

**Executive Member Decision Session  
TSAR Traffic Signal Refurbishment – YK2230 Barbican Road /  
Paragon Street**

**Annex C**

This list shows the extents of the external consultation undertaken for the Barbican Road / Paragon Street Scheme. The consultation was also distributed to officers working across multiple CYC services and local ward councillors representing the Fishergate and Guildhall Wards

Connexions Buses  
Arriva Buses  
Pullman Buses  
Stephensons of Easingwold  
Transdev  
Sustrans  
Reliance Buses  
First Group  
Harrogate Coach  
Ghost Bus Tours  
Glenn Coaches  
East Yorkshire Motor Services  
North Yorkshire Police  
NHS  
North Yorkshire Fire Service  
Age UK  
York Blind and Partially Sighted Society  
Be independent  
Resource Centre for Deafened People York  
Walk York  
York Environmental Forum Transport Group  
York Assembly  
York Archaeological Trust  
York Cycling Campaign  
York Civic Trust  
York Environment Forum  
York People First  
Visit York

A copy of the consultation text is included below. The drawing referred to in this consultation can be found at Annex A of this report.

## TSAR Consultation: YK2230 – Barbican Road / Paragon Street

Good Morning,

As part of the Traffic Signal Asset Renewal (TSAR) programme we're looking to refurbish the traffic signal controlled junction at Barbican Road / Paragon Street. During our preliminary design stage, we have worked closely with the authority's active travel and sustainable transport officers to discuss existing issues with the junction and identify how the facilities can be improved for pedestrians and cyclists.

The main changes that we are proposing at the site are as follows:

- Full refurbishment of the traffic signal equipment
- Provision of a new signal controlled pedestrian crossing over Paragon Street including near side crossing displays
- Provision of new signal controlled pedestrian and separate cyclist crossings over Barbican Road which link with existing off carriageway cycling infrastructure to the West of the junction. Both crossing points to use near side displays.
- Alterations to the operation of the junction to allow for the inclusion of these new signal controlled pedestrian / cyclist crossings.
- Realignment of the kerb lines to provide more space for pedestrians and cyclists and resulting in a more compact junction.
- Construction of a separated, off carriageway cycle link from Barbican Road Northeast to Barbican Road South.
- Changes to the alignment of the junction to bring the entrance/exit point of the Chinese restaurant car park into the controlled area of the junction
- A yellow box road marking to be installed in the centre of the junction
- Installation of north and southbound advisory cycle lanes on Barbican Road South.
- An early start signal for cyclists on Barbican Road heading north
- Full resurfacing of the carriageway of the junction.

I would appreciate if you could review the drawing attached and send any comments to the TSAR mailbox ([tsar@york.gov.uk](mailto:tsar@york.gov.uk)) by the **7<sup>th</sup> March 2022**. If you have any questions on the proposal please do get in touch. All feedback received will be included in an Executive Member Decision report which will go before the Executive Member for Transport before any design options are taken forward.

## **Summary of Consultation Replies**

### **1. Public Right of Way - CYC**

No comment regarding scheme

#### **CYC Engineer Response**

None Required

### **2. Arboricultural Manager / Landscaping Architect – CYC**

Concern raised around the removal of the redwood in the South West corner of the junction due to the trees established nature and future intention to support developments in the area.

#### **CYC Engineer Response**

The tree will need to be removed to allow the pedestrian and cyclist facilities to be installed. Options are to be considered at detailed design for new tree planting and increased areas of green space. Further discussions to be held to consider proposed mitigation options.

### **3. City Archaeologist - CYC**

Concern raised regarding excavation below current surfaces should it be required. If excavation is below any current depths, a watching brief will be required.

#### **CYC Engineer Response**

Agreed. An archaeological watching brief will be in place for the construction period.

### **4. Cllr A D'Agorne on behalf of Fishergate ward / Capacity as Exec Member for Transport**

Broadly it is very welcome in terms of benefits for cyclists and pedestrians and I'm sure the crossing over Paragon St will be preferable to the two stage crossing at the Bar.

A couple of questions – **(1)**Active Travel officers have met with us to look at the option for switching the cycle route on Paragon St onto the foot path nearest the road rather than its current alignment which is where most pedestrians walk! This would change your proposed alignment on the corner. **(2)** Also removing the raised grass verge could be useful but a seat/ planter/ scooter location/ bollards here would prevent it becoming a new 'car parking' area on this busy corner!

**(3)**Could the cycle lane across the mouth of the private access to the Regency Car Park be marked fully to raise awareness for drivers? Cycle lanes on Barbican Road South are also welcome.

### **CYC Engineer Response**

(1)The Existing cycle route at the southern extent of Paragon Street is currently on land outside of the adopted highway boundary. Although the route has been established for many years, dialogue with the current land owner has indicated they have no desire to give up the land to CYC for formal adoption or give up additional land to expand the facility at this point. Therefore no changes to the arrangement of the cycleway and footway are to be made. This was identified during our early preliminary work and therefore a specific exclusion in our PID for the scheme was included – “Works that would require land outside of the highway boundary to be secured to deliver the scheme. (In line with preliminary findings of the Ward scheme study.)” Under a ward committee scheme, some additional signage/lining works could be undertaken to clarify the use of these footway / cycle paths. The TSAR team is in discussions with the Officers responsible for these potential works and will look to deliver these at the same time as the TSAR works.

(2)This topic has been discussed with active travel officers/sustainable transport colleagues and will be considered further at the detailed design stage. We have already had feedback from the arboriculture officers regarding their concern for the proposed repositioning of the tree from this area which will require further consideration.

(3) These comments are noted and will be reviewed at detailed design.

## **5. WalkYork**

Thank you for consulting WalkYork.

These proposals are very welcome in principle.

There are three concerns:

- (1) First, that the box junction will only work when drivers believe that CCTV is in operation. Are dummy cameras permitted as a deterrent?
- (2) Second, we strongly object to the installation of nearside pedestrian indicators which are often obscured and where the clustering by pedestrians prevents severely partially-sighted people from reaching the indicator cones.
- (3) Thirdly, the loss of farside pedestrian indicator lights at this complex junction means that many people may be uncertain of the direction in which they can walk safely. Mistakes are inevitable.

WalkYork

### **CYC Engineer Response**

- (1) Yellow box junctions are currently enforced by the police as a moving traffic offence. CYC does not have the powers to enforce yellow boxes and it is thus not appropriate to install CCTV for this purpose at the junction. The Designer will consult with CYC Road Safety officers and North Yorkshire Police regarding the potential implementation of the yellow box during the detailed design stage.
- (2) The CYC position is to use near sided Puffin pedestrian signals across the estate unless design issues dictate an alternative should be considered. This was set out at the EMDS in February 2022 and officers have received no instruction to change this position. This location is identified as generally having ample footway widths, low pedestrian flows and a simple crossing layout.

High level repeater units will be installed, as is now standard across all TSAR sites and audible signals will be included as a further assistance for visually impaired users.

(3) Current site arrangements do not provide any pedestrian indicator lights, these will be introduced during the installation of the scheme.

## **6. Principal Development Control Engineer - CYC**

Comment made requesting consideration of replacement of removed grass verge within design. This is to support the development of sustainable urban drainage which supports highway drainage.

### **CYC Engineer Response**

Comment noted. The area of grass verge across the site is increased as part of the design.

## **7. Sustrans**

Please find comments from Sustrans below on the Barbican Road / Paragon Street signal proposals. We would be happy to discuss these further – to answer any queries or revise in light of further information.

- (1) Sustrans support the proposed principle to create signalised pedestrian and cycle crossings with junction bypasses for left-turning cyclists at the Barbican and Paragon Street. The comments below identify design issues which we believe could be resolved or opportunities to improve the junction design for pedestrians and cyclists.
- (2) The onwards cycle route to the west is narrow and lacks clear segregation from the footway. We would like to see this improved as part of a wider scheme of works to ensure these proposals are successfully used by cyclists and pedestrians although appreciate this is outside scope of works for this project.
- (3) The Regency car park access is limited to a 2.4m x 10m visibility splay to the right for vehicles waiting to exit, and no visibility for pedestrians crossing. This is well below standard – maintaining existing risk for pedestrians crossing here, while the

design encourages cycles to pass close to the access creating new hazards. We would like to see the access visibility brought up to LTN 1/20 (for cycles) and Manual for Streets (for pedestrians and motor vehicles) standards. We suggest this may be improved by bringing the access give way line to the Barbican Road kerb line, moving the cycle track access towards the advance stop line area, and narrowing the access with footway build outs to improve pedestrian visibility.

- (4) Cyclists and pedestrians should be kept separate to adhere to LTN 1/20 design principles. We would like to see mini-zebras used at pedestrian crossing points over the cycle tracks to make pedestrian priority clear, and the shared use route to Barbican Mews segregated.
- (5) The cycle track and cycle lane widths (1.3m) on Barbican Road (south) are below LTN 1/20 absolute minimum widths. This creates safety concerns for all users and particularly on the cycle track blocks use by adapted cycle users, which is an accessibility issue. Unprotected cycle lanes are unsuitable for Barbican Road and will exclude most potential users from cycling (DfT A19 traffic count is 9,900 AADT - 2018 count point on Cemetery Road, see LTN 1/20 table 4.1).
- (6) The proposals make no provision for north-westbound cyclists from Wellington Street, requiring them to cross Barbican Road with no protection from heavy traffic. This would exclude most potential users (LTN 1/20 Appendix B) from cycling at this junction.
- (7) We note that the proposals make no specific provision for northbound cyclists from the Paragon Street cycle track requiring them to cross in conflict with the (presumably concurrently running) pedestrian crossing. We assume that consideration has been made to judge this an unlikely movement where any conflict is relatively low hazard and manageable between cyclists giving way to pedestrians.
- (8) Many of the cycle manoeuvres proposed require extremely tight turns which may be difficult for all cyclists and impossible for adapted cycle users. We would like to see these manoeuvres simplified – with consideration made to using angled sparrow crossings (as set out in the Greater Manchester Interim Active Travel Design Guide) and aligning the cycle crossing directly to Barbican Mews.
- (9) We would like to see the Wellington Street junction closed to motor vehicles by relocating the existing adjacent modal filter. This

would remove the junction hazard to pedestrians and cyclist here with minimal change to the highway network.

- (10) We suggest that replacing the one-way cycle lanes with a two-way protected cycle track between Wellington Street and the cycle crossing may resolve many of the issues raised above and provide a better link into the York Orbital cycle route. However Sustrans do not know the wider future context within which the cycle lanes are planned, and consideration should be made whether the reduction in service for northbound cyclists on Barbican Road is acceptable.
- (11) We note that the advance stop lines without feeder lanes will be difficult to reach when busy with queuing traffic, but that physical constraints would make provision of these difficult. The western ASL should have a taper entry to match the eastern ASL if a lane cannot be provided.

### **CYC Engineer Response**

- (1) The Design team notes Sustrans support for the scheme and appreciates the comments made.
- (2) The Existing cycle route at the southern extent of Paragon Street is currently on land outside of the adopted highway boundary. Although the route has been established for many years, dialogue with the current land owner has indicated they have no desire to give up the land to CYC for formal adoption or give up additional land to expand the facility at this point. Therefore no changes to the arrangement of the cycleway and footway are to be made. This was identified during our early preliminary work and therefore a specific exclusion in our PID for the scheme was included – “Works that would require land outside of the highway boundary to be secured to deliver the scheme. (In line with preliminary findings of the Ward scheme study.)” Under a ward committee scheme some additional signage/lining works to be undertaken to clarify the use of the footway / cycle paths. The TSAR team is in discussions with the Officers responsible for these works and will look to deliver these at the same time as the TSAR works.
- (3) The give way junction marking exiting the Chinese Restaurant access will be considered further as part of the detailed design process in line with current guidance.
- (4) The use of mini-zebras for pedestrian crossings will be considered as part of the detailed design process in line with



current guidance. The design does not look to include separated space for active travel modes connecting through to Barbican Mews.

- (5) Available carriageway width does not allow for 1.5m cycle lanes to be introduced in both directions and retain suitable width traffic lanes. An alternative would be to provide cycle lanes (1.7m min) in one direction only and this will be considered as the design progresses.
- (6) The proposal looks to prioritise the route using Barbican Mews rather than Wellington Street. Barbican Mews is a more direct route linking into the Orbital Cycle route. Consideration will be given to options for improving the links into Wellington Street as part of the detail detailed process.
- (7) Options to support this route were considered but, due to demand for this manoeuvre being low, they were not taken forward as part of the preferred option as it increased pedestrian / cyclist conflict.
- (8) Amendments to the alignment of the cyclist crossing are to be considered by the TSAR design team as part of the detailed design process. However, given space constrains a sparrow crossing is not seen as possible in this location.
- (9) Changing the Traffic Regulation Orders to relocate the modal filter on Wellington Street is outside of the scope of the TSAR project.
- (10) See Point 6.
- (11) The western ASL shall have a taper entry added.

## **8. York Civic Trust**

Thank you for your email of 18<sup>th</sup> February seeking comments on your proposals under the TSAR programme for the junction of Paragon Street and Barbican Road. This is an important junction on the inner ring road, which currently has a number of less than satisfactory features. We therefore welcome the Council's decision to seek improvements. We have set out our comments below in turn for each mode affected.

### **Pedestrians**

We welcome the provision of continuous pedestrian crossings over the western and southern arms. There is at present no protected crossing of the western arm, and that over the southern arm only provides protection against traffic from the south, which makes it particularly unsafe.

However, we argue strongly that near-side signals should not be used at this location, or at others close to the city centre. As we argued at the EMDS on 14<sup>th</sup> February, near-side signals are unsafe at many city centre junctions, where pavements are constrained and the majority of pedestrians as a result are not able to see the signal. We remain very concerned that officers have failed to respond to this point, or the concerns of visually impaired groups that near-side signals are unsafe for them or, indeed, the response to last year's Our Big Conversation, in which two thirds of those expressing a view preferred far-side signals. We argued that the Council in its policy needs to consider signalised junctions separately from signalised crossings and to be prepared to treat them differently if appropriate, but that it does then need to be consistent in its treatment of each. We will be pressing for the use of far-side signals at all inner city junctions where space is constrained, and would therefore wish to see the same approach applied at this and neighbouring junctions. **(1)**

### **Cyclists**

We welcome the proposal to provide a signalised crossing of the southern arm of the junction. We suggest, however, that it be slightly realigned to link with Barbican Mews, which offers a safe route from the orbital cycle route.

We also welcome the proposal to provide cycle lanes on both sides of Barbican Road south. However, we suspect that the widths shown are too narrow. It is clear from LTN1/20 (Table 5.2) that the minimum width must be 1.5m. If the overall carriageway width is too small to permit two 3.0m lanes, the Council should adopt LTN1/20 (Table 7.2) guidance and provide a single two-way traffic lane of 5.5m. The transition from off-road to on-road is shown as immediately north of Wellington Street. The footway at this point is only 1.8m wide, which would make this facility sub-standard and unsafe. We recommend that the transition is provided immediately south of the signalised cycle crossing. The southbound cycle lane should be continued across the mouth of Wellington St to reinforce the provisions of the new Highway Code. **(2)**

Our main concern with design for cyclists, however, is the lack of any provision between this junction and Walmgate Bar. There is little point in providing facilities for safe cycling at this junction or in Paragon Street and Barbican Road south if cyclists cannot reach them safely from the north. For cyclists heading towards Walmgate Bar, we recommend widening the footway below the Bar Walls to provide at least a 1.5m width cycle lane alongside the pedestrian route. Cyclists from Barbican Road south could simply cross with the lights and access it. Those from the Paragon Street cycleway, however, have no means of accessing it. We recommend therefore that consideration is given to providing for cyclists to use the proposed crossing of Paragon Street. **(3)**

For cyclists travelling southwards safe provision is more challenging. At present cyclists cycle with traffic, which is often changing lanes, and are exposed to conflicts with the six on-street parking bays (one of which is painted into the traffic lane), the entrance to Lawrence Court and the entrance to the Chinese restaurant car park. As far as we can judge, there appears to be sufficient width throughout this length to provide for two 2.75m traffic lanes and a 2.2m shared cycle lane and footway; the only obvious alternative would be to reduce the roadway at this point to a single lane. In either case, cyclists and pedestrians should be given priority across the entrances to Lawrence Court and the car park (the latter giving direct access to the welcome new fully separated cycle facility) and the existing on-street parking should be reduced and redesigned accordingly. **(4)**

### **Other traffic**

We welcome the provision of a box junction. At present this junction, and the approach to the right turn to Lawrence St, are often blocked by vehicles entering the junction late in the stage for Barbican Road south, even though they cannot exit from it. However, it will be important to ensure that this provision is effectively enforced. **(5)**

This junction interacts closely with that at Walmgate Bar, and we recommend that they operate on the same cycle length, and are linked so that traffic on Paragon Street can clear the two junctions as efficiently as possible, thus giving priority to inner ring road traffic over that joining it. **(6)**

As an extension of that, we recommend that the signals operate so that traffic entering from Barbican Road south is held (gated) when demand exceeds the capacity of these two junctions. **(7)**

## CYC Engineer Response

- (1) The CYC position is to use near sided Puffin pedestrian signals across the estate unless design issues dictate an alternative should be considered. This was set out at the EMDS in February 2022 and officers have received no instruction to change this position. This location is identified as generally having ample footway widths, low pedestrian flows and a simple crossing layout. High level repeater units will be installed, as is now standard across all TSAR sites and audible signals will be included as a further assistance for visually impaired users.
- (2) Available carriageway width at the location does not allow for 1.5m cycle lanes to be introduced and retain suitable width traffic lanes. The removal of centre lines is for quieter roads and not the A19 arterial into the city – traffic flow figures highlighted in LTN1/20 guidance to support removal of centre lines set out a max of 4.5k movements a day which this location exceeds significantly (around 10k per day) . A 1.2m lane is proposed based on discussion with our active travel colleagues or the provision could be removed entirely (though provision currently starting outside 30 Barbican Road would remain.) A further alternative would be to provide cycle lanes (1.7m min) in one direction. Any proposal for cycle lanes across the junction will be subject to a full safety audit and review at detailed design.
- (3) The suggestion is beyond the scope of this specific TSAR scheme. Expansion of footway into the “moat” of the bar walls would be of significant cost and also produce issues with loss of green space / trees and would need full and considered consultation. Cyclist crossing of Paragon Street was considered during preliminary feasibility works but low numbers of cyclists wishing to make the manoeuvre and issues regarding pedestrian cyclist conflict in this area meant the option was not carried forward to a preferred option.
- (4) This suggestion is beyond the scope of the existing TSAR scheme which stipulates reductions to IRR capacity are not to be considered. Carriageway lanes in this location are already narrow and carry large volumes of traffic (including large vehicles) along this arterial route. Expansion of the footway space would require removal of parking bay locations for residential properties and a 2.2 metre wide shared space would be regarded as substandard

(an absolute 3m minimum would be recommended to cater for both pedestrians and cyclists).

- (5) Yellow box junctions are currently enforced by the police as a moving traffic offence. CYC does not have the powers to enforce yellow boxes and it is thus not appropriate to install CCTV for this purpose at the junction. The Designer will consult with CYC Road Safety officers and North Yorkshire Police regarding the potential implementation of the yellow box during the detailed design stage.
- (6) A TSAR upgrade of this site allows for communications to be established between the 2 junction locations which will allow for more effective coordination of the 2 sites.
- (7) Gating provision will be possible following an upgrade of the on site signalling equipment.

## **9. York Cycle Campaign**

The Campaign has consulted with its members on the Traffic Signal Asset Renewal (TSAR) proposals for the junction of Barbican Road and Paragon Street, as shown in drawing CYC\_TST-YK2230-P-001 revision (P01), which was shared to the Campaign for consultation.

The proposal to introduce a more compact junction with dedicated cycle facilities is generally welcomed and seen as an improvement on the current arrangement. Members have raised some comments regarding concerns with parts of the proposal, and suggestions as to how the proposal could further be improved. We have summarised the comments received below, organised by the arms of the junction.

Paragon Street (western arm)

Cyclepath

Whilst only included within the TSAR scheme at junction end, a number of the comments related to the cyclepath along Paragon Road in its entirety.

A concern of members was the quality of the cycle path along Paragon Road. They reported issues with the maintenance of the vegetation alongside encroaching onto the track, and that it needs to be better maintained to make the path attractive to use.

Another concern was that whilst the path is marked as a cycle path along its length to the crossing at Lendal gyratory, it is often used by

pedestrians which then causes conflict and confusion when they aren't aware that cycles will be using it. There was understanding as to why people might think that the route is a footpath rather than a cycle path, due to its location further away from the road and the paving style also matching the pedestrianised area in front of the hotel and theatre, whilst the footpath is plain asphalt.

The suggestion is made that the allocation along the route is swapped, so the cycle path follows the road edge and footpath is set further in. This will benefit any future development on the vacant site that will likely have an active frontage onto Paragon Street which would currently conflict with the cycle path. This allocation would mean a redesign of the currently proposed junction layout. **(1)**

### Going straight ahead onto Barbican Road (eastbound)

It's been raised by members that the current junction layout doesn't provide facility for cyclists who have been cycling along the Paragon Street cyclepath to carry straight ahead onto Barbican Road heading towards Walmgate Bar.

It is feasible they could leave the path at the crossing and cut left across the junction on a green cycle light phase, which should be kept clear with the introduction of the hatched box. The delay between a green cycle stage and a green traffic stage should be long enough to allow this. This manoeuvre could put cyclists in conflict with pedestrians crossing the pedestrian crossing, which it is assumed will be green at the same time.

If the cyclepath and footpath were swapped as suggested in the previous section, this would help remove this conflict, and reduce the amount of time needed in the delay for cyclists to cross the hatched area. **(2)**

### Slipway from Barbican Road

The slipway provided for use by cyclists turning left from Barbican Road onto the Paragon Street cyclepath shows a dropped kerb following running parallel to Barbican Road. Concerns are raised that the dropped kerb will not be installed fully flush between the two surfaces, but have a slight height difference which can upset a cycle's wheel when approached at an acute angle. Examples of installations where this is a case are reported at Lilac Avenue and Scarcroft Road.

It is suggested that this kerb line is adjusted so that the kerb is brought in so it runs perpendicular to the slipway, and a cycle's wheel will hit it head-on. **(3)**

## Barbican Road (southern arm)

### Cycle Lanes

The proposal shows new advisory lanes either side of Barbican Road on the Southern Arm. These are not annotated with a dimension, however, scaling from the drawing the Campaign understands that they are around 1.2m in width either side. LTN 1/20 paragraph 6.4.3 explains that lanes should be no less than 1.5m in order to be inclusive to all cyclists, and that substandard width lanes lead to close-passes as motorists tend to use the nearside marking to judge road positioning.

Paragraphs 6.4.14 to 6.4.17 of LTN 1/20 give recommendations on centre line removal, which would allow traffic lanes to safely be reduced in width enough to allow the minimum cycle lane widths to be provided on Barbican Road. It also references a trial which found a 3mph reduction in speeds when centre lines are removed, increasing road safety. **(4)**

### Access to Orbital Route

A number of members raised that they view Barbican Mews a convenient and attractive route to access the Orbital cycle route from Barbican Road. The existing traffic island lines up directly between the Paragon Street cycle path and the entrance into Barbican Mews providing for this, however this is lost with the proposed layout. It is suggested that instead the crossing is realigned, or widened at the eastern end, so that this connection can still be made with ease without a series of sharp turns that would be difficult for longer, wider or towing cycles. **(5)**

## Barbican Road (eastern arm)

### Regency Chinese Carpark

Members commented that it would be useful to introduce green surfacing across the entrance of the car park to Regency Chinese, in the same way as is proposed for Wellington Street, to highlight the cycle lane running towards the bypass. This would help prevent cars pulling in/out on cycles carrying along the lane, and also help prevent cars edging out of the junction trying to join Barbican Road.

The same is suggested for the entrance to the Lawrence Court car park. **(6)**

## Connection to Walmgate Bar Junction

The connection from the junction towards Walmgate Bar is an important one, however there is no safe cycle infrastructure to allow for this; instead cyclists are left to try and filter through the traffic that is often waiting along the route.

It's been suggested that a cycle path could be provided by widening the current footpath on the northern side of the road into the current grass verge, making space to provide a cyclepath between the footpath and carriageway.

It's understood that the TSAR schemes can have limiting briefs and boundaries, however this can lead to piecemeal designs. The suggestion is that even if the cycle path couldn't be delivered, the design is considered to future-proof its layout should such a route be able to be provided in the near future through other means. **(7)**

### **CYC Engineer Response**

- (1) The Existing cycle route at the southern extent of Paragon Street is currently on land outside of the adopted highway boundary. Although the route has been established for many years, dialogue with the current land owner has indicated they have no desire to give up the land to CYC for formal adoption or give up additional land to expand the facility at this point. Therefore no changes to the arrangement of the cycleway and footway are to be made. This was identified during our early preliminary work and therefore a specific exclusion in our PID for the scheme was included – “Works that would require land outside of the highway boundary to be secured to deliver the scheme. (In line with preliminary findings of the Ward scheme study.)” Under a ward committee scheme some additional signage/lining works to be undertaken to clarify the use of the footway / cycle paths. The TSAR team is in discussions with the Officers responsible for these works and will look to deliver these at the same time as the TSAR works.
- (2) Options to support this route were considered but due to demand for this manoeuvre being low, they were not taken forward as part of the preferred option as it increased pedestrian / cyclist conflict.
- (3) The design of the slipway from Barbican Road will be considered as part of the detailed design process in line with current guidance.



- (4) Available carriageway width does not allow for 1.5m cycle lanes to be introduced in both directions and retain suitable width traffic lanes. Removal of centre lines is for quieter roads and not the A19 arterial into the city – traffic flow figures highlighted in LTN1/20 guidance to support removal of centre lines set out a max of 4.5k movements a day which this location exceeds significantly (around 10k per day) . A 1.2m lane is proposed based on discussion with our active travel colleagues or the provision could be removed entirely (though provision currently starting outside 30 Barbican Road would remain.) A further alternative would be to provide cycle lanes (1.7m min) in one direction.
- (5) Amendments to the alignment of the cyclist crossing are to be considered by the TSAR design team as part of the detailed design process.
- (6) The use of green surfacing over accesses is to be considered by the TSAR design team as part of the detailed design process.
- (7) The suggestion is beyond the scope of this specific TSAR scheme. Expansion of footway into the “moat” of the bar walls would be of significant cost and also produce issues with loss of green space / trees and would need full and considered consultation.

## **10. Cllr D Taylor on behalf of Fishergate ward**

I am in favour of making these changes, however, it is likely that the landowner of the Barbican site is going to be coming forward with a planning application for general housing on the site in the near future. A large number of flats is likely to be proposed. I hope that this has been taken into consideration.

### **CYC Engineer Response**

Comment noted