

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 106

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route		
Date of Meeting:	25 March 2010		
Report of:	Director of Environment		
Contact Officer:	Name: Mark Prior	Tel: 29-2474	
	E-mail: mark.prior@brighton-hove.gov.uk		
Key Decision:	Yes	Forward Plan No: ENV15277	
Wards Affected:	Goldsmid; Hangleton & Knoll; Hove Park; Preston Park; South Portslade		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 To inform the Cabinet Member of the results of the public consultation on the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route Scheme and concerns surrounding the design of the proposals.
- 1.2 The provision of a cycle route along the Old Shoreham Road formed part of the Council's Local Transport Plan 2006/7-2010/11 programme of proposed transport improvements designed to improve transport mode choices, residents' health and reduce congestion.
- 1.3 The proposed route would run east – west along the Old Shoreham Road and link with the cycle lane at Grand Avenue and The Drive.
- 1.4 The council has been progressing the proposals over the past year and has consulted with the public and key stakeholders. As the scheme has developed, a number of issues relating to the design have arisen which has led to concerns from Ward Members, key stakeholders and some members of the public on the benefits and quality of the cycle route scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member decides whether or not to proceed with the scheme based on the information in this report.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Policy Context and history

- 3.1 The proposal for cycle improvements along Old Shoreham Road was adopted as part of a package of capital schemes in the current Local Transport Plan 2006/07-2010/11. The scheme was intended to increase cycling trips by 5% per year, reduce congestion by 5% and improve health.

- 3.2 Officers began to develop the concept of the scheme in early 2009. Approval was granted at the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting in July 2009 to begin further work to develop the scheme and undertake a public consultation exercise.

Initial aims of the scheme

- 3.3 The full proposed cycle route extended from Applesham Way (Portslade) to BHASVIC (Dyke Road, Hove),
- 3.4 This scheme was proposed to be developed in two phases
- Phase 1: BHASVIC (junction of Dyke Road and Old Shoreham Road) to Nevill Road
 - Phase 2: Nevill Road to Applesham Way (Portslade)
- 3.5 The scheme was intended to provide a continuous cycle route along the entire route.

Design Issues

- 3.6 As part of the feasibility work various options were explored including the option of locating the cycle lane on the footway. However, Old Shoreham Road is lined with a number of trees, side roads on the southern side, driveways, and in parts a narrow width of pavement, which meant this option was ruled out.
- 3.7 Officers began work to develop a scheme on the carriageway which would consist of cycle lanes with new coloured surfacing on the existing road in each direction. The cycle scheme would also include new signs and Advanced Stop Lines as used throughout the City to improve safety at junctions.
- 3.8 However, the opportunity to provide a continuous cycle route scheme along Old Shoreham Road is precluded by the varying road widths, substandard junctions and potential influence on road traffic flows and capacity. This is particularly notable along the Phase 2 section, but also at the junction of Dyke Road with Old Shoreham Road, and at the railway bridge.
- 3.9 One solution for the railway bridge would be to provide an advisory cycle lane at this section however this would still mean the route could not be considered continuous. The alternative solution to an advisory lane to ensure a continuous cycle route would be to undertake some heavy and major civil engineering works involving the widening of the bridge. This would be extremely costly. A number of junctions along the route would also require major reconfiguration to accommodate cyclists safely.
- 3.10 The scheme as proposed in consultation has been subject to a Stage 1 Safety Audit; the results of which indicated that a continuous length of cycle lane has not been provided.
- 3.11 The lack of a continuous route jeopardises the quality and therefore the objectives of the scheme, particularly that of trying to improve safety for cyclists. Cycling England's Professional Support Team also made similar comments regarding the lack of continuity, particularly for Phase 2 of the scheme.

- 3.12 An additional concern, voiced by elected members, was that not enough consideration had been given to potential knock-on effects of the proposed scheme, such as vehicle displacement onto bordering roads, increased congestion and the creation of 'rat runs'. It was felt that it would be prudent to use the new city-wide traffic model to try to determine the exact nature of these effects before any further decisions are made on progressing a possible scheme.

4. CONSULTATION

Methodology

- 4.1 The public consultation comprised of a mail drop to residential addresses along the Old Shoreham Road, using addresses drawn from B&HCC land & property gazetteer, and staffed public exhibitions at Hove Rugby Club (1 to 5 September 2009) and Hove Town Hall (7 and 12 September 2009). A copy of the leaflet and questionnaire is attached in the Appendices.

Results and concerns

- 4.2 More detailed information on the responses received and a summary of the main comments received from all respondents is provided in the Consultation Analysis Report provided in Appendix 2.
- 4.3 What is clear from the consultation is that the majority of people (66%) felt they supported the idea of a cycle lane on Old Shoreham Road. However the results also show that people felt that the route should be continuous (Question 7 of Appendix 2). Furthermore, that there would not be enough room to accommodate cyclists safely and that this may discourage people, particularly children from using the route.
- 4.4 The lack of continuity and safety was also an area of particular concern for elected Members.
- 4.5 A large majority of people who responded also had concerns about the speed of traffic along the route and felt this was a danger to cyclists. There was also strong concern regarding the volume of traffic along the route.
- 4.6 The Council also received a formal response from Bricycles who state they felt the proposals were 'deeply flawed' due to its 'narrowness, pinch points and inadequate junction treatments' (letter attached in Appendix 3)

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 £750,000 was originally identified for cycle routes within the LTP capital budget for 2009-10. This was set aside to fund the Old Shoreham Road cycle route and the Pier to Marina cycle route. When it became clear that the Old Shoreham Road route would not be completed in 2009-10, the budget was re-profiled into other cycling schemes. Depending on whether the Cabinet Member decides to proceed with the scheme or not funding could be made available from the cycling capital budget in 2010-11.

- 5.2 There are no current revenue implications for this scheme. However, if the route is completed in the future any maintenance of this cycle lane would have to be covered from revenue budgets.

Finance Officer consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 15/03/10

Legal Implications:

- 5.3 Broadly, the Council's powers and duties under the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic including the provision of cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings. Also, as far as is practicable, the Council should also have regard to any implications in relation to:- access to premises; the effect on amenities; the Council's air quality strategy; facilitating the passage of public services vehicles; securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.
- 5.4 To achieve the above or any part thereof the Council can in the light of objections /representations received decide to re-consult either widely or specifically when it believes that it would be appropriate before deciding the final composition of the order. In limited circumstances it must hold public inquiries and may do so otherwise.
- 5.5 Relevant Human Rights Act rights to which the Council should have regard in exercising its traffic management powers are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and therefore there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances.

Lawyer Consulted:

Elizabeth Clubert

Date: 15/03/10

Equalities Implications:

- 5.6 In order to ensure the opportunity to hear from as many residents, users and interest groups a range of approaches were used to engage with the public and the details of these can be read in Appendix 2. Addresses were drawn from the Local Land & Property Gazetteer (LLPG), which is a centralised unique address database and is used for use to extract addresses to send out to residents. Brighton & Hove City Council's LLPG has been created from 10 different system databases, including Electoral Registration, Land Charges, Council Tax and the Postcode Address File, with the objective of giving the most comprehensive database. Venues used for the exhibition were DDA compliant and the exhibition either had a member of staff in attendance or had clear information and a contact number.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.7. The objective of a cycle scheme is to promote and increase cycling along the route which is a sustainable mode of transport. However, given the public concern regarding safety and volume of traffic the route may not attract a significant number of users to have any sustainability implications.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.8 There are no crime and disorder implications associated with the proposals.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.9 The proposed scheme has been subject to a Stage 1 Safety Audit.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 The consultation or proposals do not have any citywide implications.

EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 By choosing whether or not to proceed with the scheme the Cabinet Member will address the concerns raised in the consultation and those of ward members relating to the city wide implications of safety and traffic impacts.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The report provides the results and concerns raised during the consultation process as requested at Environment Cabinet Member meeting in July 2009.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix 1: Consultation Leaflet and Questionnaire
2. Appendix 2: Consultation Analysis Report
3. Appendix 3. Letter from Bricycles

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Local Transport Plan 2006/7-2010/11

