

From: *Redacted (NYC)*
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 1:47 PM
To: *Redacted (ATE)*
Subject: RE: XXX_NYO_02 and XXX_NYO_03

Hi *Redacted*

Just finishing something off, so I have sent Teams meeting for 2pm

Hope ok

Redacted

OFFICIAL

From: *Redacted (ATC)*
Sent: 30 May 2023 13:44
To: *Redacted (NYC)*
Subject: RE: XXX_NYO_02 and XXX_NYO_03

Yes, let's have a Teams call. Are you free now?

Redacted (ATE)

From: *Redacted (NYC)*
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 1:41 PM
To: *Redacted (ATE)*
Subject: FW: XXX_NYO_02 and XXX_NYO_03

Hi *Redacted*

Hope you are well and baring up in the nice weather.

Just trying to get my head around *Redacted (ATE)* email.....

Reading between the lines, *Redacted* is saying both schemes score pretty similarly, but we should be aiming for segregated use where possible, but in doing so we can go down to 3.5m wide (2m cycleway and 1.5m footway) at constraints, but mindful of the need for additional widths needed at fixed height objects. This does constrain matters somewhat because of trees and widths to the rear of bus stops etc and I cannot imagine *Redacted* will be wanting us to go from 3.5m at constraints (if indeed 3.5m is even possible) to 5.0m (full width segregated) then back to 3.5m and so on down the length of the route which will look very odd?

The planners are also worried about verge loss which would occur if promoting a 5.0m wide facility verses a 3.0m wide shared use facility. Even at 3.5m wide the verge loss accumulates.

The section between the application site (H49) and Crag Lane will have no built up development and therefore portrays the 'rural' characteristics of 3.0m wide shared use which will also deal with the constraints of width and level difference between carriageway and footway.

What I cannot do at this juncture is progress with the design of both a segregated scheme and a shared facility scheme as we have a limited funding pot from the Promoters who are paying for this through S106 obligations.

As such, I seem to be at an impasse and would welcome ATE's thoughts having summarised the above.

We acknowledge that the side roads need more thought and the opportunity for crossing Otley Road itself

Happy to catch up with a Teams call if easier

Redacted (NYC)

OFFICIAL

From: **Redacted (ATE)**

Sent: 18 May 2023 10:30

To: **Redacted (NYC)**

Cc: **Redacted (ATE)**

Subject: XXX_NYO_02 and XXX_NYO_03

Good morning,

Thank you for your time this week to discuss the Otley Road designs. Please see ATE's response below. If there is any additional support ATE can offer to this scheme or others relating to the development in Harrogate, please do get in touch.

Active Travel England reviewed each of the options presented for the Otley Road Cycle Route: Phase 3, as discussed in a design review meeting with representatives from NYCC on the 16th May. ATE recognise the ambition in providing active travel infrastructure prior to the completion of the west of Harrogate developments to support modal shift in the area. The notes below contain recommendations from ATE as to how both design options can be improved. ATE recognise the inter-urban setting of large parts of the route under consideration and constraints posed by level differences and preventing biodiversity loss.

Route Check assessment:

ATE use a route check tool to assess the quality of active travel infrastructure designs, which highlight critical issues for users, as defined in the metrics of ATE's tools. Both options were assessed under this method, with results below.

Score element	Shared use option	Segregated option
Existing - route check score	32%	32%
Design - route check score	46%	52%
Placemaking design score	52%	50%
Number of critical issues	1	1

In progressing to detailed design, below are recommendations to improve the quality (service) of the route (in accordance with ATE route check metrics)

Side road priority –

- It is important that wherever possible priority is given to pedestrians and cycles moving over the minor arms of junctions. In most instances, the side roads that intersect the proposed

route serve a small number of dwellings and therefore accommodate very low traffic volumes. In these cases movement priority over a continuous level surface should be given to pedestrians and cyclists enabling them to maintain momentum safely.

- The design of the priority junction will depend on the standard of the active travel infrastructure provision (shared or segregated), the physical constraints of the junction and the traffic volume turning in and out of the minor arm. See LTN-120 chapter 10.5 Priority Junctions for further design guidance.
- A further advantage is that where active travel modes have priority over side roads there is no need for the transitions between shared and segregated space. This should create greater continuity along the route and less signage clutter.

Crossings –

- Both design options present suggested improvements to existing signalised crossings which is welcomed. However, the distance between crossings remains significant, consider additional signalised crossing locations.
- It has been discussed that the Otley Road / Beckwith Road junction needs to be signalised to accommodate the development traffic trips from the allocated housing sites. Incorporating a cycle and pedestrian crossing over Otley Road to satisfy the desire line along Beckwith Road to the south (serving school journeys) and improve the connectivity of the proposed cycle track would be beneficial, as discussed.
- There are existing uncontrolled crossings with narrow central refuges, including next to [Harlow Hill](#) Recreation Ground and close [to Harlow Grange Park](#). With projected traffic volume increasing to >10,000 vpd this becomes a critical issue in terms of standard of crossing facility. It is recommended that these crossings are upgraded to provide a controlled facility.

Shared use option

Shared use provision is unlikely to see as significant an uptick in active travel when considering the planned large scale residential development to the west of the scheme, and the inclusion of the scheme on Harrogate's Primary LCWIP corridor. LTN 1/20 section 6.5 details its limitations around increased conflict between users, especially those with visual impairments. It is clear that shared use routes with high pedestrian numbers or cyclist flows should not be used, and in urban areas conversion of a footway to shared use is a last resort. Where it cannot be avoided, shared use may be appropriate if well-designed and implemented and pedestrian numbers are very low, the guidance sets out minimum widths that should be considered (chapter 6.5.6) and states the need for clear signage. Further, Gear Change notes that *“Cycles must be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians. Where cycle routes cross pavements, a physically segregated track should always be provided. At crossings and junctions, cyclists should not share the space used by pedestrians but should be provided with a separate parallel route.”*

Shared use facilities are typically only acceptable as a last resort in constrained locations where all options to provide a segregated facility have been found to be unfeasible and ATE recognise the constraints of trees and subsequent biodiversity loss in this case.

The choice of infrastructure provision should reflect existing and predicted demand. Since the number of journeys walked, wheeled and cycled is projected to increase, especially likely towards Harrogate town centre, provision of a segregated facility in that part of the scheme would be preferential. LTN-120 recommends an absolute minimum width of 2m for a 2-way cycle track at constraints and given the projected cycle user numbers a facility <3m in width would be acceptable

given physical constraints, especially where this would enable preservation of existing green infrastructure. The width of the footway should not fall below 1.5m, NYCC could consider taking both design options further to determine the viability of segregated provision.

If you need any further clarification on the points raised, please don't hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,



Redacted (ATE)

Follow us on Twitter [@activetraveleng](#), Instagram [@activetravelengland](#) and on [LinkedIn](#)

The information in this email may be confidential or otherwise protected by law. If you received it in error, please let us know by return e-mail and then delete it immediately, without printing or passing it on to anybody else.

Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications and for other lawful purposes.

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
