

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Meeting:</b>      | Executive  |
| <b>Meeting date:</b> | 7 July 2026  |
| <b>Report of:</b>    | Garry Taylor, Director of City Development                 |
| <b>Portfolio of:</b> | Councillor Kate Ravillious, Executive Member for Transport |

## **Bus Priority in York City Centre: The Rougier Route**

### **Subject of Report**

1. The report presents the results of the public consultation into bus priority in York City Centre and requests approval to deliver bus priority on George Hudson Street and Micklegate (between the Micklegate / George Hudson Street and Micklegate / Skeldergate / North Street / Ouse Bridge junctions) on an experimental basis. The report also responds to a petition requesting that Rougier Street and Ouse Bridge remain open to vehicles.
2. The report includes an update to the Council's Parking and Moving Traffic Offences Enforcement Policy. The policy has been updated to reflect the moving traffic offence powers that the Council now holds.

### **Benefits and Challenges**

3. The key benefit the project seeks to achieve is to reduce bus journey times and improve service reliability. Reliability of buses is a critical factor in passenger satisfaction and directly impacts how competitive buses are compared to driving a car. If a bus route is not sufficiently reliable then people either catch earlier buses than they would optimally like to or choose to travel in different ways. 69% of applicable respondents told us that they have had to catch an earlier bus than they needed to because they were worried they might be late.

4. Recent research commissioned by the Confederation for Passenger Transport<sup>1</sup> confirms that in bus journey time is a significant influence on patronage. They conclude that bus patronage can be expected to rise by 1.3% for every minute saved in journey time. A further benefit of reducing bus journey times and improving reliability is that the time saved can be invested in network improvements – expanded routes or better frequency of service.
5. Service 4 real time bus performance data between Clifford Street and the Rail Station has been analysed to understand current journeys times and potential time savings suggest almost six minutes could be saved Monday to Thursday and nearly 11 minutes on Friday. A reliable route through the main City Centre bus corridor will provide journey time savings and reliability benefits for passengers on the 1070 buses that operate on the proposed route.
6. The project will complement other existing bus-based initiatives. Extended Park and Ride hours, overnight parking at Park and Ride sites, the £1 bus fare for under 19s, All York Family ticket price reductions and marketing work will all achieve more if more buses run on time and journey times are shorter. It is important to be able to help the bus industry get into the positive spiral of more reliable buses, shorter journey times, reduced operating cost, more passengers and consequently more investment rather than the negative alternative.
7. The primary concern that has been expressed during the consultation is traffic displacement. A traffic modelling exercise has been undertaken using the Council's strategic transport model to help inform whether the trial should be recommended for progression. There are some limitations with the strategic model but it provides a good general indication of whether any significant issues would likely occur. A report is included at Annex C outlining the results of the modelling work.
8. The modelling shows that, across the city, 92% of journeys in the morning peak were in practical terms unchanged with the project in place – within 30 seconds quicker or slower than their existing time. In the afternoon this is true for 71% of trips. In the morning

---

<sup>1</sup> [The Case for Faster Buses](#)

peak only 3% of trips in the city are expected to increase by more than a minute and in the afternoon 9%.

9. Work has been undertaken to understand where the main journey time increases are likely to occur. The routes with the largest additional expected journey time increases are Museum Street to Blossom Street via the Rail Station and Tower Street to Blossom Street via Nunnery Lane. Travel by this route is expected to take around 90 seconds longer than currently at peak times. The Museum Street to Blossom Street journey time change is more complex to evaluate because there are changes to the layout of Station Road associated with Station Gateway and potential improvements to signal timings that could be implemented. The modelling work was also undertaken prior to the changes suggested as part of the revisions in Bishophill. The changes in Bishophill will result in fewer local trips on Station Road as residents in the Micklegate area will not have to use Station Road when travelling south. The impact is anticipated to be less than the 2 minutes 10 seconds worst case scenario in the modelling appraisal. The Nunnery Lane/Skeldergate Bridge routes will be monitored closely as part of the trial.
10. Some journeys carrying SEND students to school have potential to be impacted by a slightly increased journey time. To understand this further we have looked at current journey time data against that in the future year scenario. We have taken Fulford Road to Salisbury Terrace to reflect the most affected section of a cross City Centre journey. In the morning the journey time is expected to increase from 13 minutes 50 seconds to 15 minutes 10 seconds – an increase of 1 minute 20. In the evening the reverse route has an increase of one minute 50 seconds. These journeys and the impact of the project on them will be monitored.
11. Beyond the improved bus journey times and reliability, other significant benefits include improving the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. 16,305 pedestrians crossed Ouse Bridge compared to 7,040 vehicles in our 2025 12-hour survey. Reducing the volume of through traffic in the area will create a more pedestrian friendly environment. The project will also create new segregated cycling infrastructure, making it easier and more comfortable to access both the city centre and the National Cycle Network along North Street and Skeldergate.

12. Road safety improvements are also expected as a result of reduced vehicle flow on the corridor. Between the beginning of 2020 and the end of 2024 there were 52 casualties on the Tower Street, Ouse Bridge – Micklegate – George Hudson Street – Rougier Street corridor. 1 fatal, 6 serious and 45 slight. 16 casualties were cyclists and 28 were pedestrians, meaning a huge 85% of casualties on the route are active travel users.
13. Less through traffic in the City Centre potentially opens up opportunities for road space reallocation and significant improvement to public space. Project delivery across the Council is now taking a much more place-based approach. Examining how we can improve the built environment of our city to benefit the health and wellbeing of our residents and businesses is critical in developing new regeneration and transport ideas. Through traffic can currently pass within 45m of Clifford's Tower, one of our most historic and iconic buildings. This is not commonplace amongst the highest quality historic cities across Europe – a tier which we are very much in and should be striving to be at the top of.

## **Policy Basis for Decision**

14. The Council Plan has seven priorities; the Rougier Route will contribute towards the following priorities:
15. Health and Wellbeing. The project is anticipated to have significant road safety benefits along the corridor as well as enabling more active travel and improving air quality.
16. Sustainability. Reducing bus journey times on the Rougier Street – Micklegate – Tower Street corridor will make bus travel more attractive, enabling a shift away from car use, which will in turn reduce congestion in the city. Mode shift towards public transport also strongly contributes towards reducing carbon emissions from transport and helps the Council meet its net zero target.
17. Economic. A safer environment for pedestrians, wheelchair users, wheelers and cyclists will help to connect the eastern and western sides of the river, linking the footstreets to Bishophill and increasing footfall on Micklegate and Tower Street. A more reliable bus service will attract more people to travel by bus to the city centre, alleviating congestion.

18. The project is included within the Council's Local Transport Strategy and its accompanying implementation plan. Delivering bus journey time improvement within the City Centre is an integral part of the Council's BSIP and forms part of the programme of works agreed with the Department for Transport as part of the BSIP1 funding award. The Council has corporate ambitions to reduce carbon by 71%. The Local Transport Strategy contains targets to reduce vehicle traffic levels by 20% alongside increasing bus usage by 50% and active travel by 100% by 2030.

## **Financial Strategy Implications**

19. City Centre bus priority has a £2m allocation through Bus Service Improvement Plan funding. A further £200k of York and North Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (YNYMCA) Bus Grant funding was allocated to the project for the 25/26 financial year. The option presented in Annex A has been designed to fit within the £2.2m budget. Funding bodies have agreed to carry monies into the 26/27 financial year to allow the project to be implemented.
20. Supporting revenue cost will be funded by carried over 25/26 bus grant funding. The revenue cost of running the trial will cover the creation of a Blue Badge registration and permit process and ongoing management of resident access and enforcement. This is estimated to cost £150k. This investment would also support exemptions for other future projects where Blue Badge Access may be required. If the project is progressed to implementation the revenue cost and its long-term financial sustainability will be reviewed within the trial period as part of any decision on whether to make the bus gates permanent. If the project is revenue generating, that funding will be used for reinvestment into York's transport networks.

## **Recommendation and Reasons**

21. Executive is asked to:
  - 1) Allocate £2m of BSIP1 funding and £350k of YNYMCA Bus Grant funding to implement the Rougier Route on an experimental basis.

**Reason:** To deliver bus journey time and reliability improvements and to enable the potential benefits and disbenefits to be fully evaluated prior to a permanent decision being made.

- 2) Delegate authority to the Director of City Development to implement the Rougier Route Proposals on an experimental basis allowing exemptions initially for buses, emergency services, Blue Badge holders and Hackney Carriages.

**Reason:** To ensure expedient delivery of the project.

- 3) Delegate authority to the Director of City Development to amend the conditions of the Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the Rougier Route project during the trial period if required.

**Reason:** To allow the Traffic Regulation Orders to adapt to evidence gathered during the trial period.

- 4) Note the contents of the petition.

**Reason:** To consider the views of petitioners when making a decision on the Rougier Route project.

- 5) Approve the City of York Council Parking and Moving Traffic Offences Enforcement Policy.

**Reason:** To update the policy in line with the powers the Council now holds.

## **Background**

20. The Council's Big Transport Conversation, undertaken to inform the Local Transport Strategy identified that;
  - a. 79% of respondents told us that they would, or maybe would "use buses more often if we introduced dedicated priority routes for buses and sustainable transport".
  - b. 72% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed when asked "To what extent do you disagree with the introduction of dedicated priority routes for buses and sustainable transport".
  - c. 88% supported 'improving public transport'.

21. A range of ideas were examined to provide bus priority in the City Centre, largely focussed on how to reduce through traffic but maintain vehicle access to where people need to get to destinations within the City Centre. Travelling through the centre of York is still the quickest way to get from some residential areas to key destinations. Vehicle traffic undertaking those journeys isn't interacting with the city centre, other than passing through it and delaying people and vehicles who do need to access services in central York.
22. The key project components that were consulted between November 2025 and January 2026 are;
  - a. Bus Lane on George Hudson Street southbound and bus gates on Micklegate (between the Micklegate/George Hudson Street and Micklegate/Skeldergate/North Street/Ouse Bridge junctions).
  - b. Enabling Micklegate to go one way for motor vehicles to provide additional space for public space and a contraflow cycle lane.
  - c. Remodelling of the Micklegate/Toft Green junction.
  - d. Contraflow cycle lane on Toft Green and Tanner Row.
  - e. Remodelling of the Rougier Street/George Hudson Street/Tanner Row junction including cycle crossing facilities.
  - f. Improved bus stops
  - g. Closure of Victoria Bar to motor vehicles
23. The design consulted on ensured that every parking space, blue badge space and loading bay remained accessible to all permitted users of those bays at all times. The change being that, for some users, different routes to those spaces and bays may need to be taken than have traditionally been the case.
24. The public consultation highlighted that the project would create some issues regarding access for residents in the Bishophill area in terms of longer journey times and increased mileage. The consultation responses were reviewed and a revised design commissioned which now forms the preferred option (Annex A). A further drop in event was held on 22<sup>nd</sup> April and subject to resolution of some matters, such as permits for those on private roads or with private parking spaces, the revisions received broad support.

25. The revisions to the project design include restoring resident access through Victoria Bar and creating a resident only link through Fetter Lane to enable those who live and own businesses locally to access the area freely but cut through traffic seeking to avoid the bus gate by travelling through Bishophill would be restricted. These revisions enable residents in the Micklegate area to travel south without having to use Station Road.
26. Blue Badge holders and York Access Forum members highlighted concerns around potential journey time increases for those who may have no option other than to use a car for essential journeys to access to the City Centre including the proposed Blue Badge parking at the Castle development. The information gathered and learnt through the consultation has led to the proposal to allow Blue Badge holders access through the bus lane and bus gates on George Hudson Street. A registration process will be created in partnership with local access groups to enables vehicles used by Blue Badge holders to be exempted.
27. At the end of 2024, the Government granted powers to enforce moving traffic violations to 22 English highway authorities outside London, including City of York. This means that CYC can now use these powers to enforce moving traffic offences such as one-way systems, access restrictions (other than bus gates or lanes which were already enforceable by local authorities), banned turns, etc<sup>2</sup>. Before this change, these restrictions were only enforceable by the Police.
28. The implementation of the new civil enforcement powers requires the Council's parking enforcement policy to be updated to introduce the additional enforcement activities related to moving traffic offences. The updated policy (presented in Annex E) outlines the principles and procedures for enforcing parking and moving traffic offences within the City of York and aims to encourage compliance with highway rules for the benefit of all highway users, including disabled people, pedestrians and cyclists, promote road safety and accessibility, support sustainable

---

<sup>2</sup> The full list of restrictions which can now be enforced by local authorities is available here:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6294ddfa8fa8f5039a1bd695/annex-a-traffic-signs-subject-to-moving-traffic\\_enforcement.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6294ddfa8fa8f5039a1bd695/annex-a-traffic-signs-subject-to-moving-traffic_enforcement.pdf)).

transport, reduce congestion and environmental impacts, and ensure fair and consistent enforcement action.

## Consultation Analysis

29. Extensive stakeholder consultation was undertaken on the principle of bus priority during Summer and Autumn in 2025. There was sufficient understanding and appreciation of the importance to improve bus services in the city and the difficulty of the potential solutions to progress to public consultation.
30. Initial public consultation on the proposals was undertaken between 19 November 2025 and 12 January 2026. The aim of this consultation was to understand if there were any issues arising from the initial design proposals that would detrimentally affect people so that the project could be amended or rethought depending on the information received. A full report on the consultation results is enclosed at Annex B.
31. A significant amount of valuable information was received at the in-person events held in Bishophill and at York Library. In particular, understanding how the proposals impacted local residents and businesses in the Bishophill area. Key findings from these events included;
  - a. Concern around extended journeys for those in the Micklegate loop to access the south of the city which would increase journeys from this area across the Station Frontage.
  - b. Concern around extra time/difficulty for business owners on Micklegate accessing the south of the city.
  - c. Concern that the proposed Victoria Bar closure would lead to additional pressure on the Nunnery Lane/Price's Lane Gyratory and the Skeldergate/Bishopgate Street junction.
  - d. Parking on Fetter Lane causing problems for pedestrians and wheelchair users.
  - e. General preference to retain bollards on Bishophill Senior.
  - f. Site specific issues associated with Buckingham Court.
  - g. Concern over additional taxi movements in the Bishophill/Skeldergate area.
32. The survey also asked whether people would support roads in the corridor being set at 20mph in the future. A significant majority agreed. The principle is supported by officers and aligns with the city's transport strategy but is a longer-term project due to

implications on the City Centre; the corridor connects to the Footstreets area at the Spurriergate / Nessgate junction so 20mph on the corridor requires full consideration of the entire City Centre. The Council's Forthcoming Movement and Place Plan will progress this idea further.

33. Further to the consultation undertaken, a petition was submitted at Full Council by Councillor Warters on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2026 seeking to maintain open access to vehicles on Ouse Bridge and Rougier Street. The petition had 850 signatures as of 29<sup>th</sup> June 2026. Some of these signatories may have also responded to the public consultation. The proposed option for implementation attempts to minimise the extent of bus gate and keeps Rougier Street and Ouse Bridge open to access by all vehicles that can currently use them.

## **Options Analysis and Evidential Basis**

34. **Option One:** Proceed with the Rougier Route proposals from January 2027 using an experimental traffic regulation order and allowing Buses, Emergency Services, Blue Badge Holders and Hackney Carriages exemptions to the George Hudson Street and Micklegate bus gates. Recommended.
35. **Option Two:** Proceed with the Rougier Route proposals using a permanent traffic regulation order. Not recommended
36. **Option Three:** Implement the Rougier Route with a different sub option permutation of Executive's choosing. Not recommended.
37. **Option Four:** Do not proceed with the Rougier Route proposals. Not recommended.
38. Options one and two have several sub options to consider different potential exemptions to the bus gate and hours of operation. These are outlined below the top-level option analysis.
39. **Option One Analysis**
40. Implementing the proposed bus gates on an experimental basis provides an opportunity to trial bus priority in York City Centre whilst being able to flexibly adapt the proposals if required. Whilst strategic traffic modelling has been undertaken (Annex C) to identify the likely impacts at peak times the actual journey time

changes and traffic flow patterns will only be understood following detailed monitoring on introduction of the project.

41. Option one proposes access for Blue Badge Holders and Hackney Carriages in the first instance but the experimental approach allows for review should any significant issues arise. Implementing the project in January 2027 will ensure that the bus gates do not go live at the busiest times therefore understanding of the impact can be fully understood through the quieter January to March period. Transport officers will work with colleagues in Education Transport and Private Hire Operators to understand positive and negative impacts in detail.
42. An experimental approach also enables changes to the traffic orders to be made in the Bishophill area if required to ensure that equitable and appropriate access is enabled. If the permanent order approach was taken then any changes would require a lengthy administrative process to be followed.
43. It is proposed that the bus gates and bus lane on George Hudson Street and Micklegate (between the Micklegate/George Hudson Street and Micklegate/Skeldergate/North Street/Ouse Bridge junctions) are operational between the hours of 7am and 11pm and that resident access focussed ANPR in Bishophill and North Street apply 24 hours a day.
44. The experimental approach will mean that for the first six months warning letters would be issued ahead of anyone receiving a fine. The trial period can also be paused to accommodate essential maintenance works on Lendal Bridge.
45. **Option Two Analysis**
46. Implementing the project under a permanent Traffic Regulation Order would provide a greater level of future certainty for bus operators to make schedule amendments and route improvements. It would however, take longer and require a formal consultation process prior to implementation, rather than under the experimental approach where the 18<sup>th</sup> month trial timeframe is the formal consultation period.
47. There are a number of variables outlined in this paper and officers consider there to be a high chance, given the complex nature of delivering a change to the transport network in the City Centre, that

an issue requiring a slight change of approach will be required at some point post-implementation should the project be progressed. The permanent approach does not provide any flexibility to tweak or amend the initial conditions without undertaking formal advertisement of a revised Traffic Regulation Order.

#### 48. **Option Three Analysis**

Executive could choose to implement the project with a different set of exemptions to those recommended in option one. The officer approach has been to balance maximising bus performance with feedback from consultees, stakeholders and Place Scrutiny. An appraisal of the sub options is included below. Should any additional exemptions that are not discussed in this report be preferred then wider delegation to the Director of City Development will be required.

#### 49. **Option Four Analysis**

50. Not implementing the project would mean that buses would continue to be held up in through traffic in the City Centre resulting in long journey times and delayed services. Unattractive bus services reduce the ability of buses to remove car trips from the roads, freeing up the limited capacity for those vehicle users who have no alternative. Not implementing the project would mean funding that had been allocated to City Centre Bus Priority in York by the Department for Transport would have to be returned.
51. There is no easy alternative to the proposed project that would meet the clear requirement from residents through recent consultations to improve bus services in York. The City Centre is where all but one York bus service connects to, or through, and the City Centre is also where our most constrained road space is located. A wide range of options have been considered before proposing the bus lane and bus gates on George Hudson Street and Micklegate and none deliver the potential benefits and the ability to implement clearly and simply whilst impacting only a short amount of frontage.
52. If bus priority is not trialled in this location then there is no plan B available for tackling bus reliability and journey times. Any other improvements that can be delivered to buses would still be impacted by the reliability issues on the network in the City Centre and consequently, longer journey times.

53. The continued growth in housing, based on the Council's future Local Plan requirement to deliver an increased level of 1220 homes per annum, plus growth from neighbouring authorities will further increase the demand on York's road network. The new Local Plan will seek to deliver housing growth sustainably but there will inevitably be substantially more car trips undertaken. Additional congestion requires more buses assigned to routes to retain the same frequency (as the timetabled journey time then needs to be longer) so doing nothing would either, increase the cost of running bus services, costing more money, or result in lower frequencies on key routes.

#### 54. **Sub Option One - Hackney Carriages**

55. There are 189 independent Hackney Carriage vehicles licenced in York. Consultation with Hackney Carriage operators has highlighted the importance of journeys through the Rougier Route corridor, particularly between St. Saviourgate and the York Rail Station. The alternative routing if Hackney Carriages were not permitted to pass through the bus gates would likely be down Skeldergate onto Bishopgate Street then Nunnery Lane and onto the station.

56. Bus gates in Leeds permit Hackney Carriages so there is a local precedent for allowing them into bus lanes and through bus gates. The impact on bus times by allowing Hackney Carriages through the bus gates is likely to be low and their exemption enables those who require an accessible vehicle and who cannot use the bus quick access to the City Centre. The licenced York Hackney Carriage fleet list can easily be added to the exemption list for the bus gates and bus lane. A private hire equivalent for all vehicles who can operate in the city would require a further registration and validation process.

57. Not allowing either Hackney Carriages or Private Hire vehicles through the bus gate would result in all those who cannot use the bus, or who don't own a car having an extended route and cost to get from the Stonebow side of the City Centre to the Rail Station and beyond. It is therefore recommended that Hackney Carriages are permitted to use the George Hudson Street and Micklegate (between the Micklegate/George Hudson Street and Micklegate/Skeldergate/North Street/Ouse Bridge junctions) as they are fewer in number and the impact on Private Hire vehicles can be considered as part of monitoring the trial.

## 58. **Sub Option Two – Blue Badge Holders**

59. The Blue Badge Scheme helps people park closer to their destination. The Blue Badge Scheme: rights and responsibilities in England<sup>3</sup> states that Badge holders are not entitled to drive in bus lanes during their hours of operation.
60. The project allows for Blue Badge holders to access any blue badge bay as they can currently. It does not prevent access to any blue badge spaces. For some users, it will change the route to get to some blue badge spaces in the city; for instance Leeman Road to the proposed Blue Badge car park at Clifford's Tower. The alternate route would be to use Nunnery Lane and Skeldergate Bridge which, through the modelling work undertaken, is likely to be subject to higher traffic flows and some additional journey time increase.
61. Implementing a blue badge exemption would require a new registration-based process to be set up. Blue Badges are allocated to a person, not a vehicle so it would be likely that each blue badge holder would need to potentially register several vehicles. There is no staffing resource in place to administer such a process currently so there would be cost to create the process, configure software and ongoing staffing cost.
62. At stakeholder events and via a dedicated question in the online survey, Blue Badge holders told us that any additional journey time would cause them physical discomfort and have mental health impacts as well as additional financial cost if in a taxi. They also said they had concerns about being late for work, appointments and education if taxis were not allowed through.
63. We also heard that many Blue Badge holders cannot use buses for health reasons and that people caring for Blue Badge holders would face additional journey miles and time. More widely there was concern for access to facilities and around the quality and standards of pavements in York particularly for wheelchair users. Residents also raised concerns about bridges & surrounding roads becoming more congested and additional pollution as a result of this.

---

<sup>3</sup> [The Blue Badge scheme: rights and responsibilities in England - GOV.UK](#)

64. We should also note that there was also support for the consulted on proposals from Blue Badge holders. We heard from young adults with SEND that bus delays significantly adds to anxiety and can have knock-on effects on their education and travelling independently. This anxiety can stop people from travelling and underlines the importance of having reliable bus services. We also heard from disabled people who rely on using mobility scooters, wheelchairs and cycles as a mobility aid that the current level of traffic deters them from travelling through the City Centre using this mode of travel and that reducing vehicle traffic on this corridor would likely increase their use of sustainable travel options.
65. From the engagement undertaken it is officers' recommendation that a registration process to exempt Blue Badge holders is created in partnership with local access groups to allow exemption to the bus gates on Micklegate and the bus lane on George Hudson Street. It is not recommended to allow Blue Badge holders through the ANPR gates on Fetter Lane or Victoria Bar due to the linked requirement to enable some taxi provision and the consequential risk of cut through traffic through Victoria Bar or Fetter Lane impacting the local area. Blue Badge holders and Hackney Carriages would be able to access the areas they need to using the bus gates on Micklegate and bus lane on George Hudson Street plus via Skeldergate/Cromwell Road. The Blue Badge exemption would apply to these experimental locations only and be evaluated as part of the trial.
66. **Sub Option Three – Private Hire Vehicles**
67. There are 52 Private Hire operators operating 393 Private Hire Vehicles plus Consultation with Private Hire operators has highlighted the importance of their service provision as a cross-city journey provider to the SEND community, accessing the various SEND teaching facilities in the city. Consultation with SEND students identified that their journeys often involve multiple pick-ups and drop-offs on route.
68. Allowing access to private hire taxis using the Rougier Route corridor would reduce the overall journey time for the SEND user group but would increase the volume of cars, therefore diluting the benefit to buses and the environment on the corridor. It is therefore proposed that engagement work with affected SEND students and their parents is undertaken to apply for Blue Badges; regular

private hire taxis can then be registered as a vehicle for a Blue Badge holder.

69. Every residential address remains accessible as part of the project design – the only frontages that private hire vehicles would not be permitted on would be on George Hudson Street southbound and Micklegate between the George Hudson Street/Micklegate junction and the George Hudson Street/Skeldergate junction.
70. **Sub Option Four – Businesses with a Frontage**
71. All businesses with a directly affected frontage have had an in person visit from the project team. If the project is approved for implementation then this exercise will be repeated and the detail of their arrangements agreed with officers. Conversations with business owners may result in a need to exempt selected vehicles to ensure premises are able to be serviced and delivered to.

## **Organisational Impact and Implications**

- **Financial** – The capital funding for the design and implementation of the bus gates is assumed within grant allocations. The operational costs of the scheme will be charged to the revenue bus grants and will be monitored throughout the trial period.
- **Human Resources (HR)** – There are no HR implications contained within this report. Depending on the approach taken forward, any additional resource required as noted in paragraph 47 would be established and resourced in accordance with council policy.
- **Legal** – The Council is under the network management duty contained in section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage its road network with a view to securing the expeditious movement of traffic on that network while having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives. The duty includes any actions the Council may take in performing that duty which contribute to securing the more efficient use of their road network or for the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. It may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or

coordinate the uses made of any road (or part of a road) in its road network.

- In exercising functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Council must consider the criteria within Section 122 of that Act 1984 to “secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. In doing so, the Council must have regard to the matters in s.122(2): i. The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises; ii. The effect on the amenities of any locality affected and the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run; iii. The strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy); iv. The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and, v. Any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.
- There may be contractual implications arising out of the procurement of goods and services in relation to the enforcement of the bus priority measures, which will need to be drafted with support from Legal Services.
- **Procurement** – Procurement of services is required to successfully deliver this project. All procurement will need to be undertaken in line with the Council’s Corporate Procurement Guidelines. The Council has created a framework to support delivery of civil engineering projects which can be used to delivery the physical infrastructure. The Transport Technology framework is available to the Council to procure the operational elements of the project.
- **Health and Wellbeing** – The impacts of the trial should be evaluated to understand health, including consideration of road safety.
- **Environment and Climate action** – The objectives of this report align with the Council’s Climate Change Ambition and the objective to increase the uptake of active travel and public transport in the city. Creating a bus priority on the Rougier Street – Micklegate – Tower Street corridor will reduce bus travel times, as modelled.

This is likely to make bus travel more attractive, enabling a shift away from car use, which will in turn reduce congestion in the city. The potential mode shift towards public transport contributes towards reducing carbon emissions from transport and helps the Council meet its net zero target.

The trial should monitor the impacts of displaced traffic and the net impact of overall distance travelled and modal shift.

The ambitions in this report align with the objectives of the Climate Change Strategy

- **Affordability** – No affordability implications envisaged.
- **Equalities and Human Rights** – A Human Rights and Equality Assessment has been completed for the Rougier Route project (Annex D)
- **Data Protection and Privacy** – The data protection impact assessment (DPIAs) screening questions were completed for the recommendations and options in this report and as there is no personal, special categories or criminal offence data being processed to set these out, there is no requirement to complete a DPIA at this time. However, this will be reviewed following the approved recommendations and options from this report and a DPIA completed if required.
- **Communications** – The communications team works closely with transport colleagues and provided support before and during the recent engagement exercise on the Rougier Route proposals. This will continue through the next stages of the project. If the decision is taken to proceed with the changes, this will require a significant communications campaign to support residents and visitors to the city to explain the project and what it will mean for people. This will be backed up by a comprehensive communications strategy, continuing to work with partners to keep residents, businesses and other stakeholders informed.
- **Economy** – The experimental period will need to evaluate impacts upon the economy both City Centre and local areas.

## Risks and Mitigations

72. If the infrastructure works are not progressed then there is a high risk that the Department for Transport would request the funding to be returned. This would leave the Council to seek alternative funding, either from its own funds or YNYMCA sources to implement bus priority in York.
73. There is a cost risk. To manage the risk of an overspend the Council has engaged external cost management professionals throughout the BSIP programme and emerging designs are regularly reviewed to keep the cost plan current.
74. An extended or new ANPR contract needs to be entered into to enable enforcement of the project. A procurement framework has been identified that can deliver a route to securing a supplier in time to support the enforcement of the project.

## Wards Impacted

75. Micklegate and Guildhall.

## Contact details

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

### Author

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Name:</b>            | Garry Taylor   |
| <b>Job Title:</b>       | Director of City Development   |
| <b>Service Area:</b>    | City Development   |
| <b>E-mail:</b>          | <a href="mailto:garry.taylor@york.gov.uk">garry.taylor@york.gov.uk</a> |
| <b>Report approved:</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Date:</b>            | 26 June 2026   |

### Co-author

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Name:</b>         | Tom Horner                                     |
| <b>Job Title:</b>    | Head of Transport, Policy and Travel Behaviour |
| <b>Service Area:</b> | Highways and Transportation                    |

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>E-mail:</b>          | <a href="mailto:tom.horner@york.gov.uk">tom.horner@york.gov.uk</a> |
| <b>Report approved:</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Date:</b>            | 26 June 2026   |

## **Background papers**

None

## **Annexes**

Annex A: Rougier Route Proposals Plan

Annex B: Rougier Route Consultation Summary

Annex C: Traffic Modelling Summary

Annex D: Human Rights and Equality Assessment

Annex E: Parking and Moving Traffic Offences Enforcement Policy