way to cyclists in one direction, potentially reducing travel time along Skeldergate.

56. The existing speed humps will be retained, so that traffic speed will remain consistent with existing speeds.

57. A reduction of the carriageway width to 3m will result in a reduced perception of available space, making it clearer to vehicles when they can and cannot pass cyclists.

Impact on Pedestrians

58. Pedestrians will still be able to use the build-outs as crossing points, as before.

Impact on Cyclists

59. The installation of cycle bypasses will mean that cyclists need not rely on vehicles giving way at the build-outs in order to pass them safely.

60. Near pass issues will be mitigated by the reduction of the remaining carriageway width to 3m, due to cyclists adopting the primary position.

61. Using the principles of the Cycle Level of Service, this option is considered to score a Green rating on LTN 1/20, in comparison to a Red score for existing conditions at the Skeldergate build-outs.

Cost Estimates

Preliminary design <i>(already incurred)</i>	£10,952
CYC internal costs <i>(already incurred)</i>	£859
Further design and development	£10,653
Construction	£76,089
Risk margin	£21,685
Total	£120,279

Other options not presented for consideration

62. A number of alternative concept designs were considered as part of the feasibility works for this project. These included:

63. Introducing vehicular give-way markings and signage at build-outs, plus cycle markings along Skeldergate. This option presented no alteration to the road layout, meaning that cyclists may be subjected to the same issues as currently present if signing and markings are not adhered to by motor vehicles. This option is therefore deemed insufficient in meeting the scheme objective of reducing/removing the potential for conflict.

64. Introducing signage and markings, plus increasing the carriageway width by reducing the extent of the build-out. This increased road width may encourage vehicles to squeeze past cyclists, and though the increased

width would make this safer than under current conditions, it does not meet the scheme objective of reducing conflict.

65. Removal of build-outs, plus cycle markings and Vehicle Activated Speed Signs. Removing the build-out will reduce the effect of traffic calming measures already in place, and may result in an increase of recorded speed. This option would also make crossing the road more difficult for pedestrians, as they currently use the build-outs for a shorter crossing distance. It is viewed that these threats to the safety of pedestrians outweigh the benefits to cyclists of not having to pass through the build-outs.

Council Plan

66. Proposed changes will encourage active travel and protect the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Therefore carrying out these works contributes to the 'Getting around sustainably' key outcome of the Council Plan.

Implications

67. Financial

The capital budget allocation for the St Georges Field Crossing scheme is £148k and for the Skeldergate Cycle Improvements scheme is £150k. Both options proposed within the report can be met within these budget allocations.

68. Human Resources (HR)

There are no HR implications

69. Equalities

The Council needs to take into account the 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).

An Equalities Impact Assessment (an "EIA") has been carried out for both St George's Field Crossing (see Annex C) and Skeldergate Cycle Improvements at (see Annex G).

1. St George's Field Crossing EIA (see Annex C)

In summary, the result of the EIA is that the proposal has a neutral low impact for all identified groups in the EIA.

The recommendation of the EIA is there be no major changes to the proposal, with some additional actions and comment, as set out at 7, 8 and elsewhere at Annex C.

2. Skeldergate Cycle Improvements at (see Annex G).

In summary, the result of the EIA is that the proposal has:

- a) A negative medium impact in relation to Age and Disability; and
- b) A neutral low impact identified for all other groups in the EIA.

The recommendation of the EIA is there be no major change to the proposal, with some additional actions and comment, as set out at 7, 8 and elsewhere at Annex G.

70. Legal

Design and Construction Works

All CYC procurements and related contracts are subject to the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 ("PCRs") and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules ("CPRs"). This includes the related design and works subject of this report.

It is understood:

- a) the detailed design is proposed to be delivered by in-house Council teams and externally via a pre-procured CYC Framework Agreement; and
- b) construction works are to be delivered by in-house Council teams.

The proposed in-house elements would not require a CPR or PCR competition.

Any Call Offs from pre-procured CYC Frameworks will be subject to the CPRs, PCRs and terms of the Framework itself. Guidance from Procurement and Legal should be sought.

In the event of there ultimately being external design or construction requirements outside of in-house arrangements and existing CYC Frameworks CPR and PCR compliant procurement competition and routes will be required for those elements. In that scenario guidance from Procurement and Legal should be sought.

71. Crime and Disorder

There are no Crime and Disorder implications.

72. Information Technology (IT)

There are no IT implications.

73. Property

There are no property implications.

74. Other

Disruption during construction – Constructing this scheme inevitably means a certain level of work on the adopted highway, with an associated level of delay and disruption to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. Such works will be scheduled and planned to minimise this disruption, and sufficient information and notice will be given to affected parties.

75. Risk Management

Project Risks are recorded in the Project Risk Register and are handled by the Project Team and monitored by the Transport Board.

All risks are managed in line with the Corporate Risk Management Strategy.

Contact Details

Author:

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Bethan Old
Project Manager
Active Travel Programme

James Gilchrist
Director of Transport, Environment and
Planning

Report **Date** 24/11/22
Approved

Specialist Implications Officer(s) List information for all

Financial:
Patrick Looker
Finance Manager

Legal:
Ryan Bell
Senior Lawyer – Contracts & Commercial

Wards Affected: Guildhall, Fishergate, Micklegate

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Executive Member for Transport Decision Session 14/2/22
(<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=738&MIId=12734&Ver=4>)

Annexes

Annex A – SGF Preliminary Design
Annex B – SGF Public Consultation Summary
Annex C – SGF Equalities Impact Assessment
Annex D – SGF Designer’s Report
Annex E – Skel Preliminary Design
Annex F – Skel Public Consultation Summary
Annex G - Skel Equalities Impact Assessment
Annex H - Skel Designer’s Report

List of Abbreviations Used in this Report

CYC – City of York Council

ATP – Active Travel Programme
SGF – St Georges Field Crossing
Skel – Skeldergate Cycle Improvements