
**Decision Session – Executive Member for
Transport and Planning**

15 November 2018

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy and Place

Walmgate Bar Traffic Signal Refurbishment

Summary

1. The traffic signalling equipment at this junction is life expired and has become difficult and costly to maintain, it needs to be replaced.
2. The signalling equipment at this junction is in very poor condition and is at risk of irreparable failure which would result in a significant period of time without signal operation.
3. The TSAR (Traffic Signal Asset Renewal) programme is addressing the issue of life expired traffic signal assets across the city. Walmgate Bar is now the highest priority for renewal.
4. Although the primary aim of TSAR is to replace life-expired assets, carrying out this work means the Authority is required to also consider bringing the junction up to current standards in terms of safety and junction geometry.
5. Due to necessary minor changes to improve compliance, a decision is required to approve the alterations.

Recommendations

6. The Executive Member is asked to approve Option 1.

Reason: To mitigate the risk of failure of the junctions signal equipment.

Background

7. A report was brought to the Executive Member for Transport and Planning on 12 November 2015 to seek approval to undertake the 5-year

'TSAR' (Traffic Signal Asset Renewal) programme.

8. To date, through the TSAR programme 19 sets of signals have been refurbished. These have been prioritised in order of condition and liability to failure. Availability of road space also dictated the order in which schemes were constructed. Walmgate Bar is now the clear leader in terms of priority junctions to refurbish.
9. Maintenance Engineers have informed the Authority that the junction is liable to imminent failure due to its condition. Additionally, the condition of the junction means that when it does fail it may not be possible to repair it and bring it back into operation.

Consultation

10. The scope of the works included within this proposal are relatively minor and in normal circumstances would not require an executive decision for approval, or an external consultation.
11. However, due to the sensitivity of the location a consultation has been carried out to offer key user groups an opportunity to have their say on the proposed scheme.
12. Annex A shows the distribution of the consultation and the consultation content.
13. Annex D highlights key feedback items drawn from the consultation responses

Progress since the consultation

14. The drawing that was sent out for consultation is shown in Annex C. A minor change has been made to the proposed preliminary design since consultation.
15. It is no longer proposed to make alterations to the cycle facility within the bar walls. Initially it was thought that there was an outstanding safety issue in this location that needed addressing. Further safety assessment work has determined that in fact the accident record at this location is good and no remedial work is required.
16. Due to the minor nature of this change since consultation, a further round of consultation is not seen as being of benefit.

Options

17. The following options are available:
18. Option 1 – Approve the proposed preliminary junction layout shown in Annex B
19. Option 2 – Do not approve the proposed junction layout

Analysis

Option 1

Decision

20. Approving this Option will result in progressing the proposed preliminary design to the detailed design stage and on to construction, with no further Executive Member decision required.

Description of changes

21. A drawing showing the proposed changes is included in Annex B. These changes consist:
22. A full replacement of all traffic signalling technology, including signal heads, poles, cabling, cabinets, detectors, pedestrian indicators, communications and ducting.
23. Widening of all pedestrian crossings.
24. Realignment of the pedestrian crossing over Foss Islands Road.
25. Widening and lengthening of the pedestrian islands on Lawrence Street and Barbican Road.
26. Extension of the ASL on Foss Islands Road.
27. Widening of the cycle lane on Lawrence Street.
28. Introduction of an advance cycle start facility on the Walmgate approach to the junction.

Reasoning

29. Replacement of the traffic signalling technology is the primary purpose for this scheme. The reason is to ensure that the junction remains operable and maintainable.
30. Widening of the pedestrian crossings is necessary to bring the pedestrian facilities in line with current guidance and standards.
31. Realigning the pedestrian crossing on Foss Islands Road is necessary to bring the facility up to current guidance and standards. Pedestrian crossings should be perpendicular to the kerbline to assist visually impaired users. Additionally, the waiting area on the east side of the crossing was too small. Although the new alignment brings the crossing away from the pedestrian desire line for some users, overall this is seen as an improved arrangement.
32. Enlarging the pedestrian islands is necessary to bring the pedestrian facilities in line with current guidance and standards.
33. Extending the existing ASL on Foss Islands Road has been identified as an 'easy win' that improves usability of the junction for cyclists without any significant detriment. The cost and impact of implementation is also minor.
34. Widening the cycle lane on Lawrence Street is necessary to bring the facility in line with current guidance and standards. The existing layout is too narrow and represents a safety risk to users. There is sufficient road space available to widen this facility without any significant disbenefits.
35. The Walmgate approach to the junction has been identified as an approach that is suitable for the introduction of an advanced cycle signal. This is seen as another 'easy win' due to the fact that the signalling equipment is being replaced anyway and this is an inexpensive addition that provides benefits for users.

Impact on vehicular traffic

36. This option has no significant impact upon journey times or delays for vehicular traffic.
37. Introduction of an advanced cycle signal, widening of a cycle lane and extension of an ASL are seen as positive changes for cyclists that have no significant drawback.

Impact on pedestrians

38. Widening the pedestrian crossings and enlarging the islands is seen as an improvement to the pedestrian facilities as users will have more room to navigate the junction. This will be especially beneficial for users of prams, wheelchairs and mobility scooters.
39. The realigned pedestrian crossing provides an improved waiting area, however it takes the crossing away from the pedestrian desire line for some users. Overall this is seen as a minor improvement.

Safety Considerations

40. The new traffic signalling technology that will be introduced will improve pedestrian safety. Near-side pedestrian indicators are associated with a reduced accident rate.
41. An independent Safety Assessment has been carried out on the preliminary design attached. It highlighted some minor points that will be adequately resolved during the detailed design stage.
42. A further Road Safety Audit will be carried out after detailed design and before construction. This is the means by which the design safety will be controlled.

Conservation

43. The CYC Design and Sustainability Manager and York Archaeological Trust have been engaged throughout the process and no significant issues have been identified. These teams will continue to be engaged throughout the detailed design stage and construction.

Other Options Already Discounted

44. In addition to the consultation responses that were considered in Annex D, the design team has also pursued and ruled out various other solutions that are not deemed suitable for presentation to an Executive Member decision session. This is a brief summary of those discounted ideas.
45. Discounted Option A – Changing the lane assignment on the Foss Islands Road approach to the junction, such that the first lane becomes

left only. This layout is shown in Annex E.

46. This option allowed wider pedestrian islands, however it was discounted because it had significant impacts upon delay, and because a safety assessment suggested that vehicles would likely travel straight ahead from the left lane anyway, causing a safety risk.
47. Discounted Option B – This option explored widening the carriageway to allow a wider pedestrian island. This layout is shown in Annex F.
48. This option was discounted because the costs of diverting utilities in the footway was prohibitively expensive
49. Discounted Option C – This option installation of a straight across crossing on the southern arm of the junction in replacement of the current pedestrian island. This layout is shown in Annex G
50. This option was discounted because it significantly increased delays, whilst not actually improving pedestrian safety, in the view of the safety assessment.
51. Discounted Option D – This option was an evolution of Discounted Option C that attempted to resolve the congestion and safety issues by introducing an internal stop line, similar to junctions that might be seen in larger cities like Leeds and Manchester. This layout is shown in Annex H.
52. This option was discounted based on advice of the safety review, which deemed the solution to have serious safety issues.

Council Plan

53. Replacing life-expired traffic signalling assets allows the Authority to continue to manage the traffic on its highway network, minimising congestion and ensuring user safety. Therefore carrying out these works fulfils the 'A focus on frontline services' priority of the Council Plan.

Implications

54. **Financial**
Delivery of the TSAR programme of works is ahead of schedule and the funds available for the 18/19 financial year have already been committed on schemes completed earlier in the year.

55. To fund this scheme, it is proposed that monies are brought forward from future years TSAR budgets. Specifically, this will be from a CRAM bid amount that is currently pending approval. If this funding is not forthcoming then the funding will be brought forward from the 19/20 LTP fund.
56. **Human Resources**
There are no HR implications
57. **One Planet Council / Equalities**
All junctions are designed with equalities in mind. The recommended designs follow the most up to date guidance with respect to disability access. The technology included in all designs includes aids to persons with visual and mobility impairment.
58. **Legal**
There are no legal implications.
59. **Crime and Disorder**
There are no Crime and Disorder implications.
60. **Information Technology**
The Information Technology implications of constructing the proposed designs has been considered and are included in the Project Plan. No issues are envisaged.
61. **Property**
There are no property implications
62. **Other**
Disruption during construction – Constructing the TSAR schemes inevitably means a certain level of work on the 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 give to affected parties.

Risk Management

63. There are no known significant risks associated with any option presented in this report.

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

Contact Details

Author:

Christian Wood
Smart Transport Programme
Manager
Transport
01904 551 652

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Assistant Director – Transport, Highways
and Environment

Report
Approved



Date 07.11.18

Wards Affected: List wards or tick box to indicate all

All

Guildhall Ward
Fishergate Ward

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

[Executive Member Report - 'Traffic Systems Asset Renewals and Detection Equipment Plan' – 12 November 2015](#)

Annexes

Annex A – Consultation Distribution List
Annex B – Proposed Preliminary Design Layout
Annex C – Layout included in Consultation (superceded by Annex B)
Annex D – Summary of key consultation responses
Annex E – Discounted Option A
Annex F – Discounted Option B
Annex G – Discounted Option C
Annex H – Discounted Option D

Abbreviations

TSAR – Traffic Signal Asset Renewal
ASL – Advanced Stop Line