

Report author: Rebecca Atherton

Tel: 0113 378 8642

# Powered Two-Wheeler Use of Bus Lanes

Date: 16 September 2021

Report of: Head of Democratic Services

Report to: Infrastructure, Investment and inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board

Will the decision be open for call in?  $\square$  Yes  $\boxtimes$  No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? ☐ Yes ☒ No

# What is this report about?

Including how it contributes to the city's and council's ambitions

- On 4 September 2019 the Infrastructure, Investment and Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board recommended that Leeds City Council should establish a trial of powered two-wheeler access to bus lanes.
- A section of the A65 was subsequently identified as the most favourable location and proposals were brought forward to progress an initial scheme.
- On 24 June 2021 the Board was advised that local ward members in Kirkstall are not supportive of the scheme and the trial could not therefore be implemented.
- The Board was further advised that since 2019 national guidance relating to cycle
  infrastructure and bus strategy has evolved. In the context of a number of changes officers
  advised scrutiny board members that the proposed site on the A65 is currently the only bus
  lane in Leeds deemed suitable for a trial of powered two-wheeler access to bus lanes.
- The Infrastructure, Investment and Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board requested a working group to enable members to further explore the views of stakeholders. The working group took place on 26 July 2021 and the notes of that meeting are attached at Appendix 1.
- At the conclusion of the working group members were asked to vote on whether they were supportive of:
  - a) The Board recommending to Executive Board that the proposed trial of powered two wheelers using the bus lane on the A65 is still progressed.
  - b) Providing an initial indication to Executive Board that in due course other segregated routes such as the A647 and A61/A639 should similarly be considered as possible locations for powered two-wheeler access to bus lanes.

- The vote was inconclusive with regard to recommendation A. The Chair therefore committed
  to providing an opportunity for the full Board to vote on this recommendation at its next
  formally constituted meeting.
- A majority of members supported recommendation B in principle, albeit on the understanding that further information regarding cost and site-specific feasibility would be required to inform any specific future recommendation in that regard.

#### Recommendations

- a) The Board is asked to vote on whether it wishes to formally recommend to Executive Board that the proposed trial of powered two wheelers on the A65 is still progressed.
- b) The Board is asked to confirm that it endorses the view of the majority of members in attendance at the working group in relation to recommendation B.

#### Why is the proposal being put forward?

- 1 In July members of the Board met with officers, a local ward member and representatives from the Motorcycle Action Group (MAG).
- 2 Those present discussed in detail issues including (but not limited to):
  - updated advice about cycling infrastructure included in Cycle Infrastructure Design LTN 1/20
  - a summary of wider policy reviews on the subject of powered two-wheeler access to bus lanes
  - a new national bus strategy
  - local and regional collision data involving different types of vehicles
  - speed compliance data
  - limited local flexibilities regarding speed mitigation measures
  - ward member concerns about the safety of young cyclists
  - the views of MAG about how best to protect disproportionally vulnerable road users using powered two wheelers.
- 3 The summary of those discussions is attached at Appendix 1.
- 4 A vote on whether to formally recommend to Executive Board that the trial is progressed despite ward member concerns was inconclusive. The Chair therefore committed to asking the full Board to vote on the recommendation at its next formally constituted meeting.

# What impact will this proposal have?

Wards affected:			
Have ward members been consulted?	⊠ Yes	□No	

Having considered the available evidence on two previous occasions Board members are asked to determine whether to formally recommend to the Executive Board that the trial of powered two-wheeler access to bus lanes is progressed on the A65.

#### What consultation and engagement has taken place?

6 The Board has consulted with local ward members, MAG and Leeds City Council officers.

#### What are the resource implications?

- 7 This report has no specific resource implications.
- 8 However, members have explored the resource implications of progressing a trial, should that be the view of decision makers, within their most recent deliberations.

# What are the legal implications?

9 This report has no specific legal implications.

#### What are the key risks and how are they being managed?

10 There are no specific risk management issues raised by this report.

# Does this proposal support the council's three Key Pillars?

- 11 The three pillars have been discussed in the context of the Board's ongoing deliberations about the merits of supporting a trial of powered two-wheeler access to bus lanes on the A65 in Kirkstall.

# Options, timescales and measuring success

#### a) What other options were considered?

12 The Board is asked only to provide a view on the two issues subject to a vote at the recent working group.

#### b) How will success be measured?

13 Officers will support members in making any recommendations necessary after the conclusion of their vote.

#### c) What is the timetable for implementation?

- 14 The Board is asked to take a definitive view at this meeting as to whether members wish to recommend to Executive Board that a trial on the A65 is still progressed despite opposition from local ward members.
- 15 The Board is also asked to endorse the view of members in attendance at the work group regarding recommendation B.
- 16 Any agreed recommendation will be facilitated by officers on behalf of the Board.

# **Appendices**

17 Appendix 1: Summary of the working group discussion

#### **Background papers**

18 None