



Meeting:	Executive Member for Transport Decision Session
Meeting date:	17/06/2025
Report of:	Garry Taylor, Director of City Development
Portfolio of:	Cllr. Kate Ravilious, Executive Member for Transport

Decision Report: Active Travel Crossing Request Evaluation & Prioritisation Methodology

Subject of Report

1. The current active travel crossing request evaluation and prioritisation methodology was adopted back in 2016. Government guidance has changed in the intervening period which has highlighted the need to update the council's methodology to bring it into line with that new guidance. The methodology also enables officers to better reflect the council's recently revised hierarchy of transport users, adopted as part of the new Local Transport Strategy and will help to deliver improvements in line with the recently adopted Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.
2. This report proposes an updated evaluation and prioritisation methodology which puts greater emphasis on need (including destinations) and potential future usage, it also puts forward a methodology for prioritising requests for dropped kerb crossings independently of the crossing evaluation.
3. Finally, the report proposes to put all historic requests, including those which have been rejected using the previous assessment methodologies, through the first stage of the proposed new assessment methodology (Sense Check) to quickly identify sites which are not appropriate, or can be dealt with by other work programmes, as a means of simplifying the task of tackling the significant backlog of requests.

Benefits and Challenges

Benefits

4. The main benefit of this decision is that it helps to address one of the main barriers to active travel (walking, wheelchair use, wheeling and cycling) by making those trips easier, more accessible and safer. It does this by identifying locations that should be recommended for improved crossing facilities that give greater priority to active travellers reducing the delay and danger which tend to be encountered when crossing busy and/or fast roads.
5. The council first adopted a hierarchy of transport users approximately 25 years ago as part of its' first Local Transport Plan, this hierarchy placed pedestrians, then wheelers and then cyclists as the top three modes with motorised forms of transport below them. In the intervening period some council policies and many transport schemes have not necessarily reflected this hierarchy, however, the proposed revisions to the crossing assessment methodology are an opportunity to better reflect the latest version of the hierarchy which was adopted as part of the York Local Transport Strategy (2024-2040).
6. Improved crossing facilities also help the council to comply with its' Public Sector Equality Duty by ensuring that groups with protected characteristics, who may be negatively impacted to a greater degree, are not discriminated against when it comes to crossing roads.
7. Updating the existing assessment methodology will enable it to be better aligned with current guidance and will help in the delivery of the newly-adopted Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

Challenges

8. The biggest challenge this proposed change in methodology will create is a potential significant increase in sites which are deemed to be appropriate for formal crossings across the city. This in turn will require additional resources, both in terms of staff resource to undertake the assessments, feasibility, design and delivery and also financial resources to pay for the infrastructure and its' installation. There is a risk that without the extra staff and financial resources it will be very difficult to fully realise the benefits which the proposed new evaluation and prioritisation methodology will create.

9. In the short term there will be a need for extra staff resource to put the historical list of requests through the “Sense-Check” process to identify those sites which are not appropriate for formal crossing facilities and/or should be dealt with through alternative workstreams (dropped kerb programme, local safety schemes, safe routes to school etc).
10. Another challenge will be the additional highway assets to inspect and maintain. There is a risk that without extra revenue funding being made available the new assets will fall into disrepair and that the benefits in terms of increased levels of active travel may be lost.
11. The final challenge will be one of public acceptance due to potential delay to vehicular journeys, however, the methodology does align with the policies in the Local Transport Strategy by enabling us to follow the adopted hierarchy of transport users by giving walkers, wheelchair users, wheelers and cyclists a higher priority than people using vehicular modes. The risk of delays will be partially mitigated by other measures being introduced as part of the transport strategy where the main aims are to reduce the number of driven miles, reduce traffic congestion and enable more people to choose sustainable means of travel. These measures will also help deliver on some of the transport objectives in the city’s 10-year Climate Change Strategy.

Policy Basis for Decision

12. Active travel forms an integral part of, or contributes to, the following council strategies:
 - Council Plan 2023-2027 “One City, for all” – Priority D – Transport: Sustainable, accessible transport for all
 - York Climate Change Strategy 2022-32 – Objective 3.2 Increase take-up of active travel
 - York Joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2032 – increased levels of active travel could contribute towards 5 of the 10 big goals:
 - i. Reduce the gap in healthy life expectancy between the richest and poorest communities in York,
 - ii. Reduce anxiety scores and increase happiness scores by 5%,

- iii. Reverse the rise in the number of children and adults living with an unhealthy weight,
 - iv. Reduce health inequalities in specific groups,
 - v. Reduce sedentary behaviour so that 4 in every 5 adults in York are physically active.
 - York Economic Strategy 2022-2032 – A greener economy – Increase cycling and active travel to work where appropriate as modes of commuting.
 - York Local Transport Strategy 2024-2040 – improvements to the active travel networks are a key component of the following Policy Focus Areas:
 - i. Improve Accessibility,
 - ii. Improve walking, wheeling and cycling,
 - iii. Shape healthy places,
 - iv. Manage York's transport networks for Movement & Place.
13. Improvements to the active travel network also contribute to all four of the administration's key manifesto pledges as follows:
- **Affordability** – walking, wheeling and cycling are some of the cheapest forms of travel,
 - **Environment** – walking, wheeling and cycling have the smallest carbon footprint and can make positive contributions to reduced congestion and improved air quality,
 - **Equalities and Human Rights** – provision of better crossing facilities make the active travel networks safer and more accessible to a wider spectrum of people, including those with protected characteristics and these improvements will help us to comply with our duties under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010: the Public Sector Equality Duty.
 - **Health Inequalities** – increased levels of walking, wheeling and cycling can help to reduce health inequalities in terms of both mental and physical health through enabling active travel.

Financial Strategy Implications

14. Whilst the updated Evaluation and Prioritisation Methodology itself won't have direct costs associated with it there will be costs further down the line in terms of staff resource, plus financial resources to deliver improved crossing facilities and then to maintain them thereafter.

15. These resources could be funded from several different sources including:
- Highways and Transport Capital Programme,
 - External sources such as Department for Transport / Active Travel England funding rounds,
 - Contributions from developers secured through the development control process,
 - Funding from the Mayoral Combined Authority.

Recommendation and Reasons

16. The Executive Member is recommended to:

- Approve the adoption of the revised evaluation and prioritisation methodology (shown in flowchart form in Annex A) and delegate authority to the Director of City Development to commence the initial stage assessment of all requested sites, both current and historic. This will enable the backlog of requests, which have built up over the previous few years, to be assessed as detailed in paragraph 33 of this report.

Reason: The revised methodology is in line with current guidance and gives greater priority to need and future usage whilst addressing existing casualty issues and perception of danger of potential users. The methodology also enables prioritisation of specific requests for dropped kerb crossings to be undertaken independently of other crossings recognising this has its own separate budget.

- Delegate authority to the Director of City Development to implement the active travel crossing programme and dropped kerb programme annually based on the outcomes of the revised evaluation and prioritisation process and the budgets allocated.

Reason: To ensure there are no additional delays in implementing the two programmes each year once the Transport capital programme has been approved at Executive level.

Background

The Issues

17. Council officers (and elected members) receive many requests for active travel crossing improvements each year. There are several ways in which requests can be submitted:
 - Download and submit a form (an example is shown at Annex B) via the council website at [Request a new pedestrian crossing – City of York Council](#)
 - Submission of a petition
 - Submission via an elected member, MP, or Parish Council
 - Direct email to officers or the walking.cycling@york.gov.uk email address
18. Requests can be for formal crossings (zebras, puffins, toucans), kerb build-outs or central refuges and also for dropped kerb crossings. The number of requests received far outweighs the allocated budgets and staff resource available to deliver them. As a result, it has for many years been necessary to put each request through an assessment and prioritisation process, firstly to assess whether the suggested locations are appropriate for the type of crossing being proposed and secondly to sort those sites which are appropriate into a priority order for further feasibility / design work and potential delivery if sufficient funding is available.
19. The current evaluation and prioritisation methodology was adopted in 2016, however, in the period since it was adopted there has been a significant shift in national transport policy towards giving active travel more priority. The adoption of the first national Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) in 2017 gave some assurances that the government were taking active travel seriously and a commitment to help fund infrastructure improvements in England. The CWIS also introduced the concept of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) where local highway authorities would lay out plans for walking, wheelchair user, wheeling and cycling networks in their respective administrative areas. A key tool to address one of the main barriers to active travel on those networks is the provision of improved crossing points, especially on busy parts of the road network.
20. Taking the above into consideration, alongside changes to guidance, it has become evident that the current crossing assessment methodology is flawed because it doesn't place

enough emphasis on suppressed demand for safer crossings i.e. those people who would have crossed at that location if a safe crossing were available but instead choose to cross elsewhere, or don't cross at all and potentially travel by other less sustainable means.

21. Traditionally crossing assessments were mostly done using a PV^2 calculation where P represents the "pedestrian" flow (which encompassed all types of active traveller) and V represented the vehicle flow. The calculation only took into consideration the existing flows and ignored the potential for increased active travel flow which crossing improvements could achieve. It also didn't take into consideration the differing levels of vulnerability for different types of crossing-user and levels of potential danger from different categories of vehicle.

2016 Revision of Assessment Methodology

22. The 2016 revision to the assessment methodology attempted to address some of the limitations mentioned above by assessing sites in more detail through the application of adjustment factors. Active travel flows were adjusted by allocating higher scores to the most vulnerable types of crossing-user (children, older people and disabled people who could be identified from the associated video survey) and vehicle flows were adjusted according to type and size of vehicle. Other adjustment factors were also added which took into consideration the crossing environment. These included:
 - a safety factor, which acknowledged the site's recent casualty history,
 - a delay factor, which acknowledged how long active travellers had to wait to cross,
 - a road width factor, which acknowledged that roads become more difficult to cross as they get wider,
 - a speed factor, which acknowledged existing vehicle speeds,
 - a trip attractor / generator factor, which acknowledged the number of sites in close proximity (less than 400m) to the crossing site which may attract or generate walking / wheelchair-user / wheeling / cycling trips.
23. Whilst this methodology did enable many more factors to be considered which directly influenced the ability to cross, it still resulted in relatively few sites being considered suitable because they didn't reach the required score thresholds (shown below).

Adjusted PV ² value (x 100,000,000)	Type of facility to be considered
>1.0	Zebra / Puffin / Toucan
0.7 to 1.0	Zebra
0.5 to 0.7	Central refuge / build-out / other Traffic Management
<0.5	Dropped kerb crossing

24. The main criticisms of the current methodology have been that it doesn't necessarily give sufficient emphasis to suppressed demand (i.e. active travel trips which aren't made because of the traffic flow / crossing environment) and that it was still too rigid in terms of the score thresholds which needed to be achieved to justify provision of formal crossing facilities (zebra, puffin, toucan).

2025 Revision of Assessment Methodology

25. To enable the assessment and prioritisation methodology to be brought up to current standards council officers commissioned the consultants, Systra, to review the council's existing methodology against current UK guidance and then to review how other Highway Authorities across the UK evaluate their own crossing requests. Systra were then asked to provide some recommendations as to how York's methodology could be changed to better align with current guidance and best practice. The Systra study is attached as Annex C.
26. The main recommendations of the consultants' report relate to suggested changes to the adjustment factor scoring and addition of some potential new ones. Systra also produced a flowchart showing a potential staged process which could be used to evaluate requests.
27. Taking Systra's recommendations into account, officers have made the following amendments to some of the existing scoring criteria, namely:
- Modified active travel flow (P_{mod}) - Extra options added for active travellers whose movement is made more difficult (encumbered) by – walking a dog(s), pushing a pram or pushchair, carrying several shopping bags or luggage. In these cases, the scores will be adjusted upwards by adding +2 to their unencumbered score. This gives the scoring in the table below.

Active traveller category	Score
Child	4
Encumbered Child	6
Adult	1
Encumbered Adult	3
Older Person	4
Encumbered Older Person	6
Disabled person*	6
Encumbered disabled person*	8

*It is impossible to identify all disabled people using video surveys, therefore the types of visual clues which survey analysts should use include : wheelchair/mobility scooter-users, users of walking aids, assistance dog-users, cane-users, escorted people walking arm in arm.

- Modified vehicle flow (V_{mod}) – the scoring for motorcycles has been adjusted upwards from 0.75 to 1.25 and for all types of cycles has been adjusted upwards from 0.5 to 0.8 to reflect the fact that it is difficult for active travellers to judge the speed of oncoming motorcycles and cycles because of their narrow profile when viewed from the front. As e-bikes are very difficult to distinguish from regular bikes they have been allocated the same score. E-scooters will also be added as a new mode with a score of 0.8. The new scores are below.

Vehicle Type	Score
Car / Mini-van	1
Light Goods Vehicle / Bus / Coach	2
Heavy Goods Vehicle (rigid / articulated)	2.5
Motorcycle	1.25
Pedal cycle (or e-bike)	0.8
E-scooter	0.8

- Speed factor (S) – the previous 85th percentile speed bands did not correspond to groupings used in other Department for Transport guidance and have therefore been adjusted so that they are in line with the DfT's Local Transport Note 1/07: Traffic Calming. The scores have also been adjusted slightly as follows.

85 th Percentile Speed	Score
<20mph	0.8
20 to 25mph	1
26 to 30mph	1.1
31 to 35mph	1.2
36 to 40mph	1.3
>40mph	1.4

- Trip Attractor factor (T) – the scores for different sizes and numbers of different types of trip attractors / trip generators have been altered to give more weighting to this adjustment factor as below. Lists of the types of attractors which fall into different size categories are listed on Page 5 of Annex A.

Size / Number of Trip Attractors	Score
No significant attractors	1
1 small / medium attractor	1.2
2 or more small/medium attractors	1.5
At least 1 large attractor	2

- LCWIP factor (L) – this is a new factor which takes into consideration the crossing's contribution to the strategic networks adopted in the council's local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). Sites which are on the LCWIP priority walk, wheelchair-user, wheeling or cycling networks are given a score of 1.2 and those which aren't on the networks are given a score of 1.
28. Officers have tested the revised scoring criteria to assess the impact of the proposed revisions on all the sites which have been assessed and scored over the past 12 years (excluding those sites which have already had crossings installed). The results are shown in the table below and show that several of the sites which were previously low scoring achieve a revised score which would have enabled them to be put forward for feasibility and design work.

	Original Reported PV ² - pre-2016 methodology changes*	Adjusted PV ² value using 2016 methodology	Adjusted PV ² value using 2025 methodology / thresholds*
Site	Value x10 ⁸	Value x10 ⁸	Value x10 ⁸
Heworth Green (South of Malton Rd Roundabout)	2.6	5.04	10.57
Askham Lane / Westfield School	N/A	2.37	4.88
A19 Shipton Road (Northolme Drive)	N/A	2.07	4.21
Bishopthorpe Road / Campleshon Road	N/A	1.85	3.52
A19 Shipton Road (East Cottages)	0.9	1.71	3.48
Eastholme Drive near shops	N/A	1.12	2.36
B1224 Wetherby Road (Acomb Green)	0.5	1.1	2.26
Huntington Road (Lowther Street to Park Grove)	0.7	1.04	2.21
Thief Lane West of University Road	N/A	1.2	2.20
New Lane / Anthea Drive, Huntington	N/A	0.79	1.63
Haxby Road (Folk Hall) 2021 reassessment	0.5	0.75	1.56
Stonebow / Hiscox	N/A	0.73	1.44
Innovation Way	0.1?	0.67	1.22
York Road Haxby (Holly Tree Lane to Main Street)	0.57	N/A	1.18
University Road (opposite Heslington Hall)	0.3	0.5	1.04
Acomb Road (West Bank Park)	0.3	0.45	0.95
Clifton Moorgate / Oakdale Road West	N/A	0.44	0.90
Walmgate near Margaret Street	0.2	0.4	0.88
Thanet Road / Eason View	N/A	0.39	0.78
New Lane/Jockey Lane, Huntington	0.2	0.37	0.77

	Original Reported PV ² - pre-2016 methodology changes*	Adjusted PV ² value using 2016 methodology	Adjusted PV ² value using 2025 methodology / thresholds*
Site	Value x10 ⁸	Value x10 ⁸	Value x10 ⁸
Stockton Lane (near Christ Church)	0.35	N/A	0.73
Horseman Road /Main Street, Copmanthorpe	0.2	0.33	0.67
Elvington Lane / Main Street near school	0.33	N/A	0.67
York Road, Strensall near Barley Rise North	0.1	0.32	0.65
University Road near Thief Lane	N/A	0.25	0.56
Kent Street / Fawcett Street	N/A	0.22	0.44
Bishopthorpe Road (Winning Post)	0.1	0.17	0.37
Hamilton Drive (West Bank Park)	0.1	0.14	0.30
Water Lane near Rawcliffe Drive	N/A	0.14	0.26
Cemetery Road (near Cemetery gates)	0.04	0.08	0.16
Greenshaw Drive near Wandhill	0.005	0.017	0.04
Thief Lane East of University Road	N/A	0.007	0.01

Key

Below threshold for feasibility for crossing (*stricter
thresholds used pre-2016 and post 2025)
Borderline for formal crossing consideration
Consider for formal crossing



29. In order to avoid a situation where virtually all sites requested exceeded the threshold where they were considered suitable for a formal crossing Officers have amended the threshold levels as below.

Adjusted PV ² value (x 100,000,000)	Type of facility to be considered
>1.0	Consider for a Zebra / Puffin / Toucan
0.7 to 1.0	Borderline for a Zebra / Puffin / Toucan
0.5 to 0.7	Consider for central refuge / buildout / other traffic management options
<0.5	Consider for dropped kerb crossing

30. Officers have revised the flowchart created by Systra to create more points along the process where decisions can be taken to either disqualify a site and/or direct it to a more appropriate workstream, thus avoiding the need to undertake detailed survey work at all sites. This includes a “reality check” as the first stage to enable requests which are completely unrealistic to be rejected thus ensuring officer time is used in the most efficient manner.
31. Examples of requests which may be rejected outright without further investigation include sites which are not under council control (such as the A64), sites where traffic levels are extremely low, plus dangerous locations such as blind bends in the road or blind summits where forward visibility is very restricted and alternative solutions should be investigated instead. The revised evaluation flowchart (with scoring criteria as detailed in paragraph 26) is attached as Annex A.
32. In addition to requests for new crossings, officers also receive many requests specifically for dropped kerb crossings each year. This will also be added to by some sites which, after passing through the new crossing assessment, have been downgraded to only being suitable for dropped kerbs. It is therefore necessary to prioritise those requests to enable them to be dealt with in a strategic manner. A methodology for prioritising dropped kerbs independently of the other crossing requests is put forward on page 6 of Annex A for adoption.
33. In order to tackle the backlog of crossing requests, which have built up as a result of resourcing issues over the past few years, it is proposed to put all historical requests, including those which may have been turned down previously, through the first stage (Sense-Check) of this revised methodology. This will enable officers to identify those sites which are not appropriate for a crossing and/or should be addressed via an alternative

workstream, such as the dropped kerb programme or local safety scheme programme.

34. This process will deliver us a pipeline of crossing improvement schemes. The council will then aim to deliver this pipeline over a number of years within available budgets. Creation of a pipeline will also enable bids for funding to be submitted where appropriate as opportunities arise.
35. Next Steps (assuming recommendations are approved):
 - Run all requests through the Sense Check process
 - Deliver the 2025/26 crossing programme dependent on the agreement of funding in the council's Transport Capital Programme and York & North Yorkshire Combined Authority funding bids. Specific sites where Section 106 funding has been secured to deliver them will continue to be delivered in parallel with those funded as above
 - Develop designs for the highest priority sites to enable delivery in 2026/27 and to create a pipeline for potential ad-hoc funding opportunities.
 - Commission the necessary surveys to undertake the crossing assessment to address the petition submitted for a crossing outside Clifton with Rawcliffe Primary School. Petitions have also been received previously for a crossing on Haxby Road outside the Folk Hall and at the Kent Street / Fawcett Street junction. Further assessment work will be commissioned for the Folk Hall site and the Kent Street site will be reassessed to take into consideration the additional student accommodation which has been constructed nearby since the original surveys were done.

Consultation Analysis

36. Consultation with representatives from several sections within the council (whose work is directly related to active travel crossing improvements) was undertaken by Systra as part of the development of the new methodology. The officers consulted were from the following work areas:
 - Transport Policy,
 - Active Travel,

- Highway Access & Development,
- Road Safety,
- Traffic Systems/Signals,
- Highways Engineering & Design,
- Access and Diversity.

37. Feedback from the consultees helped Systra to shape the revised methodology taking on board comments received, these are detailed in Chapter 5 of the consultants' report in Annex A.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

38. There are 3 potential options available to the Executive Member:

- Do nothing – leave the evaluation and prioritisation methodology as it currently is,
- Accept the recommendations – make the proposed changes to the evaluation and prioritisation methodology,
- Propose an alternative methodology – reject the proposed new methodology and create an alternative one.

39. Do nothing – The advantage of this option is that it keeps the status quo, and officers can continue to evaluate and prioritise crossing requests in the same way as they have done for the past 8 years. The main disadvantage is that the current methodology isn't compliant with new guidance and schemes which probably should be considered for further feasibility and design work may continue to be rejected. A key concern about this option is that the council wouldn't be complying with its' Public Sector Equality Duty if groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 continue to be disadvantaged through the continued usage of an outdated tool that fails to recommend all locations where the crossing of busy roads needs to be improved.

40. Accept the recommendations – The advantage of this option is it will bring the methodology in line with current guidance and will give more weight to sites where walkers, wheelchair-users, wheelers, and where appropriate, cyclists would cross if there were a safe means of doing so, this would help us to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty. The disadvantage is that more sites will inevitably be put forward for feasibility, design and delivery stages which will require more staff and financial resource.

41. Propose an alternative methodology – The advantage of this option is that there is some flexibility if the Executive Member, or

stakeholders disagree with the proposed methodology for them to make changes. The disadvantage will be further delay in adopting a new methodology and additional officer time to undertake further work.

Organisational Impact and Implications

42. The recommendations of this report have the following implications.

Financial

43. The new methodology will prioritise where investment needs to be made. Any investments in related capital interventions will be reported through reports to Executive Member using capital funds outlined in the report.

Human Resources (HR)

44. Whilst the report identifies that an updated evaluation prioritisation methodology won't have HR implications it does note a requirement for additional resources to undertake the assessments, delivery, feasibility and design of active travel crossing requests. Such additional resource will need to be quantified, established and recruited in accordance with Council policy

Legal

45. It is noted that grant funding may be used to fund the resourcing of the delivery of the Evaluation and Prioritisation Methodology. If this is the case any proposed grant funding terms would need to be reviewed to ensure they can be complied with and that the funding is compliant with the Subsidy Control Act 2022.

Procurement

46. Should any priorities requirement procurement, all works and/or services must be procured via a compliant, open, transparent, and fair process in accordance with the council's Contract Procedure Rules and where applicable, Procurement Act 2023. Further advice regarding the procurement process and development of procurement strategies must be sought from the Commercial Procurement team.

Health and Wellbeing

47. The recommendations of this report contribute directly to the ambitions and goals of the York Joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2032 to “Make good health more equal across the city and improving transport options... to support active travel and a fitter population”.

Environment and Climate action

48. Providing a safe means of crossing for active travel users supports the York Climate Change Strategy 2022-32 – Objective 3.2 Increase take-up of active travel. The methodology changes proposed could have a positive impact on active travel users.

Affordability

49. There are no Affordability implications of this report.

Equalities and Human Rights

50. A full Equalities Impact Assessment is included as Annex D, this identifies a range of positive impacts of the proposal for a range of protected characteristics and regular feedback on the work will be shared with York Access Forum.

Data Protection and Privacy

51. The completion of data protection impact assessment (DPIA) screening questions evidenced there would be no processing of personal data, special categories of personal data or criminal offence data processed, so there is no requirement to complete a DPIA

Communications

52. Any changes to the highways, should this methodology be approved, will require communications support throughout the planning and implementation stages to ensure local communities are aware of any changes in their area.

Economy

53. From an economic standpoint, the revised methodology for assessing active travel crossings supports long-term cost savings

by promoting healthier, low-carbon transport options. It encourages walking and cycling which can reduce healthcare costs, traffic congestion, and environmental damage and aligns with many companies own active travel policies. The approach also enhances local economic vitality by improving access to businesses and services. However, the success is dependent on securing sufficient funding and staff resources to implement and maintain the infrastructure with a continuing focus on supporting local businesses required. This proposal does align with York's Economic Strategy.

Risks and Mitigations

- 54. There are risks associated with both accepting the recommendations of the report and for rejecting them.
- 55. The risks of accepting the recommendations all relate to resourcing issues, both in terms of staffing and finance. To mitigate these risks, officers need to ensure a source of appropriate funding can be identified which doesn't necessarily move spend from another part of the existing transport capital programme. Maximising developer contributions (where appropriate) may be one source of funding or bids to the Mayoral Combined Authority. The creation of a pipeline of schemes will also enable officers to deliver the programme over a number of years and to have schemes ready to submit for other funding bids.
- 56. The risk of rejecting the recommendations mostly relate to the council's responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty which could leave the council open to challenge and possible litigation if we are perceived to be discriminating against people with protected characteristics and thus disabling them by not adopting a policy that effectively identifies safe crossing facilities.

Wards Impacted

- 57. All wards.

Contact details

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

Author

Name:	Garry Taylor
Job Title:	Director of City Development
Service Area:	Place
Telephone:	07701 258247
Report approved:	Yes
Date:	05/06/2025

Co-authors

Name:	Andy Vose
Job Title:	Transport Policy Manager
Service Area:	Highways & Transport
Telephone:	07887 754532

Name:	Tom Horner
Job Title:	Head of Sustainable Transport
Service Area:	Highways & Transport
Telephone:	01904 551550

Background papers

Exec Member for Transport Decision Session Report and Annexes (11th August 2016) Item 25 [Agenda for Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport - Expired on Thursday, 11 August 2016, 2.00 pm](#)

Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6 Traffic Control 2019 – Section II Crossings p99-145 [Traffic Signs Manual – Chapter 6 - Traffic Control](#)

Annexes

Annex A – Proposed evaluation process flowchart

Annex B – Pedestrian / Cyclist Crossing Request Form

Annex C – Systra Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Review – Technical Note

Annex D – Equalities Impact Assessment