

**Forward Plan reference number:** N/A

<b>Report title:</b> Chelmsford City Growth Package: Station to Parkway Cycle Connectivity Scheme, Chelmsford	
<b>Report to:</b> Councillor Kevin Bentley, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Infrastructure	
<b>Report author:</b> Andrew Cook, Director for Highways & Transportation ( <a href="mailto:Andrew.cook@essex.gov.uk">Andrew.cook@essex.gov.uk</a> )	
<b>Date:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> February 2019	<b>For:</b> Decision
<b>Enquiries to:</b> Ian Turner, Major Projects Sponsor, Tel 0333 136890, e-mail <a href="mailto:iturner@essex.gov.uk">iturner@essex.gov.uk</a>	
<b>County Divisions affected:</b> Chelmsford	

## 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The Chelmsford City Growth Package is introducing a series of highway capital improvements across the city. Public Information Events have been held for these improvements. Part of these improvements will include a cycle link from the Burgess Springs development near the Station, along Victoria Road South and Parkway to New London Road (the Scheme) (see Appendix C General Arrangement Drawing). The advertising of the scheme details has led to a representation from one objector.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To agree that that the Scheme proceed to implementation as per Option 3 in Section 4 below.

## 3. Summary of issue

- 3.1 The Chelmsford City Growth Package includes a number of new cycle routes around the town centre to improve cycle route continuity and access. These include the Great Baddow to City Centre route, the Broomfield Road Hybrid Cycleway, the New Street Hybrid Cycleway, cycle access through the Parkway / New London Road subway and this Station to Parkway Connectivity scheme. This scheme will provide a vital link between the New London Road area of Parkway and the Station, which is a generally north / south cycle facility which the town centre currently lacks. North / south links via the High Street, Tindal Street and Cornhill have all been previously considered but not proved feasible.
- 3.2 The scheme will consist of an unsegregated shared use cycle / pedestrian facility along the north east side of Parkway from New London Road to Bellmead, across the front of the High Chelmer Multi Storey Car Park, continuing along the east footway of Victoria Road South to the Market Road

junction. North of Market Road the route will continue north via a short section of segregated cycleway / footway adjacent to the library. The route will then cross Victoria Road South using an upgraded crossing facility and link on to the new Burgess Springs Development. Burgess Springs is to remain private but will contain a signed cycle route to the Station as dictated by their Planning Permission. The proposed scheme was advertised in the press and via Public Notices placed on site between 12<sup>th</sup> October 2018 and 26<sup>th</sup> October 2018.

- 3.3 ECC has received one objection following the advertisement of the Scheme. The objector has raised issues concerning the Scheme on three grounds and these are set out below.
- 3.4 The objector has recommended that where the cycle path crosses the car park exits at Victoria Road South and Bellmead, the cycle path should be routed further away from Victoria Road South so that it will not be blocked by cars waiting to enter the main traffic stream. Further suggesting that by raising the cycle path table would make its existence more apparent to cars, which would make them proceed slowly and be ready to give way.
- 3.5 The cycle route will need to go on a reasonably direct line to provide continuity of the route for cyclists. To place the route further back into the car park access at Victoria Road South would create an irregular directional flow to the cycle. This could result in cyclists choosing to ignore the marked path and use their own route, which would not have in place any safety features and could put them at risk. The proposed Scheme will have give way lines located behind the cycle route, the route itself will have edge markings and there will be cycle ahead warning signs, which will inform drivers that cyclists will be passing through and they should aim to wait behind the cycle path until a sufficient gap occurs in the main traffic stream.
- 3.6 A raised table is not recommended for this Scheme, this is due to the route being used by buses entering the market bus stop area and a raised table would create a very uncomfortable ride for bus passengers as well as introducing drainage issues and a maintenance liability.
- 3.7 The Scheme crossing at Bellmead, has seen the dropped kerbs being extended into the junction, providing room for cyclists to move behind a waiting vehicle, when necessary. A raised table at this location is not recommended as the road is on a curve and a raised table would create a very uncomfortable ride for vehicle drivers as well as introducing drainage issues and a maintenance liability. Due to the good visibility and the close proximity of the junction, vehicle speeds are expected to be low.
- 3.8 The Objector also stated that they believed that where the cycle path crosses Market Road, the cycle path should be routed further away from Victoria Road South so that it is not blocked by a car waiting to enter the main traffic stream.
- 3.9 As stated before, the cycle path needs to go on a reasonably direct line to provide continuity of the route for cyclists to take the most direct line and not

be deviated further back into Market Road on an irregular route. Having cyclists cross Market Road further away from Victoria Road South would also introduce a potential conflict with buses exiting the market bus stop area. Similarly, with this location, it is likely that cyclists would naturally choose the most direct route. If this deviated from the marked route this could cause conflict between the cyclists and vehicles using this area.

- 3.9 Finally the Objector indicated that the Scheme proposals at Burgess Springs, should include the widening of the dropped kerb to give more space to avoid conflict with pedestrians. There should be a cycle logo on the carriageway near the dropped kerb to make it clear where cyclists are expected to turn south across the Bellmouth. A direction sign to the city centre should be added to the wayfinding post.
- 3.10 The Bellmouth is currently part of a private development. However, ECC will reconsider the plans for the drop kerb and its extension at the entrance to Burgess Springs as appropriate once the Bellmouth is adopted by ECC or sooner if this can be done by agreement with the developer. In addition, a cycle logo will be included on the same basis. Direction signage has been added along the length of the Scheme.
- 3.11 The responses and actions in response to the representations from the objector are contained in Appendix A.

#### **4. Options**

##### **Option 1: Implement the Scheme as advertised.**

- 4.1 The scheme could be implemented as originally advertised and for the most part it is still expected to be so. However, it is considered that the original scheme layout will benefit from extended dropped kerbs on the south side of the bellmouth entrance to Burgess Springs plus a cycle marking adjacent to the dropped kerbs as suggested by the scheme objector.

##### **Option 2: Incorporate all the suggestions put forward by the Objector**

- 4.2 It is considered that, with the exception of the point in 4.1 above, the suggestions from the objector should not be included within the scheme, for the reasons given in sections 3 above.

##### **Option 3: Implement the Scheme with the amendments set out in paragraph 3.10**

- 4.3 Implementing the scheme as advertised plus the inclusion of the objector suggestions around the Burgess Springs junction, as described in section 3.10 above, is believed to provide the optimum scheme design.

4.4 The latter of these 3 options is recommended. That way, the scheme will benefit from the original design, enhanced as appropriate, and by the input from the objector.

4.5 With respect to the comment relating to Burgess Springs, it is proposed that the final works at the Burgess Springs access will be undertaken once the access bellmouth is adopted by ECC or sooner if an agreement can be reached with the developer.

4.6 The final design will be subject to consideration of road safety audit comments. Where a design change is made to accommodate a road safety audit comment, but the principle of the provision remains the same further authority will not be sought. Where the change is substantial, such that the provision no longer provides the same benefits further authority will be submitted for approval.

## **5. Issues for consideration**

### **5.1 Financial implications**

5.1.1 Amending the scheme in line with Option 3 (from Section 4 above), will have negligible financial implications (circa £1,000). This cost will be covered under the CCGP Capital Budget.

5.1.2 ECC has decided that some decisions which can be funded from existing budgets are low risk and the reports do not need to be individually approved by the Section 151 Officer. As this report is about traffic orders it has been confirmed with ECC Finance officers that it does not require S151 sign off.

### **5.2 Legal implications**

5.2.1 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 gives the Council a statutory duty to exercise its traffic functions to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic of all kinds, including pedestrians and to provide suitable and adequate parking facilities. So far as practical the Council is also required to have regard to:

- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
- (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;
- (c) the importance of facilitating the passage of buses and their passengers.

5.2.2 The proposed scheme is in accordance with these provisions.

## 6. Equality and Diversity implications

6.1 The Public Sector Equality Duty applies to the Council when it makes decisions. The duty requires us to have regard to the need to:

- (a) Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other behaviour prohibited by the Act. In summary, the Act makes discrimination etc. on the grounds of a protected characteristic unlawful
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- (c) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

6.2 The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, gender, and sexual orientation. The Act states that 'marriage and civil partnership' is not a relevant protected characteristic for (b) or (c) although it is relevant for (a).

6.3 The equality impact assessment indicates that the proposals in this report will not have a disproportionately adverse impact on any people with a particular characteristic.

## 7. List of appendices

Appendix A: The responses and actions in response to the representations from the objector.

Appendix B: Equality Impact Assessment.

Appendix C: General Arrangement Drawing.

## 8. Background Papers

8.1 Advertisement of the Scheme

<b>I approve the above recommendations set out above for the reasons set out in the report.</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Councillor Kevin Bentley, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Deputy Leader</b>	18.02.19

In consultation with:

<b>Role</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Director Highways and Transportation</b>	
<b>Andrew Cook</b>	01.02.19

# Chelmsford City Growth Package: Station to Parkway Cycle Connectivity Scheme, Chelmsford

<b>Head of Major Projects</b>  <b>Erwin Deppe</b>	01.02.19
<b>Director, Legal and Assurance (Monitoring Officer)</b>  <b>Kim Cole on behalf of Paul Turner</b>	01.02.19