



York Civic Trust

A walking strategy for York

April 2021

[Data still needed from CYC is highlighted.]

1 The need for a holistic strategy

York's current Local Transport Plan was drafted in 2011 and sets out a long term strategy for the city's transport system for the period from 2011 to 2031, and a more detailed programme over the period to 2016. There is broad agreement that a new Local Transport Plan is needed, and that work should start soon in the context of the draft Local Plan, which is currently being examined.

We have already prepared a document with recommendations for an overall transport strategy for York, and this is one of seven reports offering proposals for individual modes and policies. Our vision is of a city which respects its environment while enhancing quality of life, social justice and economic vitality. York's new Local Transport Plan should be designed to contribute to that vision. It needs to address the city's needs over the next two decades, while identifying steps which can be taken now. For this to happen, political consensus will be essential to ensure that policies are not reversed each time the Council's political control changes.

In achieving our vision, the new Local Transport Plan should be designed to meet a number of interconnected objectives for the city. Of these, the most important are ensuring that the transport system is efficient, generates substantially less pollution and results in far lower levels of carbon emissions.

At the same time the Plan must be designed to achieve the objectives of ensuring safety, supporting public health, increasing equality of access, increasing liveability, and protecting public space and heritage. A Plan which successfully addresses all of these will also help to strengthen the sustainability and economy of the city.

In meeting these objectives, the Plan needs to adopt a holistic, bold and visionary strategy which achieves significant changes in travel behaviour in the immediate future. The transport strategy should be designed to make effective use of the full range of potential policy measures and to combine them to ensure that the strategy is acceptable, affordable and effective. In doing so it should seek to emulate the best examples in the UK and continental Europe of integrated, sustainable transport planning.

Since population growth is likely to exacerbate York's transport problems, the key elements of the strategy will be measures to enhance public transport, walking and cycling and, at the same time, to reduce car travel, especially in congested and sensitive areas of the City, and

to reduce the need to travel, particularly through the design of sustainable communities. This combination of “carrots” and “sticks” will help make the strategy both more effective and more acceptable to the public and the business community. It should be reinforced by adopting a “hearts and minds” approach, in which incentives are designed to encourage users to change their travel habits and to respect the needs of others.

To reinforce this core strategy, action is needed to improve the operation of the road network, by reallocating road space and using it more efficiently and to improve freight and delivery operations.

2 The focus of this report

In this report we consider the role of, and needs for, walking. We have included walking for all purposes, and for all users. However, we have limited ourselves to the general condition of walking outdoors for work, education, shopping and recreation on public footpaths, footways and pedestrian zones (‘foot streets’) in urban areas.¹ We do not consider walking for recreation beyond the built-up area. We have drawn on an earlier Discussion Paper produced by our sub-group on walking in May 2020².

Cycling and walking together are categorised as ‘active travel’, and the arguments in favour of both are similar. But the solutions are different and, as the Government’s 2020 policy document on active travel, *Gear Change*,³ stresses, pedestrians should be separated from ‘vehicles’ – which include bicycles or tricycles being ridden rather than pushed.

The Government in 2017⁴ asked local authorities in England to provide Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). York has been slow to do so. The city council has recently received a scoping study report,⁵ and agreed to commence preparation of its LCWIP. We welcome this decision, and will be happy to support the Council in preparing its LCWIP. We offer this report as advice on the strategic approach to provision for pedestrians which the LCWIP might adopt. We have not attempted to propose specific schemes, since these are appropriately part of the LCWIP itself.

3 The contribution of walking to our objectives

Support for walking contributes to objectives both directly through the benefits which walking offers and indirectly by offering an alternative to the car.

Directly, walking offers **equality of access** for the large majority of residents of all ages to all parts of the city. In a compact, flat city like York, walking is a practicable choice. However, abilities to walk vary considerably dependent on age, fitness, infirmity or other illness, disability, sensory impairment or the need to support other people, shopping or luggage. Some walkers are disabled. Walking is also ‘mixed traffic’ consisting of different paces and speeds, and is multi-directional within the same routes.

Walking is of considerable importance as a source of leisure and exercise, and has become even more so during the pandemic. In these ways walking supports **public health**: regular

¹ Where footways are footpaths adjoining carriageways and are part of the public, ie adopted, highway.

² York Civic Trust (2020), *Walking: a Discussion Paper*, York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group

³ Department for Transport, [Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking](#), July 2020

⁴ Department for Transport, [Cycling and walking investment strategy](#), April 2017

⁵ City of York Council, *York Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Scoping Report*, July 2020

active travel reduces all-cause mortality by 31%, and 20 minutes exercise a day reduces the risk of depression by 31%.⁶ A detailed study in the British Medical Journal⁷ found a dramatically reduced risk of dying from cancer and cardiovascular disease (41%) amongst people who walked compared to non-active transport. For those who are able, walking brings health benefits in terms of cardiopulmonary improvements at a brisk pace or, at a slower pace, mental health benefits.⁸ Walking is a relatively safe form of travel [**add brief reference to casualty numbers**] and an increase in walking should benefit the **safety** of all road users.

Increased walking also promotes **liveability** and the protection of **public space and heritage**. The DfT's 2016 report on *The Value of Cycling* analysed a multitude of studies and real-life examples of active travel neighbourhoods across the world. They concluded that "cycling has positive impacts for people and the places where they live. It can improve their well-being, lessen their spending on travel and enhance the liveability of their environment."⁹ Similar conclusions can be adduced for walking. The same report established that children who walk or cycle to school achieve better grades and that environments which are supportive of active travel promote more physical activity in later years.

Finally, pedestrian footfall supports the retail **economy**. There is evidence also that promoting walking and cycling in preference to travel by car can increase retail turnover by 30-40%.¹⁰

Indirectly, walking can offer an alternative to car use. Nationally, 40% of urban car journeys are under two miles,¹¹ and many of these can be walked. 45% of all journeys in Yorkshire and the Humber are under 2 miles.¹² A reduction in car use is essential if the Council's target of being **carbon neutral** by 2030 is to be achieved, as evidenced by reports for West Yorkshire Combined Authority¹³ and the City of York Council¹⁴. We have developed our own initial assessment of targets based on those reports, which suggest a reduction of between 20% and 30% in car-km by 2027, and 25% to 35% by 2037¹⁵. In our companion report on managing car use,¹⁶ we have thus advocated targets of reducing the car mode share to 49% in 2027 and 40% in 2037. This would result in the avoidance of most congestion, thus making the transport system more **efficient**. It would also contribute to a **reduction in air pollution**, thus contributing further to improved **public health**. *Gear Change* suggests that doubling walking, by reducing car use, would reduce premature deaths in the UK by around 8,000 per year.¹⁷

⁶ *Gear Change*

⁷ Carlos A Celis-Morales, [Association between active commuting and incident cardiovascular disease, cancer, and mortality: prospective cohort study](#), BMJ 2017

⁸ NHS, [Walking for Health](#). Cardiopulmonary means heart & lungs.

⁹ Rajé and Saffrey, *The value of cycling*

¹⁰ *Gear Change* predicts 40%; Ellis Lawlor, [The pedestrian pound. Just Economics for Living Streets](#), 2014 predicts 30%

¹¹ *Gear Change*

¹² Department for Transport, [National Travel Survey 2019](#), August 2020

¹³ West Yorkshire Combined Authority (2020). *Carbon emission reduction pathways*. Leeds, WYCA.

¹⁴ Gouldson A et al (2020). *A net zero carbon road map for York*. City of York Council.

¹⁵ York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group, *Carbon reduction requirements*, March 2020

¹⁶ York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group, *Managing Car Use*, 2020

¹⁷ Department for Transport (DfT), [Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking](#), July 2020.

4 Current trends and problems

4.1 Pedestrian flows

The only regular counts of which we are aware are those associated with the city centre. The Council's current Local Transport Plan (LTP3) shows that people entering the city centre in a 12 hour period on a September day in 2004 were 18,447 in 2004 and 21,629 in 2019. The council has sought to measure hourly footfall in Coney Street, Stonegate, Parliament Street, Micklegate and Church Street in commercial partnership with Springboard. However, the automatic cameras and software have become problematic over the years. In December 2019, only the Micklegate camera was working. The council has been recommended to 'extend Springboard's contract for a year and explore options for a long term ... solution.'¹⁸

A particular component of York's pedestrian traffic is the very high number of visitors. Latest information suggests that prior to the pandemic the city received eight million a year - nearly 25,000 a day.¹⁹ Most are drawn to the city centre and, in particular, the Minster precinct. There are key walking routes from the station (a quarter of visitors arrive by train), from the Union Terrace and St. George's Field Coach Parks, from the main car parks and from the Park & Ride bus stops. Further information on visitors' travel patterns would be useful.

It is also evident that walking for leisure and exercise has increased substantially during the pandemic, and that such higher levels of activity might be expected to be sustained. The Council at present has no means of recording such trends.

4.2 Modal shares

Nationally, walking accounts for 27% of all trips but only 3% of total mileage. The numbers of walking trips and mileage on public highways in 2018 were the highest since 2006. 80% of journeys of less than a mile were made on foot. This declines to 15% for 1-5 miles and declines steeply for longer distances.²⁰ In 2015, 11% of travel to work was undertaken on foot (compared with 64% mainly by car, 7% by rail, 13% by bus, and 4% by bicycle).²¹ The proportion of trips on foot is highest among young people, peaks at 19-21 and then declines gently to plateau at 40%.²² Nearly half primary school children attending primary and two fifths of secondary school children walk to school.²³ The relationships between proportions walking, income and gender are complex.²⁴ Generally speaking, walking to work is greatest by lowest income families and lowest for those with the highest income.²⁵ Women walk slightly more often than men, but for shorter distances. This may be explained

¹⁸ Report of Head of Economic Growth to Executive Member for Economy and Strategic Planning, 16 March 2020.

¹⁹ Make It York (2019) Annual Report

²⁰ Source: National Travel Survey Report 2018, 2019

²¹ Source: National Travel Survey Report 2015, 2016

²² Source: National Travel Statistics, Report 2018, Table NTS0614. 2019

²³ 48% for primary school children and 39% for secondary pupils. Source: National Travel Statistics, Report 2018, Table NTS0312. 2019

²⁴ Roe, J., Aspinall, P., and Thompson C. (2016), *Understanding the relationship between health, ethnicity, Place and the role of urban space in deprived [UK] urban communities*, in International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. University of Edinburgh, 2020. Roe J is a member of staff at York's Stockholm Research Institute.

²⁵ Rind, E., Shortt, N., Mitchell, R. *et al.* [Are income-related differences in active travel associated with physical environmental characteristics? A multi-level ecological approach.](#) *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **12**, 73 (2015)

by their different activity patterns, with more time spent caring and their reliance on local shops and facilities and part-time jobs. Their lack of choice of other means of transport increases their perceived and real vulnerability, especially at night.

York's Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) reports that the 2001 national census recorded that 15% of journeys to work were made on foot,²⁶ whilst the travel to work survey of 2015 recorded a figure of 14%.²⁷ **[We have asked for more recent data for York from the National Travel Survey and Active Travel Survey.]**

The LCWIP Scoping Study²⁸ (analyses commuting by Census Middle Level Super Output Area (MSOA, of which there are 24 in York) by mode, destination and journey length. The four heaviest pedestrian flows are between the city centre and Heworth South and the Groves, Fulford Road and Clementhorpe, Holgate East, and Clifton. Fig 16²⁹ from the report is particularly interesting in showing origin-destination pairs less than 3.5 miles apart with car commuting journeys of over 150 per day, but few cycling or walking journeys. The largest are from Bishopthorpe, Copmanthorpe and Woodthorpe to the city centre, from Clifton Without to Huntington and from Huntington to Heworth South. While most of these are more suited to cycling, the latter two suggest particular priorities for improvements in walking provision.

4.3 Walking frequency

The LCWIP Scoping Study³⁰ also analyses data on frequencies of walking in York from the National Travel Survey, the DfT Cycling and Walking Statistics and the Active Lives Survey. In 2017/18 36% of adults walked at least five times a week, and 79% at least once a month, with minor variations over the previous three years. Our own surveys of 2019 show that only 5% of residents never walk; 50% walk at least once a day, and 84% at least once a week.³¹

It is clear from the above data that recent information on walking activity in York is inadequate. The LCWIP Scoping Study (p16) recommends that the Council conduct a new survey of levels of cycling and walking. We agree, and recommend that it identify baseline data for the LCWIP and the LTP for mode shares by journey purpose, origin and destination, as well as providing more up to date information on flows and frequencies of use.

4.4 Aspirations and future trends

Our 2019 surveys indicated that, of residents, 34% of residents expect to walk more in the next five years, but 54% would prefer to increase their travel on foot. The equivalent figures for commuters into York, while in York, were 13% and 28%³². There is thus a readiness to increase active travel, which the Local Transport Plan should aim to satisfy.

²⁶ City of York Council (2011) LTP3 table 2.2

²⁷ ONS, May, 2017: based on small sample data

²⁸ City of York Council, *York Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Scoping Report*, July 2020, pp19-24.

²⁹ City of York Council, *York Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Scoping Report*, July 2020, p24.

³⁰ City of York Council, *York Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Scoping Report*, July 2020, Fig 3, p11.

³¹ York Civic Trust, [York Transport Consultation – Key Findings Report \(Residents and Commuters\)](#), Nov 2019

³² York Civic Trust, [York Transport Consultation – Key Findings Report \(Residents and Commuters\)](#), Nov 2019

The pandemic has had a marked impact on travel. In the initial lockdown, across the UK as a whole, car use fell by 70% and bus use by 85%, while walking remained unchanged and cycling as much as doubled. By November, car use had increased, but was still 11% lower, while bus use remained 55% below pre-lockdown levels. York's figures were similar but, while bus use was only 40% lower, cycling had also fallen by 10% compared with before lockdown. It is currently unclear whether any of these impacts will be long-lasting, though it seems likely that higher levels of working from home and shopping online will be sustained, reducing the demand for walking to work and to shop. Given these uncertainties, any future strategy needs to be flexible.

With the current significant shift from petrol and diesel to electric vehicles, the nature of transport and its supporting infrastructure in York is having to change. These changes need to be anticipated and integrated with York's walking strategy, supporting the common aims of achieving positive economic, environmental and social outcomes for the city.

4.5 Problems for pedestrians

4.5.1 Collisions: Nationally there were 456 pedestrians killed in 2018 (27% of all GB road fatalities) down from 600 in 2008. During the same period, all casualties declined from c30,000 pedestrians to 22,412, and serious casualties fell from 925 to 634, whilst the distance travelled on foot fell from 14 to 12 billion miles.³³ In York, pedestrians accounted for 18% of all casualties in 2018, with numbers of casualties falling for the previous five years.³⁴ Casualties were widely distributed across the inner city road network, but with a marked cluster around Ouse Bridge.³⁵

4.5.2 Uneven and impeded footways There is widespread concern over the quality of footways in the city. In the 2019 Age Friendly York survey, 64% of respondents were dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied with pavement quality, generating 160 specific criticisms; these far exceeded concerns expressed on other travel problems. The next most frequently raised concerns for pedestrians were lack of toilets (65) and conflict with cyclists (61). In addition, 23 expressed concerns over parking on pavements, both because it disrupts pedestrians and because it adds to pavement damage. Fourteen respondents raised concerns over pavements which were too narrow and congested.³⁶ Four years ago, the council banned the display of A-boards in the city centre. The anticipated backlash from businesses never materialised. We noted in our discussion paper the problems of pavement congestion on the city centre bridges, the approach from the station, many narrow city centre streets and, more generally, where pedestrians cluster at crossings. The need for social distancing accentuated the need to tackle this problem, and the extension to the footstreets reduced pavement congestion in many narrow city centre streets, though not on the approaches to Ouse Bridge. In our 2019 survey, 63% of residents and 53% of commuters into York considered problems with vehicles parking inappropriately to be serious.³⁷ In 2020 York Cycling Campaign sought comments on locations which caused problems for active travel, using an interactive Commonplace Map. While most inevitably

³³ Source: Department for Transport (2019), *Report of Road Casualties in Great Britain*, Annual Report, 2018.

³⁴ City of York Council, *York Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Scoping Report*, July 2020, pp32-33

³⁵ City of York Council, *York Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Scoping Report*, July 2020, Fig 21, p33.

³⁶ CYC (2020). *Age Friendly York. Getting out and about – your journey – key findings*.

³⁷ York Civic Trust, [York Transport Consultation – Key Findings Report \(Residents and Commuters\)](#), Nov 2019

related to cycling, around 100 submissions identified problems for pedestrians, distributed throughout the city.³⁸

4.5.3 Barriers to direct movement The 2019 Age Friendly York survey generated 45 complaints related to ability to cross roads, of which the most frequent were: lack of time to cross at signals; new green man signals inappropriately sited; vehicles not stopping; and poor surfaces and layouts.³⁹ In our own survey, 57% of residents and 41% of commuters into York considered problems in crossing roads to be serious. More generally, 50% of residents and 36% of commuters were concerned by unsafe or incomplete walking routes.⁴⁰

4.5.4 Problems for the elderly and people with disabilities Elderly pedestrians may well walk more slowly, and thus require longer to cross the road, and be slower in their reactions to other road users. More generally, evidence confirms that the ability of people with disabilities to move a given distance varies considerably between types of disability and also within each group. While 95% of wheelchair users and those who are visually impaired can move at least 140m without a rest, only 75% of those with ambulatory disabilities who use no aid, and 60% of those who use a stick, can do so. 25% of stick users are not even able to walk for 70m without a rest.⁴¹ It is recommended that seating is provided every fifty metres, though even this will not be sufficient for all those with disabilities. York Disability Rights Forum's initial survey of members in 2020 also highlighted that many of the problems highlighted above are more serious for those with disabilities. Examples listed include uneven surfaces, narrow pavements (making turning in a wheelchair impossible), the clutter of street furniture, parked bicycles and pavement cafés, crossings with a dropped kerb on one side but not the other, and crossing surfaces causing hazards.⁴² Lack of toilets and changing places with hoists is also a particular problem for those who are disabled and their carers.

The temporary extension of the pedestrian zone was reported as welcomed by 61% of disabled respondents to a Council survey, though the York Accessibility Action Group and York Disability Rights Forum have raised concerns about the basis for these responses. The same survey highlighted some of the problems caused; the scheme has extended the distances which blue badge holders have to travel; 80% of disabled respondents considered that there were insufficient blue badge parking spaces, and 40% reported that none of the alternatives offered was acceptable.⁴³ More recently over 1000 people have signed the petition *Closed to Us*. It is therefore clear that more needs to be done, when designing and extending footstreets, to provide accessible alternatives for those who are no longer able to access the centre. Urgent action is needed to address the restrictions imposed by the current footstreet extension.

4.5.5 Perceptions of personal safety While the surveys cited above do not highlight concerns over personal safety, recent national events have provided a reminder that women, in particular, frequently feel insecure while walking during the day and even more

³⁸ York Cycle Campaign, [Safe Streets York Recap](#), December 2020

³⁹ CYC (2020). Age Friendly York. *Getting out and about – your journey – key findings*.

⁴⁰ York Civic Trust, [York Transport Consultation – Key Findings Report \(Residents and Commuters\)](#), Nov 2019

⁴¹ Institution of Highways and Transportation (1991). *Reducing Mobility Handicaps; Towards a Barrier-Free Environment*. London, IHT.

⁴² York Disability Rights Forum (2020) Initial survey of members.

⁴³ CYC (2020) Footstreets and accessibility – an open community brief.

so after dark. The growth in the night time economy has increased the numbers of people having to walk home late at night. It would be helpful for the Council to seek information on users' perceptions of safety and security, as a basis for taking action to protect them.

5 Proposed targets for walking

We propose four targets which between them reflect desirable changes in levels of walking, satisfaction with pavement quality, and overall perceptions of quality. These are listed in the table, and justified below. We have used target dates of 2027, which is five years after the start of the new Local Transport Plan, and by which time the outer ring road should have been upgraded, and 2037, by which time the planned development in the draft Local Plan should be complete.

Target	Baseline	Survey
Increase walking overall: 25% increase in pedestrian flows by 2027; 40% by 2037	2019 city centre entry flow: 21,629 in 12 hours	Council surveys. We would like to see counts over a wider network.
Increase walking mode share: 20% of journeys by 2027, and 21% by 2037; for children going to school, 50% by 2027 and 60% by 2037	19% were walking to work in 2011 (Census) [we are seeking NTS and Active Travel Survey data]	Census 2021 and potentially National Travel Survey and Active Travel Survey
Satisfaction with pavement quality: only 20% dissatisfied by 2027; 10% by 2037	64% dissatisfied in 2019 Age Friendly York survey	Repeats of the Council's Age Friendly York survey
Improve public perception: 50% of residents to think York a convenient and safe place to walk by 2027, and 75% by 2037	[We know of no data on this at present]	We propose an equivalent of the Sustrans Bike Life Survey to be implemented by the Council and to cover walking as well.

5.1 Increasing overall walking

The Government, in *Gear Change*,⁴⁴ sets a target of half of all journeys in towns and cities being cycled or walked by 2030. In 2011, 31% of York residents commuting to work in York used active travel, and well in excess of 50% of secondary school pupils did. For York, therefore, the target in *Gear Change* is unambitious. Our analysis of the implications of York aiming to be carbon neutral by 2030 suggests that pedestrian flows will need to increase by up to 25% by 2027 and 30% by 2037.⁴⁵ There is a case for setting a target higher than this for 2037, given the benefits of increased active travel and the planned population growth. These increases in flow are only currently monitored using for entry to the city centre. These surveys need to be sustained, and expanded to other areas of the city.

5.2 Walking mode share

Modal shares are only regularly recorded in the ten-yearly census **[we are checking whether they are also available for York from NTS and the active travel survey]**. Our analysis of the

⁴⁴ Department for Transport (DfT), *Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking*, July 2020.

⁴⁵ York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group, *Carbon reduction requirements*, March 2020

implications of York aiming to be carbon neutral by 2030 suggests that the required transfer from car will principally be to cycling and public transport, with only small increases in pedestrian mode share to 20% by 2027 and 21% by 2037.⁴⁶ However, it is important to specify these targets to ensure that walking levels are sustained. For school children, walking to school, or cycling for longer distances, should be considered the preferred mode, and a reduction sought in the numbers of parents and carers driving children to school. Provisionally, we propose targets of 50% walking by 2027 and 60% by 2037.

5.3 Pavement quality

Poor pavement quality is a serious deterrent to walking, particularly for the elderly and those who are disabled. The Council's 2019 Age Friendly York survey found that as many as 64% of respondents were dissatisfied with pavement quality. This is a serious indictment, and needs to be addressed. We recommend that the survey is repeated at least biennially, and that challenging targets are set to reduce this figure to 20% by 2027 and 10% by 2037. We appreciate that this has significant budgetary implications, but if the targets are to be reduced to reflect limited resources, this should be made clear.

5.4 Perceptions of quality

In our report on Cycling we advocate that the Council should adopt the Sustrans Bike Life Survey as providing the best indicator of cyclists' experience. We suggest that the same style of survey might be adopted to assess satisfaction with walking, in terms both of convenience and of security. In the absence of a baseline, we have proposed the same targets as we specified in our Cycling report, and would hope that the survey would help identify causes of dissatisfaction and perceptions of insecurity.

5.5 Access for people with disabilities

We have not as yet specified a target for access by disabled people, but recommend that one is defined. The Council's Footstreets and Accessibility survey of 2020⁴⁷ highlighted continuing problems for those with disabilities in gaining access to and moving around the city centre. Research demonstrates that around 20% of the population have a disability which may make walking difficult, and that within that cohort there is a very wide range of abilities to walk. Council officers have stated that 8,000 people qualify for a blue badge. The ideal should be to enable as many as possible to be able to move around the footstreet area from drop-off points on the immediate periphery, and then provide dedicated access by vehicle for those who cannot. This requires a regular survey, and we recommend that the Council works with York Disability Rights Forum to design and conduct such a survey and then specify a target to be achieved by 2027, and a further one by 2037.

6 The range of policy measures

The government's policy document on active travel, *Gear Change*,⁴⁸ offers little guidance on walking. Some guidance is provided in *Manual for Streets 2*⁴⁹ but by far the most

⁴⁶ York Civic Trust Transport Advisory Group, *Carbon reduction requirements*, March 2020

⁴⁷ CYC (2020) Footstreets and accessibility – an open community brief.

⁴⁸ Department for Transport (DfT), *Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking*, July 2020.

⁴⁹ Department for Transport (2010). *Manual for Streets 2: Wider Application of the Principles*.

comprehensive source is the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation's *Designing for Walking*.⁵⁰ We based our list of policy measures on that.

6.1 Overall network design

1. Overall provision
2. Pedestrian Zones ('Footstreets') and other pedestrian areas
3. New routes
4. Provision in new developments.

6.2 Design of links and crossings

1. Footway widths
2. Separation of cyclists and pedestrians
3. Traffic signals
4. Roundabouts
5. Priority side road crossings
6. Signalised crossings
7. Zebra crossings
8. Refuges
9. Guardrails
10. Signs, markings and lighting
11. Barriers
12. Facilities for pedestrians.

6.3 Recurring commitments

1. Soft measures (which we cover in our report on Managing Car Use)
2. Enforcement and pavement parking
3. Maintenance
4. Representation and advocacy.

7 The ways in which each policy measure might be applied

The Council rightly places pedestrians first in its hierarchy of users,⁵¹ but this is only of value if the Council's actions fully reflect that priority. We are particularly concerned that, despite placing pedestrians first in its hierarchy of users, and disabled people second, the Council has no priority list of schemes designed to support them. Moreover, we are aware that the Scoping Study for the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) focuses mainly on cycling.⁵² The Council needs urgently to develop its LCWIP and, in doing so, to give at least equal emphasis to the needs of pedestrians. We recommend that its LCWIP addresses all of the proposals which we outline in this section. *Designing for Walking* advocates the use of the Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) for assessing the adequacy of current provision, and we suggest that this be used to underpin the LCWIP.⁵³ It also describes Living Streets' Community Standards Audit; we suggest that this might be considered for use at ward level.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT.

⁵¹ City of York Council (2011). *Local Transport Plan 3*.

⁵² City of York Council, *Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Scoping Study*

⁵³ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 7.2.

⁵⁴ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 7.3.

7.1 Overall network design

7.1.1 Overall provision *Designing for Walking* offers general guidance on the provision of walking networks in cities, and stresses the importance of offering direct routes between all significant start and end points for journeys.⁵⁵ York has an extensive pedestrian network, reinforced by off-road routes along the rivers and through the strays. However, the network in outer York and its connections to the villages is more sparse, and we recommend that a plan be developed for a new, strategic network of walking routes to improve orbital access to outer York employment, retail and leisure centres, and radial routes to the countryside and villages beyond the outer ring road. This could in particular address the need for improved provision on short commuting journeys on which car use predominates, between Clifton Without and Huntington and Huntington and Heworth South. More generally, the network needs to be checked to ensure that it meets the needs of disabled people, for which new guidance has been published.⁵⁶ We recommend that the Commonplace Map facility, as applied by York Cycling Campaign, be used to encourage users to identify problems, which could then be reviewed and prioritised at a ward level.

7.1.2 City Centre pedestrian zone and other pedestrian areas In our discussion paper, we advocated extending the core area of the pedestrian zone in the city centre to include Blake Street and Lendal, Petergate, Deangate, Goodramgate, Colliergate and Castlegate. We were pleased to see that all of these were added in response to the pandemic, and recommend that they be made permanent. We would like to see heavier vehicles banned from the area to reduce pavement damage and intimidation of pedestrians. In due course we recommend that the Council repave streets, as already effected in Coney Street and Davygate, to provide a continuous surface, with appropriate marking of the section on which vehicles are permitted. However, we are aware that these extensions and the longer duration of restrictions have made it very difficult for some disabled residents, who are now normally prohibited from entering from 10.30am to 8pm, to access the shops. It will be essential to address the access needs of disabled people#, including blue badge users, in a way which enables them to access the centre while minimising vehicle movements. We recommend that the Council consider reintroducing a green disability badge for people with exceptional needs, or alternatively to use automatic number plate recognition to achieve the same effect. As more people work from home, local centres will become more important for shopping and social activity. We recommend a review of all local shopping centres to improve access to them and to identify streets which could be closed other than for pedestrians and green disability badge holders for at least part of the day.

7.1.3 New routes We hope that some new routes will emerge from our recommended plan for outer York. In addition, we advocate new routes to relieve pavement congestion in the city centre. Specifically, we would like to explore the potential for of a new, wide footway and bridge between the railway station and the city centre, via Memorial Gardens and Museum Gardens, thus relieving pressure on the footways on Lendal Bridge. The proposed river crossing between North Street and St Martin le Grand would also help to relieve pedestrian flows on Lendal and Ouse Bridges, and provide a more direct link to the Rougier Street bus stops. Along the rivers, we welcome the proposals for a continuous broad, cantilevered footway connecting Judi Dench Walk and King's Staith, and the

⁵⁵ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 4.1.

⁵⁶ TRL for DfT (2018) *Updating Guidance for the Accessible Public Realm*, July 2018.

approved provision of new pedestrian routes by the Foss in the Castle Gateway development.

7.1.4 Provision in new developments All new developments must be designed to provide high quality access for pedestrians and cyclists, and to give priority to public transport over the private car. We would like to see new residential areas designed around pedestrian and play streets, with parking, other than for people with disabilities, provided on the fringes.

7.2 Design of links and crossings

7.2.1 Footway widths *Designing for Walking* recommends that footways should be at least 1.8m wide, with a desirable width of 2.0m, and 2.6m alongside busy roads.⁵⁷ While the extension of footstreets has addressed some of the concerns over inadequate pavement widths, problems remain on Station Road and Lendal Bridge, Gillygate, Ouse Bridge and its approaches, and Skeldergate Bridge. There are also problems in those footstreets which have yet to be repaved, including Low Petergate and Goodramgate. More generally, congestion and restrictions for wheelchair users and blind and visually impaired people occur where pedestrians wait to cross the road, pass bus stops and where street furniture and pavement cafés intrude. Action is needed to identify and prioritise these locations, and to widen pavements as necessary. Problems are unnecessarily caused where permission is granted for shop and other doorways to discharge directly onto footways. In a few situations in outer York, footways are only available on one side of the road. Except in the rare situations where there is no frontage activity and no need for through movement, these should be remedied by reallocating road width to a second footway. As *Designing for Walking* states, a reduced width of 1.5m is better than there being no footway.

7.2.2 Separation of cyclists and pedestrians The new design guidance for cyclists, LTN1/20,⁵⁸ makes clear that bicycles should be treated as vehicles and separated from pedestrians. We recommend that this principle should be applied except where flows are low. Where facilities remain shared, as currently on New Walk and Millennium Bridge, clear and consistent signing should be provided to encourage safe and considerate use. We recognise that there is a case for allowing some access for cyclists across the footstreet network, but stress that it should be designed on the same basis, with clear guidance to cyclists that they need to give priority to pedestrians. The same principle needs to be applied in Minster Yard by Minster Gates, where cycling is the source of frequent complaints about speeding cyclists.

7.2.3 Traffic Signals At all junctions where there is significant pedestrian movement, signals should be designed to allow pedestrians to cross each arm in a single stage, and preferably to cross diagonally. This is a particular problem at the Bootham Bar, Layerthorpe and Walmgate Bar junctions on the inner ring road, where pedestrians can take over two minutes to cross. More generally the timing of signal phases needs to be designed to minimise delays for pedestrians, reflecting their higher ranking in the hierarchy, either by shortening lengths of signal cycles or introducing a second pedestrian stage. Early action at the Pavement/Piccadilly junction, where pedestrians predominate and the junction

⁵⁷ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 4.2

⁵⁸ Department for Transport, [LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design](#), July 2020

operates at well below its traffic capacity, would help demonstrate a commitment to make such improvements. All signals need to be equipped with the necessary technology for blind, visually impaired and hard-of-hearing people, and the pedestrian signal heads need to be located so that they are not obscured by other pedestrians.

7.2.4 Roundabouts These lack a pedestrian-only phase although some refuges are provided. One source of delay, irritation and danger to people on foot is the reluctance of drivers to slow down on approaching the roundabout or to signal when they intend to exit the roundabout. *Designing for Walking* recommends the provision of small roundabouts to limit the diversion from desire lines, and the use of speed tables, refuges and, where demand is high, zebra crossings.⁵⁹

7.2.5 Priority side road crossings *Designing for Walking* recommends that all side road entries should be designed with small radius corners, and that speed tables or blended crossings (in which the pavement continues across the side road) should be used where demand justifies it.⁶⁰ We recommend that the Council adopts this approach. The new Highway Code⁶¹ will require drivers to give way to pedestrians when they are crossing side roads. However, it will take some time for this to become accepted practice. We recommend that the Council publicises this change through signing, changes of surfacing and its road safety campaigns.

7.2.6 Signalised crossings Pelican crossings are being superseded by two forms of signalised crossings; Ped-X crossings which retain the 'green man' signal on the far side, and Puffin crossings, which place it at the nearside.⁶² The latter have been the source of widespread criticism in our surveys because they are often obscured by other people on foot, do not clearly indicate the destination, and fail to provide reassurance when crossing. Guide dogs are trained to respond to far-side signals. The most recent government advice to councils is that they can choose either near-side or far-side displays on new signalised pedestrian crossings but should be consistent in their choice.⁶³ We recommend that the Council now consults on the relative merits of the two approaches. Subject to that, our preference is to adopt far-side rather than near-side signals.

7.2.7 Zebra crossings The Department for Transport has also allowed councils to relax their reliance on the longstanding PV^2 formula in determining whether protected pedestrian crossings are justified.⁶⁴ The Council's new policy was approved in 2016,⁶⁵ but needs further review because it ignores shopping as a generator of pedestrian activity. More generally, such crossings need to be provided on desire lines. The crossing of Tower Street from Skeldergate Bridge is a particular serious example of failure to do so, adding up to two minutes to the time taken to cross.

⁵⁹ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 6.7.

⁶⁰ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 6.7.

⁶¹ Department for Transport (202). *The Highway Code*. London, TSO.

⁶² Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 6.4.

⁶³ Department for Transport (2019). *Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6: Traffic Control*. London, DfT.

⁶⁴ Where P is the number of pedestrians crossing an hour on a 100m section and V is the number of vehicles traveling along that section in the same period. Where PV^2 was less than 0.2×10^{10} , no crossing was considered to be required.

⁶⁵ Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services to the Executive Member for Planning and Transport, *Pedestrian Crossing Request Evaluation and Prioritisation*, 11 August 2016

7.2.8 Refuges Refuges should be wide enough to provide safe space for pushchair, wheelchair and mobility scooter users, and large enough to be clearly visible to drivers and contribute to slowing them down. *Designing for Walking* recommends a minimum of 2m width and depth to provide for all users.⁶⁶ Refuges should be provided at all major junctions which have no other provision, and at regular intervals and at all bus stops on main roads. Where there are cycle lanes sufficient space should be retained to allow them to continue past the refuge. They should be located to ensure that pedestrians can cross safely on their desire lines. Where demand is high, speed tables should be provided; elsewhere dropped kerbs will be needed. Where parking is provided, kerbs should be built out to ensure full visibility.

7.2.9 Guardrails *Designing for Walking* states clearly that while guardrails “can be useful in limited circumstances, it is visually and physically intrusive, reduces the width of available footway, and can be dangerous for people riding bicycles on the carriageway who may become trapped between vehicles and guardrail”.⁶⁷ It goes on to recommend that guardrails “should only ever be considered for locations where there is a real risk of pedestrians being hit by traffic should they walk onto the carriageway [such as] where there is a risk of people being knocked into the carriageway or when the desire line really cannot be accommodated”. We agree, and recommend that the Council review its existing guardrail provision and remove all sections that cannot be justified on this basis. Two cases in point are the guardrails on Tower Street and Castle Mills, which impose a diversion of over two minutes on those wishing to cross.

7.2.10 Signs, markings and lighting Signs must be legible, understandable,⁶⁸ comprehensive, continuous, clear and consistent.⁶⁹ Helpful guidance is provided in *Designing for Walking*.⁷⁰ We welcome the recent installation of new wayfinding displays in the city centre, and recommend that their coverage be extended at least to all areas which tourists visit. However, there remains a shortage of street signs to demonstrate to visitors that they have actually reached their destination. The authorised ‘No Vehicles’ sign on entry to pedestrian areas is misunderstood, which may explain the number of younger cyclists riding through the pedestrian zone. Supplementary signs saying ‘No Cycling’ would be helpful. All pedestrian routes need to be sustainably lit to increase personal security and safety, following the guidance in *Designing for Walking*.⁷¹ Sustainable lighting that avoids light pollution should be provided on all walking routes. Consideration should be given to improving CCTV coverage where users report concerns over personal security.

7.2.11 Barriers *Designing for Walking* discusses the design of three types of barrier: ones which restrict vehicles from accessing off-road paths, those which stop vehicles accessing pavements, and those designed as anti-terrorism devices. On the first it argues, as we do in our companion report on Improving Cycling, that such barriers should be removed, and the focus placed on enforcement action where necessary. Where barriers need to remain, they should be designed to permit easy access by users of wheelchairs and mobility

⁶⁶ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 6.3.

⁶⁷ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 4.8.

⁶⁸ *Gear Change*, principle 10

⁶⁹ *Gear Change*, principle 11

⁷⁰ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 8.

⁷¹ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 4.5.

scooters.⁷² On the second it offers general guidance on the use of bollards.⁷³ The Council largely follows that guidance where it provides bollards, but we recommend that they be used more widely where pedestrians are at risk from vehicles mounting the kerb. On the third it discusses appropriate solutions,⁷⁴ although this has potentially been superseded by recent developments. The Council is committed to installing anti-terrorist barriers using vehicle-proof sliding bollards on the edge of the original pedestrian zone. We recommend that, if implemented, the boundary be extended to cover the extended footstreet zone.

7.2.12 Facilities for pedestrians Despite the city centre's many attractions and pedestrian areas, facilities for people on foot are comparatively sparse. They are especially important for older and very young people, and disabled people. In particular, there are relatively few seats and benches. Many are grouped together and in perpetual shade. There are no shelters at all for people on foot other than in bus shelters. We recommend that more, better-spaced seats, benches and shelters are provided in the city centre and elsewhere where people can rest, enjoy fine views in sunlight or shade, and socialise. A 50m spacing is recommended.⁷⁵ The only free public toilets are located in the Coppergate Centre and the railway station, and are unsupervised. Pay-on-entry facilities are located at Silver Street and Bootham Bar. We support the Council's proposal to adopt the Take a Seat scheme, drawing on examples in Keswick, Sheffield, Oxford and Nottingham.⁷⁶ Facilities to refill water bottles would also be welcome.

7.3 Recurring commitments

7.3.1 Enforcement and pavement parking Enforcement is principally an issue in the footstreets, where vehicles park on pavements and where blue badge parking is misused. We would like to see enforcement officers give greater priority to ensuring that the streets are kept free of vehicles during core hours: too many delivery vehicles remain in the pedestrian zone way beyond the 10.30 cut-off. More enforcement is required of inappropriate and illegal cycling activity. The government has recently consulted on powers to allow councils to control pavement parking, and we have advocated the option in which all pavement parking is declared illegal except where otherwise specified.⁷⁷ We recommend that pavement parking should be prohibited, except where there is little alternative and at least a 1.8m footway can be retained alongside parked vehicles. The Council should devote sufficient resources to ensuring that this ban on pavement parking is enforced.

7.3.2 Maintenance As noted above, problems with damaged pavements dominated the concerns in the recent Age Friendly York surveys, and it is essential that the Council devotes sufficient resources to repairing pavements, and also to tackling locations where crossings are uneven for wheelchair users or frequently flood. While not mentioned in the surveys, problems also occur where vegetation is allowed to protrude into the footway. The original

⁷² Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 10.7.

⁷³ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 4.9.

⁷⁴ Philpotts M (2015). *Designing for Walking*. London, CIHT, Section 10.6.

⁷⁵ *Revised guidelines for reducing mobility handicaps: towards a barrier-free environment*. Institution of Highways and Transportation, 1991

⁷⁶ CYC (2021). *Age Friendly York – Evolving Action Plan*.

⁷⁷ Department for Transport (2020). *Pavement parking: options for change*. London, DfT.

city centre pedestrianisation scheme was carried out over thirty years ago. Many major thoroughfares require reconstruction. Winter gritting and snow clearance are also important elements of the required maintenance programme. We welcome the recent reconstruction of Stonegate. We share Age Friendly York Action Plan's commitment to seeking information on problem locations, prioritising action and demonstrating the benefits.⁷⁸

7.3.3 Representation and advocacy People who walk can be marginalised by the absence of a local, powerful, interest group to represent them in calling for change or commenting on new proposals at the consultation stage. Cyclists, taxi drivers, bus users and business groups can be very influential. We welcome and strongly support the founding of the new representative and advocacy group, WalkYork, and hope that the Council will consult with them on a regular basis. Similarly, the launch of the York Disability Rights Forum has provided an important new basis for dialogue between the Council and disabled people.

8 The proposed policy measures by area

8.1 Network-wide measures

The Council needs to conduct a review of the walking network throughout the city, in order to prepare a list of priority measures for inclusion in its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. We offer this strategy as a basis for doing so. We recommend that it ensures that all significant origins and destinations are served by direct walking links, and that the quality of provision is assessed using the Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS). We suggest that these priorities might be further tested at ward level using the Community Standards Audit. We also encourage the Council regularly to consult on its proposals with WalkYork and the York Disability Rights Forum.

Throughout the network all footways should be upgraded to be a minimum of 1.8m wide, and in and on the approaches to the city centre at least 2.0m. Pedestrians and cyclists should be separated except where flows are lightest. Barriers should be removed from all off-road routes, or redesigned to ensure that wheelchair users can negotiate them easily. All walking routes should be sustainably lit, and consideration should be given to CCTV coverage where there are concerns over personal security. The Council should prepare itself to take advantage of the anticipated legislation on pavement parking, and adopt a default position that pavement parking will be prohibited, except where there is little alternative and at least a 1.8m footway can be retained alongside parked vehicles.

As far as crossings are concerned, we recommend that the Council conduct a review with the public of the choice between near-side (Puffin) and far-side (Ped-X) signals; our preference would be to revert to far-side signals as standard. At the same time the Council should review its standards for the provision of zebra crossings to ensure that they reflect the demands generated by shopping streets. A review is needed of all guardrails, with the default being to remove them unless they are clearly required to satisfy current guidance.

⁷⁸ CYC (2021). *Age Friendly York – Evolving Action Plan*.

There are major concerns about the condition of many footways, and the Council needs to seek regular input on problems that need to be addressed, including footway damage, obstructive vegetation and blocked crossings. On this basis it needs to update its priority list for remedial action and to increase the budget for the programme.

8.2 City centre

We would like to see the recent extensions to the footstreet network retained, with priority given to providing a continuous surface on streets which still have kerbs. To avoid pavement damage, an appropriate low weight limit should be applied for all access to the area. Access needs to be retained for those who are most disabled, and we recommend the introduction of a green disability badge to allow them to pass automatically enforced access points, and with parking provided where it does not disrupt pedestrian movement. We suggest that the Council investigate the possibility of a small electric vehicle to permit those who are less disabled to access all parts of the area. We would like to see groups of seats provided at least every 50m throughout the area, and the Council promote the Take a Seat initiative to extend the provision of toilet facilities. We propose that a clearly demarcated cycle route be provided east-west and north-south through the city centre on suitably wide streets, and that the same design be adopted in Minster Yard. In addition, cargo bikes, but not couriers, might be permitted in other wider footstreets. Enforcement action should focus on removing vehicles not permitted to access or park within the footstreet network. If the Council does pursue its proposed anti-terrorism measures, they should be located around the periphery of the extended footstreet network.

We welcome the proposal for providing a new walkway along the River Ouse between Lendal and Ouse Bridges and along the River Foss as part of Castle Gateway, and a new bridge from North St to Coney St. We also would like to explore the potential for a new pedestrian route from Memorial Gardens to Museum Gardens across the River Ouse, to offer a high quality traffic-free route between the station and the city centre.

The inner ring road as it now operates restricts free pedestrian access to the city centre. Its junctions need to be redesigned to give priority to pedestrians, reflecting the Council's own agreed hierarchy. Crossings should be able to be made in all directions in a single stage, with more time allocated to pedestrians to reduce the delays that they incur.

8.3 Inner and Outer York

Throughout the main road network, refuges need to be provided to permit pedestrians to cross on their desire lines, and designed to recommended standards. Pedestrians walking along main roads need to be given priority to cross side roads, with raised table crossings or blended crossings. At roundabouts, similar provision should be made on all arms. Where footways do not exist a minimum 1.5m width footway should be provided, unless it is clear that there is no demand for through movement. In local shopping centres opportunities should be sought to introduce pedestrian streets, with similar access for disabled users to those proposed for the city centre. New orbital walking routes should be sought to the key outer York employment, retail and leisure centres, and between Clifton, Heworth, Huntington and Clifton Moor, all of which have high levels of short distance car travel. Walking routes need to be improved within the larger retail centres.

8.4 The villages

All villages need to have dedicated, safe and attractive walking routes to the city centre, secondary and tertiary education, major employment, retail and leisure facilities, adjacent suburban centres and into the countryside. All crossings of the Outer Ring Road and other high speed major roads should have well-designed underpasses with line of sight through them.

8.5 New developments All new developments also need to be designed to provide dedicated walking routes to the city centre and local centres. The developments themselves need to be designed around pedestrian and play streets, with high quality access for pedestrians and cyclists, and cars and servicing vehicles limited to the periphery.

9 The implications for each user type

Pedestrian facilities need to be designed to meet the needs of all users, whether they are walking for a purpose or simply for leisure and social interaction. Those with greatest need are those who are disabled, including users of wheelchairs and mobility scooters, parents with prams and young children, and pedestrians for luggage. As a general rule, design for people in these circumstances will ensure that the schemes adopted are suitable for all users. We recommend, therefore, that the York Disability Rights Forum and WalkYork are consulted whenever new schemes are being proposed. In some cases the needs of people with different types of mobility impairment will differ. This is particularly the case when comparing people with visual impairments, who require clearly demarcated space, and those in wheelchairs and mobility scooters, who need ramps and level surfaces. It will be important for the Council to follow current design practice in providing for both these groups of user. The most recent government document is *Inclusive Mobility*.⁷⁹ This was reviewed by TRL in 2018⁸⁰ who highlighted enhancements that were needed, but as far as we are aware no updated guidance has been published.

10 The barriers to be overcome, and ways of doing so

10.1 Political acceptability

The Council had a national reputation for its support for pedestrians when the footstreets were introduced. However, it appears more recently not to have given as much emphasis to meeting their needs, even though it places them first in its hierarchy. As an example, while the Council has a priority list of measures to support cycling, it has no such list of projects to aid pedestrians. This is surprising since, as we have found, half York's residents walk every day and 84% walk at least once a week. We recommend that the Council develops a cross-party approach to supporting pedestrians, and reflects this in its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

10.2 Public acceptability

Public acceptability is influenced by the types of measure adopted. In most cases, improvements for pedestrians can be implemented without causing obvious disadvantages for other road users. Where road space is reallocated, it will be particularly important to make clear the objectives for doing so and to consult on the options available. Public

⁷⁹ Department for Transport (2005). *Inclusive Mobility*. London, DfT.

⁸⁰ Greenshields S et al (2018). *Updating guidance on the accessible realm*. Crowthorne, TRL.

opinion will also to some extent influence levels of walking activity, and we recommend that the Council monitors attitudes to walking in the city, and publicises its benefits.

10.3 Governance

All of the measures considered in this report are within the purview of the Council, and there are thus in principle no governance-related barriers. This may however change if the structure of local government is amended. It will thus be important to agree on the policies to be adopted before such changes occur. In practice we are aware that the Council's ability to allocate road space to pedestrian facilities such as refuges is influenced by the requirements of the police and emergency services. Given the importance of providing additional safe crossings on desire lines, it will be important to agree a set of design principles to which both the Council and emergency services adhere.

10.4 Skills and professional commitment

The Council has been dependent on a very small team of experts responsible for active travel, and our impression is that their focus has been principally on cycling. We are pleased to learn that the active travel team is being expanded, and suggest that the Council allocates one member of the team as a dedicated specialist Pedestrian Officer, and considers expanding the team further to reflect the importance of active travel and the large proportion of the population who will benefit.

10.5 Finance

Most of the measures considered in this report are inexpensive to implement. However, they are typically dependent on revenue funding, which is less readily available from government. Given the cost-effectiveness of these measures, the Council needs to specify and support a revenue budget sufficient to enable the programme to be funded. Some measures, such as footway widening and new routes and subways, will involve more substantial capital funding. Finance for walking measures linked to new development can sometimes be obtained by negotiation through Section 106 and Section 278 Agreements issued with planning permission. Given the planned number of new developments, these will be an important source of funding, and the Council needs to ensure that its Local Plan and development control team facilitate such legal agreements and ensure the funded measures are delivered.

10.6 Enforcement

Enforcement is principally an issue in the footstreets where vehicles enter or remain illegally, and more widely with pavement parking. We recommend that the existing city centre enforcement team are instructed to focus on illegal vehicle movements, and that the Council establishes a team to enforce restrictions on pavement parking once they become law, in the expectation that it should be able to be funded through revenue from fines.

11 The implications for, and requirements of, other strategy elements

11.1 Reducing travel

The strategy for reducing travel is designed in the main to reduce car use and journey lengths, and should not reduce the demand for walking. If successful, it should make it easier to reallocate road space to pedestrians.

11.2 Managing car use

Our proposals will, if implemented, make walking easier, faster and more attractive. The first consequence will be that those people who already walk will do so more often and for longer distances. The second will be a small transfer from short distance car and bus use. Policies directly to manage car use will be essential if a further transfer is to be achieved. The strategy for managing car use should, by reducing traffic levels, make it easier to reallocate road space to pedestrians. By influencing the types of car used, it may also reduce the intimidation felt by pedestrians. The strategies for walking and managing car use need to be designed to complement one another, since each facilitates the other in achieving modal change.

11.3 Public transport

All bus users will need to walk at either end of their journey, and improved conditions for walking will therefore support the public transport strategy. In particular, crossing facilities need to be provided close to all bus stops. Buses also help to extend the distance over which people can walk, and there is a strong case for providing a dedicated service in the footstreet area to allow those with disabilities that make it difficult to reach all parts of the centre. Pedestrians and buses are only in potential conflict near bus stops, and there is a case for reviewing the location and design of bus stops to ensure that pedestrians are not impeded by the stop itself or the resulting queues.

11.4 Cycling

Walking and cycling are alternatives for shorter journeys, but in the main they need to be designed to complement one another. In particular, as stressed in LTN1/20, they need to be kept separate on footways and in road space, except where flows of either are low.

11.5 Managing the road network

We make a number of recommendations for the design of crossing facilities, some of which will reduce capacity for other road users. This reduction in capacity should be delivered through the road network management strategy. By influencing speed and queuing, the strategy will also help reduce danger, intimidation and pollution for pedestrians.

11.6 Improving freight

Lorries and vans can be intimidating for pedestrians in the footstreets, at crossing points and when loading and unloading. The freight strategy needs to address these issues by ensuring that the size of vehicle operated and the timing of deliveries are appropriate to the environment, and that loading facilities are not provided in locations where pedestrians congregate.

11.7 The overall strategy

While the measures considered in this report should significantly improve the experience of pedestrians and those who are disabled, they will on their own have relatively minor impacts on overall patterns of travel, and hence on the key challenges of climate change, pollution and congestion. These will be more directly delivered by efforts to manage car use, improve public transport and cycling, and to change the ways in which the road network operates. Thus the measures to enhance walking are best seen as part of the holistic package of strategies which we advocate.