



Streetscape Space Allocation Policy and issues and opportunities to be considered in its Application





# Leeds Streetscape Space Allocation Policy

### Introduction

The Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy sets out the Council's aspirations for the transformation of transport and travel across Leeds. The Strategy focuses on three primary objectives:

- Tackling climate change
- Delivering inclusive growth
- Improving health and wellbeing

The Strategy set out our commitment to the climate emergency and to work towards net-zero carbon emissions. This will be addressed by:

- Reducing the need for travel, reducing the number of car journeys, and delivering a carbon neutral transport system by 2030
- Encouraging people to choose active travel and public transport rather than the private car
- Encouraging and leading the uptake of zero emission vehicles

Furthermore, the Strategy describes how the inclusive growth objective will be delivered by:

- Supporting individuals to access more employment opportunities through a comprehensive transport network
- Developing and regenerating places through continued investment in transport infrastructure
- Improving productivity by investing in a more time and cost-efficient transport system
- Lowering the costs of mobility, ensuring transport is affordable and accessible for everyone

Finally, it sets out how improving health and wellbeing will be achieved by:

- Ensuring walking and cycling are the first choice for the shortest journeys improving physical and mental health
- Reducing the negative effects of transport on our local communities, improving air quality and reducing CO2 emissions
- Helping to make Leeds the best city to grow old in and a child friendly city through making streets accessible to all
- Eliminating road danger by adopting a Vision Zero approach to road traffic collisions

# A Streetscape Space Allocation Policy for Leeds

Public feedback on the Transport Strategy clearly demonstrates that people want the opportunity to walk and cycle within safe, healthy and far less traffic dominated environments. People also want their local communities to be more attractive and welcoming, in a way that is more responsive to the needs of people, rather than catering solely for the needs of motor vehicles. Moreover, people want to see

improvements in public transport services which Leeds City Council can support through changes to highway infrastructure to help address conflicting priorities.

Recent changes to the transport infrastructure delivered through the Leeds Public Transport Improvement Programme and the City Connect Programme are demonstrating how positive changes can be introduced and in a way that supports the Strategy and its objectives. The designs behind these improvements have been developed through lengthy engagement, discussions, trials, and appraisal. Fundamentally they have been based on challenging and changing the conventional ways of thinking.

In summary therefore, the Council has adopted the following Policy to support the objectives of the Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy and meet the aspirations of Leeds's residents:

Street space should be reallocated to prioritise active and public transport on key routes so creating a desirable streetscape for all users to travel and use. This Policy will be supported through a series of recommendations for application as set out in the rest of this document.

The practical application of this Policy can be supported by following the considerations as set out in the rest of this document.



# Streetscape space allocation: considerations to support the delivery of the Policy through revised design practices

This document sets out the need to update the approach, apply new thinking and adopt best practice in designing highway projects. It identifies those areas where the approach to design should change and proposes some high-level principles which will guide and contextualise decision making. It is guided by the new emphasis on designing roads, and streets, for everyone and supporting the Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy objectives for climate, inclusion and health. It reflects recent changes to the Highway Code which prioritise the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.

Fundamentally, it presents a set of considerations and opportunities which will help planners and design engineers consider how to allocate 'street-space' to address the needs of different users, in a way that can best support the objectives of the Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy.

This document will set out a proposed set of considerations which will inform an updated approach to future streetscape design. Having a new approach, with some guiding principles in place will enable a more efficient and consistent approach to:

- amending existing infrastructure as part of ongoing maintenance or improvement being promoted through regeneration, transport or highway projects;
- developing designs for new projects;
- providing a set of outcomes to be achieved as part of the delivery of thirdparty developments; and
- undertaking project consultation and avoiding the need to justify the rationale for changes in the way streetscape space is allocated on a case-by-case basis (which can be time consuming and can lead to sub-optimal designs).

The principles will provide design engineers and planners with an updated approach to understanding priorities, outcomes and how to address compromises between differing objectives. It will provide them with the confidence to adopt a new approach to designing new streetscape infrastructure.

While the considerations set out in this document should be followed as a matter of course, it is likely that engagement with Members, businesses, stakeholders and/or the public might identify instances where the approach could lead to local conflicts. In these instances, and on the basis that evidence is provided to justify why the approach is not followed, exceptions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Leeds Council has an agreed categorisation of the 'Carriageway' network with the following types of roads:

法系

- 1. Motorway
- 2. Strategic route
- 3. Main distributor
- 4. Secondary distributor
- 5. Local access road

This approach focuses on main distributor and secondary distributor roads and parts of the strategic route network. Where strategic routes form part of the radial highway network, and if they are part of the core (high frequency) bus route network this approach would apply. The considerations are not intended to cover orbital strategic routes such as the Outer Ring Road. They do not attempt to address motorways or local access roads. Further work will in due course need to consider the design principles and compromises for those local roads. Motorways are outside the authority of Leeds as the Local Highway Authority.



Clearly there is an overlap/boundary between the categories under consideration and local access roads. The considerations set out in this document will need to be considered and applied at those locations which interface between the different types of roads. In other words, there should not be a 'hard' boundary where local access roads connect to other road categories and designs need to be transitioned across any 'boundary'.

This new emphasis will require a significant shift in the way designs for new highway infrastructure are developed, designed and delivered. This will involve a step-change in thinking and approach, which will result in a different set of outcomes aligned to climate, inclusion, place making and health.

There will be a need to re-think, re-prioritise and re-define the function and purpose of our roads in a way that is more focused on supporting the ambitious and transformative transport strategy objectives. Over recent years, a 'predict and provide' design principle has been that highway capacity for private vehicles should not be reduced. There is a recognition that this approach needs to change. The new objectives set out in the Strategy cannot be delivered within this 'traditional' way of thinking.

#### An approach to design principles

A review of national and international good practice has helped inform the approach to developing a streetscape space allocation policy for Leeds. Some key conclusions can be summarised as below:

• within the context of limited space, and limited capital resources, there will need to be <u>compromises</u> between the needs of different users

- initially an understanding should be established which clarifies a <u>Vision</u> for our roads and streets: how they function, how they can be part of the fabric of community, how they are places in their own right
- good local practice needs to <u>evolve gradually</u>, with a focus on what can be practically achieved, what is publicly acceptable and what is affordable
- the area under consideration is not just the space between kerbs (the carriageway-space) but must consider the footways, frontages and other facilities within the wider <u>streetscape</u>

Public and business expectations are also changing. While impacts on the general public will be part of the impact assessment of a scheme, the specific needs of different groups at risk of being excluded from the benefits of highway works must also be fully considered. The Council's Policy on Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration provides direction on undertaking an initial screening and then, if necessary, how to determine if an Impact Assessment is required. Moreover, landscaping and the use of 'green infrastructure' is becoming a standard expectation as its benefits are recognised and valued by the public, businesses, and other stakeholders.

The move towards 'healthy streets' reflects the fact that historically our approach to the design of roads has been focused on the needs of the car, without an adequate consideration of the needs of other users or indeed the negative impacts of cars on other users (such as noise, pollution or feelings of intimidation.)

Furthermore, the specific requirements of providing a network for abnormal load routes needs to be considered. That network should not be compromised without viable and accepted alternatives being provided. This could affect the approach to some strategic routes.

Guidance from TfL (Streetscape Guidance, TfL, 2019) helpfully sets out the concept of 'streetscape' which considers the nature of the road and its footways together. This is a more integrated approach as activities on the footway interact with, and are influenced by, activities on the carriageway. Both 'spaces' interact with each other and should therefore be considered together. It identifies an approach which requires design engineers to consider six key roles which streets and roads need to perform, in the context of a Vision for the streetscape:

- Moving help people, goods and services get from A to B, by enabling more <u>efficient</u> and reliable movement for a range of transport modes
- Living provide <u>welcoming and inclusive places</u> which support economic, cultural and community activities
- Unlocking improve the <u>accessibility, connectivity and quality</u> of major growth areas to support the delivery of new homes, jobs and economic sectors that cities need as they grow
- Functioning ensure essential access for deliveries and servicing
- Protecting improve safety and ensure streets are secure
- Sustaining reduce road network emissions and support clean, green initiatives for a <u>healthy and more active</u> city

## A Vision for Streetscape in Leeds

The Vision for how our streetscape should be designed is shaped by the aspirations in the Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy. Indeed, this document is a way in which the vision for transport in Leeds, can be supported through a changed approach to how our streetscapes are designed, operate and function. Importantly, aspirations for a significant transfer of trips from car to walking, cycling and public transport will be under-mined without a new approach to the design of the streetscape.

The Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy sets out a number of 'Big Moves' which include practical measures that can help deliver its objectives and support its targets. Some of the most relevant Big Moves which justify the need for a streetscape space allocation policy include:

- Creating healthier streets, spaces and communities
  - o Use street space more efficiently, tackling congestion and reducing traffic
  - o Ensuring walking and cycling are the first choice for the shortest trips
  - Implementation of the Vision Zero aspiration to eliminate the potential for all serious road death and injury through appropriate designs and more effective speed limits
- Enhancing public transport
  - Upgrade key bus corridors (including provision of additional bus priority measures to provide fast and reliable high frequency bus services)
- Transform the city centre
  - o review our parking strategy

The aim to provide Healthy Streets will also be supported by refreshing and rethinking our approach to streetscape design. The approach will consider People, Place and Environment which are central to the approach to new thinking about allocating streetscape space. The aspirations for changes in mode share identify a reduction in car use, with an increase in the use of 'cleaner' more inclusive modes. By 2030 the Strategy proposes the following targets

- Walking increase by 33%
- Cycling increase by 400%
- Bus increase by 130%
- Rail increase by 100%
- Car decrease by 30%

The Covid pandemic has resulted in changed travel behaviours, which suggest we may not hit the absolute target increases, but we should still aim to hit mode share targets.



These targets cannot be achieved without significant changes to the way space within the streetscape is allocated. For many years the needs of the private vehicle have taken priority. However, recent investments such as the transformations delivered through the Leeds Public Transport Investment Programme (LPTIP), are demonstrating the benefits of a more holistic and equitable approach to streetscape space allocation. In its simplest form there has been a clear rebalancing of streetscape space priorities and allocations, away from prioritising travel by car:

- o footways have been widened, and carriageways narrowed
- improved and expanded road crossing facilities make it more convenient, safer and less stressful to cross the road, for increasing numbers of pedestrians
- more public space has been created for pedestrians to enjoy, relax and socialise
- pavement cafes, which became more common during the COVID pandemic, may become more permanent features of our streetscape
- o more segregated cycle lanes
- $\circ$   $\,$  more bus priority, in terms of bus lanes and gates  $\,$
- better bus passenger waiting areas, with more space and a better environment
- o catering for disabled people, older people and children
- o providing more (and protecting existing) green infrastructure

林、新

- delivering higher quality landscaping using more modern and attractive materials
- managing on-street parking in a way which can cater for some of the demand, and provide for priority users such as disabled motorists and taxis

The LPTIP infrastructure works have focused investment on public transport and active travel priority. The investment is underpinned by a "people movement" approach, based on the user hierarchy summarised in the following table, with the needs of protected characteristics including, but not limited to, disabled people, older people and children to be considered for all modes. The hierarchy of users is aligned with recent changes to the Highway Code which has also adopted a user hierarchy,

whereby road users who can do the greatest harm have the greatest responsibility to reduce the danger or threat they may pose to others.

#### **User Hierarchy Diagram**

Use	er Hierarchy
Consider First	Pedestrians Cyclists Public Transport Users Specialist Service Vehicles (e.g Emergency services, waste, etc) Blue badge holders Vehicles serving local businesses Taxis
Consider Last	Other motor traffic.

Recent national policy directives and guidance also provides a new emphasis on addressing road space and changing the balance between user groups to achieve national objectives related to carbon, mode transfer and inclusion:

- LTN 1/20 provides clear direction for a need to provide connected, continuous, segregated and higher quality cycle infrastructure
- The National Bus Strategy provides clear direction on the need to consider bus priority on all 'high frequency' bus routes

The opportunity to enhance the streetscape is important within new designs and the use of green infrastructure should be incorporated. Appropriate green infrastructure can enhance the local environment and can mitigate against adverse traffic impacts. The West Yorkshire Green Streets guidance document should be a primary consideration at the outset.

Vision Zero highlights the need to both reduce general traffic speeds, through reviewing and implementing safe speed limits, and provide highway infrastructure which can physically constrain inappropriate speed levels. The considerations, measures and principles set out in this document must consider the aims of Vision Zero through practical measures on the highway. Clearly proposals which reduce speed limits need to consider the views of the Police who are responsible for their enforcement.

#### An understanding of streetscape users

Any approach to the allocation of space within the streetscape needs to consider not just kerb-line to kerb-line activity, but the whole extent of space within the highway boundary, and all those activities which take place across the frontage-to-frontage space including the footways. Therefore, it is necessary to consider:

- Pedestrians, including those in wheelchairs or mobility scooters
- Cyclists

- Users of e-scooters
- Public transport users
- Public transport vehicles
- Freight and goods vehicles
- Public service vehicles
- Private motor vehicles including cars and motorbikes
- Shared vehicles, including taxis, car clubs and car-pooling which can be considered as both private and public transport vehicles

Pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers require significantly far less space than motorised vehicles, in terms of parking and/or standing or whilst moving. As such these modes can be more efficient in catering for travel demand and prioritising them would lead to a more equitable and efficient response to user needs.

Moreover, Leeds policy aspirations for reducing carbon emissions, promoting inclusion and health, lead to a people focused approach to improve the quality of the urban environment and encourage more localised activity (reducing the need to travel further to access services).

Public consultation on the draft Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy (CLTS) emphasised the need for street designs which reflect the individual needs of disabled people and individuals with mobility impairments. Catering for these users as a priority, will bring benefits across the whole range of travellers.

Each of the user groups can be sub-divided into groups with different characteristics and different needs.

Pedestrians include the full range of the population:

- Active, fully mobile users including adults and children
- People (including Disabled People) with mobility impairments including older people, those with visual, mental or physical impairments
- People who use prams, wheelchairs (electric or self-propelled)

<u>Pedestrians</u> will include people accessing local facilities (shops, schools, local employment etc.), those travelling to connect with public transport and those travelling to/from car parking spaces. They include people moving across or along road corridors, and in some locations include people not moving, where they are waiting for buses, window shopping or engaging socially with other people on the street.

<u>Cyclists</u> include people travelling along a corridor, accessing local services or parking up in a secure location. Cyclists include a cross section of the population from confident cyclists who are happy to use the main carriageway, to those cyclists who are deterred from cycling without dedicated and segregated cycle infrastructure. Feedback from consultation on the CLTS suggests there is a supressed demand for cycling, from potential cyclists who are discouraged by the 'intimidating' effects of car traffic and the lack of segregated cycle facilities. Different types of cycle should also be considered and could include cargo bikes, accessible and adapted bikes, as well as e-bikes and self-propelled bikes. <u>Public transport</u> users include bus passengers and those people accessing, waiting or alighting at bus stops. In time public transport may well incorporate on street mass transit which will require less frequent, but larger stops.

<u>Freight and goods vehicles</u> include a range of motorised vehicle types primarily involved in servicing business activities or providing goods and services across the city. The type of vehicle can include large Heavy Goods Vehicles (delivering/ transporting bulk goods such as serving supermarkets or moving goods around), light goods vehicles (such as those providing home deliveries or proving home or business services such as building or plumbing). These types of vehicles can be travelling along a corridor, or serving shops, businesses or homes along it. Emerging technologies for autonomous deliveries would have specific needs.

<u>Private vehicles</u> include people accessing local destinations. Some people will be used to parking on street outside shops, dropping passengers off (at schools for example) or parking for longer periods outside workplaces or near rail stations. Car users include drivers/passengers with additional mobility needs, such as blue badge holders. The parking needs of these users would need to be considered but would have to be categorised to target and prioritise different users, to prioritise blue badge users, vehicles with children on board and motorcycles.

<u>Shared vehicles</u> Initiatives to support car-sharing including car-club sharing schemes would benefit from dedicated parking spaces giving those schemes higher visibility

<u>Emergency and public service vehicles</u> Within the car category (and light goods vehicles and some police/responder motorcycles) there are emergency 'blue' light vehicles which require priority and benefit from specific exemptions. Moreover, public service vehicles such as refuse collection, street maintenance or utility works have specific requirements and will require exemptions or specific access.

<u>Taxis</u> have some specific needs while they are operating (when not in operation they should be treated as cars). They may need on-street waiting ranks, or locations where it is both convenient and safe to stop and drop off or collect passengers. Taxis can be licenced hackneys or private hire vehicles. Infrastructure provided for these different types of vehicles should reflect the impact on wider streetscape activities, such as the location and scale of taxi ranks, or the promotion of pick up/drop off locations.

In locations where space is limited (which is predominantly the case without an undesirable or unaffordable approach using road widening) compromises between conflicting priorities will be needed. Such design decisions need to be shaped by considering the Transport Strategy outcomes set out at the outset (i.e., tackling climate change, delivering inclusive growth and improving health and wellbeing). These will shape the design principles, and compromises to be considered.

#### **Design Principles**

This policy, and considerations to be made in applying it, focuses on main and secondary roads which form the bulk of roads in Leeds, outside of the 'local access' roads. The policy would not include motorways or strategic routes such as the Outer

林、新

Ring Road. The main and secondary roads in question generally have the following characteristics:

- Roads which carry most bus services (particularly the higher frequency services) and are a focus for bus lanes
- Enable connections into the city centre and other major destinations
- Often, they pass through District Centres with high pedestrian and retail activity
- The sustainability of those retail businesses is critical, and the need to enhance the ease and comfort of their accessibility is important
- Normally have 30mph or 40mph speed limits
- Often have higher levels of pedestrian activity
- Have a high density of traffic signal junctions and pedestrian crossings
- Have a high density of frontage activities, including shops, businesses and houses
- Have a mixed approach to regulation of on-street parking

While this document does not explicitly address streetscape space reallocation within residential/local streets, it will be necessary to consider streets that are adjacent to the main and secondary roads as they may well be affected by any reallocation of parking away from those roads to adjacent side streets.

The consideration of 20mph speed limits on residential streets has identified that a targeted approach, rather than an area wide approach is preferable. The use of reduced speed limits on residential streets could be considered within a package of shared space, active travel neighbourhoods and measures to prioritise the needs of pedestrians. It is envisaged that further advice will be developed addressing priorities, design principles and the need to resolve conflicting demands between different users across residential/local streets.

As identified previously, this document sets out a set of consideration which will help the application of the streetscape space allocation Policy. It does not attempt to specify standards, dimensions, or materials.

Providing guidance on where to change the 'business as usual' approach, will

- Rebalance priorities in support of the outcomes required in the Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy
- Help design engineers adopt a more standardised approach to streetscape design
- Speed up the design process by having a set of more 'standardised' solutions
- Give a clear and visible message that Leeds City Council recognise the value of improving the streetscape for the benefit of local people and local businesses

Specific guidance and technical standards set out in three key documents needs to followed:

- Cycle Superhighway Design Guidance
- Advice note LTN 1/20 (Cycle Infrastructure Design)
- Leeds Transport Supplementary Planning Guidance Street Design Guidance (currently in draft)
- West Yorkshire Bus Stop Design Guidance

The design of the Cycle Superhighway and City Connect projects, sought to establish a consistent and coherent approach to designing cycle routes based on the following design principles:

- Route to be fully segregated from motor traffic
- Cycle priority over motor vehicles at most junctions, side roads and residential or business premises driveways
- Accessible in all weathers, to all users and at any time
- Junction designs follow good design from elsewhere in the UK and Europe, and act as an exemplar design to inform future schemes
- Linked to local networks and key attractors as far as budgets permit
- Integrated with current and future developments.

Furthermore, national policy as set out in 'Gear Change' and detailed in LTN1/20 must be considered in terms of providing a continuous approach to cycle facilities. An effective network must be continuous to provide confidence, legibility and avoid 'unsafe' sections, which can discourage usage, particularly to new users with lower confidence or experience of cycling in traffic.

Update of the Cycle Superhighway Design Guidance will be undertaken given the lessons learnt from subsequent cycle infrastructure programmes City Connect 2 and 3, Leeds Public Transport Investment Program and the Transforming Cities program. Any update would also reflect LTN 1/20 and recent feedback on the proposed design of developing cycle projects from Active Travel England.

The Supplementary Planning Guidance (Street Design Guide) identifies a set of guidance to be followed for new developments. Clearly these are not going to be retrospectively applied, but as changes to the highway infrastructure are developed as part of scheme improvements, the outcomes sought in that SPD should be considered. All schemes and proposals developed utilising this guidance will always be subject to Road Safety Audits as part of the development and construction process.

#### Summary

The following table incorporates a set of considerations which need to be addressed as part of the design process for all highway work. Following this approach will help the application of the streetscape space allocation Policy.

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy
Footways	<ul> <li>The approach to designing footways must start by considering how to support healthy and safe streets principles that will improve the quality of the space that is delivered for the benefits of the local community and businesses</li> <li>The footway needs to be considered as a pedestrian amenity and its attractiveness and comfort for pedestrians needs to be considered in the design process</li> <li>If overall street widths do not allow for a minimum footway width, which in practice may be the width required for two people to pass each other, consideration should be given to reducing carriageway widths and speeds to reduce the adverse impact of traffic on pedestrians</li> <li>The opportunity for additional footway width should be a primary consideration at road crossing points, outside shops, at bus stops or other pinch points i.e., where people gather/wait and where pedestrian congestion can occur</li> <li>Minimise clutter to maintain a minimum effective/usable footway width</li> <li>Where available space is limited, consider using cantilevered signs, erecting poles at the rear of the footway or combining signs onto single poles. It would be helpful to consider public realm guidance which proposes solutions on how to minimise the impacts of street furniture and rationalise street 'clutter'</li> <li>Discouraging footway parking and loading. While this can be difficult to enforce, designs should consider how it can be discouraged through highway engineering at known problem areas. While parking on the footways on residential streets may be accommodated in specific locations, it should generally be actively discouraged (through design) on the strategic, main and residential roads</li> <li>Access across pavements into private parking spaces at the back of the footway (outside shops for example) needs to be minimised. This would be done through engagement with local businesses</li> <li>Where space exists on the pavement, activities such as pocket parks, café seating or displays outside shops should be ensuri</li></ul>
13	

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy
	<ul> <li>new developments should be considered. The Transport Strategy has a target of a 33% increase in walking and that increase should ideally be used as the minimum target uplift above baseline activity</li> <li>Footways should be capable of allowing different users to pass one another including accommodating wheelchairs, double buggies and electric wheelchairs. Consideration should be given to guidance and standards set out in the 'Inclusive Mobility' document</li> <li>The footway should generally not be shared with cyclists (apart from children) but may need to be considered where there are specific local constraints such as very limited space, a lack of other options or as part of Active Travel Neighbourhoods</li> <li>Cycle parking and/or e-bike docking stations would only be provided on the footway where space for pedestrians in not compromised, and where their location does not lead to cycling across the footway particularly to/from dedicated cycle lanes. Ideally cycle parking and docking hubs should be adjacent to those cycle lanes.</li> <li>Footways should not be shared with any form of motorised vehicles, apart from electric wheelchairs</li> <li>Where roads pass through district centres, increased pavement widths will be required to cater for increased footfalls, increased pedestrian density and other calls on footway space e.g., bus stops, displays/seating outside shops</li> <li>A similar approach should be adopted outside schools where large numbers of more vulnerable pedestrians travel and/or congregate</li> <li>Consultation as part of the development of designs should be targeted at existing and latent users of the footway to understand existing issues and as designs progress, to understand the scale of acceptability or need for mitigation/refinement. The views of local businesses should be considered, particularly local retail shops. Some businesses will value more pedestrian space which would improve footfall, others (such as food take-aways) may value highway parking space close to their prem</li></ul>
Cycle Ways	<ul> <li>If the carriageway route forms part of the Leeds cycle network (including all radial routes into Leeds) a fully <u>segregated</u> cycle route would be the preferred option using an agreed minimum width</li> <li>The route should ideally be segregated from other users, continuous and with no gaps in the network</li> </ul>
14	

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy
	<ul> <li>Where standards in provision are missing in constrained sections, designs must make it clear to all users that the route is part of the city-wide cycle network. This could be design measures to make motorists more aware of the category of route, and that they need to have more awareness and consideration of cyclists</li> <li>Ideally a raised kerb or vertical barrier should be used to define the boundary and provide some 'protection' (physical and/or perceived) between the footway and cycleway, and between the carriageway and the cycleway</li> <li>Shared cycleways/footways should be avoided unless there are specific exceptional circumstances, such as low pedestrian flows, and an acceptable minimum width</li> <li>Exceptions may include at and around schools where children are being encouraged to cycle/scoot to school</li> <li>Zero-tolerance of any vehicular parking, loading, or crossing of the cycleway, at unauthorised locations</li> <li>Where cycleways and busy pedestrian footways run across uncontrolled side road junctions Copenhagen style crossings should be considered. This would emphasise the priority for cyclists and pedestrians across the side junction</li> <li>Cycleways could be either bidirectional on one side of the road, or unidirectional on each side of the carriageway. This will be determined by local circumstances and the need to connect into the existing cycle ways</li> <li>If the overall carriage way width is not adequate then shared lanes within the carriageway would be used, and in those circumstances, consideration should be given to reducing speed limits potentially to 20mph</li> <li>Design of facilities should incorporate access to, and across, those routes from surrounding residential roads to support a network concept</li> <li>Design and location of new facilities should consider cycle desire lines for existing and future demand levels, in a way that can accommodate the scale and location of that demand</li> <li>Signage and infrastructure for traffic from side roads and crossing th</li></ul>
15	

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy	
Bus priorities	<ul> <li>On Core bus routes <ul> <li>On dual carriageways the inside lane should be allocated for buses</li> <li>On wide single carriageway, a bus lane should be on the approach to junctions to maximise journey time savings to buses</li> <li>On narrower single carriageways with only a maximum of two lanes, buses and general traffic will share the carriageway</li> </ul> </li> <li>The reasons for why the above are not being provided should be clearly set out and justified</li> <li>Standard bus lane widths should be applied and would need to reflect different speed limits, gradients and traffic composition. If minimum widths cannot be provided consideration should be given to reducing traffic speeds. Further thought will be given to a technical standards document to set out minimum bus lanes widths. This would need to be done in a collaborative way between LCC, WYCA and bus operators, and would need to reflect national guidance and local practical experience in Leeds</li> <li>When being replaced or upgraded, traffic signals and signalised pedestrian crossings should always include detection for buses and an early call, or green extensions should be used to prioritise bus flows</li> <li>Bus detection priority should not be dictated by keeping to the scheduled timetable but should seek to reduce bus journey times specifically. An exception would be on low frequency (to be defined, but perhaps 2 buses per hour) bus routes</li> <li>Bus gates (with bus priority) should be considered on entry into narrowed sections of carriage way where buses and general traffic are sharing carriageway space, and non-bus traffic can be held back into suitable queuing sections. It is likely that local traffic modelling will be required to demonstrate the impact on delays for general traffic, weighed up against saving for bus passengers</li> <li>Bus lanes should seek to minimise setbacks from signalised junctions, and if there is no left turn, they should extend to the stop line</li> <li>All new facilities (bus gates, bus lanes and traffi</li></ul>	
16		

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy
Carriageway	<ul> <li>Where carriage way widths are not adequate to include bus and or cycle lanes, or where it is necessary to widen pavements, any on street parking should be minimised, using double yellows, clearways or Red Routes. In these circumstances opportunities for side street, or off-street parking provision should be explored and provided, with appropriate parking management</li> <li>Engagement on relocation or removal of parking will be carried out with local businesses, residents, and Members</li> <li>If more space is required for bus and/or cycle lanes and/or pedestrians, or if traffic flows are being constrained, consideration should be given to restricting delivery/loading to outside of peak hours, and away</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>from any locations which would impact on flows along the carriageway unless specific loading bays are provided</li> <li>Minimum lane widths should be agreed and then implemented for <ul> <li>Bus only lanes</li> <li>Shared bus and cycle lanes</li> <li>All vehicle lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>If there is no space to provide a segregated cycle way, general traffic, buses and cycle would share the carriage way, but reduced traffic speed (through reduced speed limits and highway engineering measures) should be considered. This may need to include 20mph on main and secondary roads</li> <li>On single carriageway roads with two lanes only, consideration should be given to eliminating right turning movements after considering safety implications and alternative means of access</li> <li>Carriageway design should consider the needs of blue light, service vehicles and wide loads</li> <li>Where adequate lane widths cannot be provided consideration should be given to one way or shuttle working</li> </ul>
Signalised junctions	<ul> <li>All junctions should include pedestrian phases on every arm, unless it can be shown that pedestrian desire flows are accommodated on other arms without any inconvenience to the pedestrians</li> <li>All turns must consider the safe operation of cyclists and reducing conflicts between traffic and cyclists. Where possible segregated space should be provided to separate cyclists from traffic in space and in time</li> <li>Ideally pedestrian crossings should be enabled in one phase, unless crossing more than two lanes</li> </ul>
17	

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy	
	<ul> <li>To ensure appropriate signal visibility to drivers, mast arms should be considered as a means of avoiding the need for splitter islands</li> <li>The issue of the conflict between left turning traffic and straight-ahead cyclists should be specifically addressed, by using Advance Stop Lanes (ASLs) preferably with low level cycle signals to provide early release (except for where filter arrows are in use as per Traffic Sign Regulations and General Directions)</li> <li>ASLs may be excluded, if space is limited, when segregated facilities are provided, but if space is available then they should be considered as these are of benefit for more confident cyclists</li> </ul>	
Crossing points	<ul> <li>When redesigning/upgrading crossing points, an initial consideration should be made to determine if they should be relocated to better address current/future pedestrian desire lines</li> <li>Designated signalised cycle crossing facilities should be provided along the designated Leeds Cycle Network</li> <li>The driving factors in the location, scale and nature of road crossing points should include a consideration of pedestrian safety, reducing delays and the quality of journey</li> <li>Crossing points should be signalised if the speed limits are 40mph or more. Below that speed limit, Zebra crossings may be appropriate (such as close to schools for example)</li> <li>Where road speeds are reduced to 20mph, Zebras and raised tables may be preferable to demonstrate pedestrian priority, reduce pedestrian wait times and reduce vehicles speeds</li> <li>Islands/refuges should be considered as a means of enhancing pedestrian safety, but must be balanced against a lessening of journey quality</li> <li>Zebra crossings should be considered as an alternative to signalised crossings close to schools particularly if pavement space constrains the numbers of pedestrian who can wait on the pavement for a green phase</li> <li>Signalised crossing points should include pedestrian detection, but should always be integrated with bus arrivals on the core bus network</li> <li>Green time for pedestrians should cater appropriately for large pedestrian demands, and should incorporate emerging technology to extend the green man to achieve this, particularly in locations around schools and with higher demands from slower pedestrians</li> </ul>	
18		

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy	
	<ul> <li>Increasing the frequency at which the green phase for pedestrians can be called should be considered. This could be particularly appropriate close to schools or within District Centres. The design and location of crossings and green time for pedestrians should be considered as a means of spreading pedestrian demand on both sides of the street where appropriate</li> <li>A minimum crossing width (laterally) should be considered and agreed to spread demand along the footway, and provide more space to cross the road</li> </ul>	
Green infrastructure	<ul> <li>The addition of Green Infrastructure is important and desirable because it can improve the health, quality, and public space within which it is provided</li> <li>Green infrastructure can provide benefits in terms of absorbing harmful emissions (such as CO2, NOX, and particulates), acting as a noise and visual barrier and retaining rainwater and reducing run off and surface flooding</li> <li>In this respect highway designs should always consider at the outset if street trees and/or other vegetation can be provided. Trees offer the benefits set out above, but additionally provide shelter from heavy rain and shade from the sun</li> <li>Providing more, and better-quality green infrastructure is desirable and should follow 'West Yorkshire Green Streets Design Guide' principles. The approach should be 'can it be incorporated' not 'should it be incorporated'. Areas of zero, minimal or poor-quality green infrastructure should be enhanced particularly where there are high levels of pedestrian activity</li> <li>While the provision of Green Infrastructure is desirable, it needs to be affordable within the funding made available as part of any programme budget. Any early feasibility and proposals/applications should include an appropriate level of funding to provide it. Consideration of green infrastructure should be a prime consideration at an early stage in the design process. Alternative or enhanced funding for these enhancements should also be considered and investigated at an early stage, particularly if highway/transport budgets are constrained</li> <li>Green infrastructure should always be accommodated (subject to affordability) where it does not or reduce available footway space below the minimum required</li> <li>cause visibility issues (for traffic and/or pedestrians)</li> </ul>	
19		

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy	
	<ul> <li>overhang into the carriageway</li> <li>provide the potential for anti-social activities, such as littering</li> <li>While integrating green infrastructure within highway designs is highly beneficial, it will also lead to increased capital and maintenance costs. The potential to secure enhanced funding should be explored at an early stage in the design process. Indeed, the provision of green infrastructure should always be considered early in the design process as retrofitting after a scheme has been progressed through designs will be sub-optimal and likely to incur higher costs</li> <li>Existing green infrastructure should not be removed unless</li> <li>It is causing, or likely to lead to, failure in the footway or carriageway particularly where it creates uneven trip hazards or pooling of rainwater</li> <li>It is causing a safety issue (for vehicles or pedestrians)</li> <li>In exceptional circumstances additional space is required for new/widened footway or cycle lanes</li> <li>If green infrastructure is removed, alternative replacements must be provided in the locality in a more appropriate place(s) ideally on more than a 'like for like' basis: a 3:1 replacement ratio is recommended as a minimum</li> <li>Opportunities should be sought to design/implement/maintain the facilities using local community-based initiatives and integrating with community aspirations and/or more formal Neighbourhood Plans, which may allow wider aspiration and budgets to be integrated</li> <li>Where space is constrained, and/or sub-surface infrastructure prohibits vegetation which needs root space, planters should be considered</li> </ul>	
Bus stops	<ul> <li>WYCA (West Yorkshire Combined Authority) has produced bus stop design guidance which should be followed</li> <li>Alterations or any impacts on bus stops should be discussed with WYCA (Transport Services) at an early stage in the design process</li> <li>Bus stop locations adjacent to signalised junctions or pedestrian crossings must consider avoiding restrictions on exit and entry capacity which could compromise junction efficiency</li> </ul>	L
20		

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy	
	<ul> <li>It would be preferable to relocate bus stops/shelters away from constrained locations to less constrained locations, but a balance need to be sought if they are moving away from locations where demand is currently focused. While relocating bus stops can raise many objections, early dialogue with bus operators, Metro's Transport Services and local businesses and users will be useful to understand any opportunities and constraints</li> <li>Relocation should also be considered to better reflect passenger desire lines, which may have changed since the bus stop facility was first located</li> <li>Engagement with WYCA's Bus Services Team should be done at an early stage in the design process, and should consider and be integrated and aligned with any bus stop replacement or upgrade programmes (and budgets)</li> <li>Ideally bus shelters should be provided, unless at stops with zero/low boarding numbers (i.e. with less than WYCA's minimum of 50 boarders per day), which may mean relocating to locations with less constraint on space, rather than just having bus stop poles</li> <li>Bus laybys should not be provided, unless within a bus lane, where specific space is required for cycle lanes or where high bus flows (greater than 20 per hour) would lead to excessive delays at bus stops where buses are held up behind a stopped bus</li> <li>Existing laybys should be considered for removal when designing new schemes</li> <li>Bus clearways should be provided at all bus stops to discourage parking/stopping</li> </ul>	
Parking	<ul> <li>Parking on street should not be accommodated if it inhibits the capacity of the carriageway or conflicts with the need to allocate road space particularly for cycle and bus lanes. However, the needs of local businesses which rely on that parking should be understood, explored and alternatives sought. At some stage compromises may need to be made, but that should not simply rely on maintaining the status quo</li> <li>Parking should be regulated with TROs, clearways and/or Red Routes</li> <li>Locations where illegal parking is more frequent should be monitored/enforced by Parking Service patrols</li> <li>The use of physical measures to prevent inappropriate parking such as planters, bollards or trees should be considered within the design process</li> <li>Parking should be totally excluded on all footways and cycle ways</li> </ul>	
21		

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy
	<ul> <li>Ideally, residential parking, should be off the road, but if no viable alternative location exists designated spaces could be provided for specific residents in line with residential parking policy guidance and would address the specific needs and prioritisation of disabled parking requirements</li> <li>Parking outside shops/takeaways should only be accommodated if dedicated space exists in a way that does not impede general traffic flows. This may need to reflect different levels of flows at off peak times.</li> <li>All bus stops should be enforced with clearway regulations</li> <li>Scheme design should clarify if existing on street parking is serving residential or non-residential demand</li> <li>Particular attention needs to be given to the parking needs of: <ul> <li>Blue badge holders</li> <li>Taxis (hackneys and PHV)</li> <li>Motorcycles</li> <li>Pedal-cycles</li> </ul> </li> <li>Parking for pedal cycles needs to be in visible and convenient locations to deter anti-social behaviour. However, they need to avoid any constraint on footway capacity and avoid the potential to cycle across/along footways</li> <li>Consideration should be given to providing cycle parking ipaces for use by cyclists</li> <li>A balance needs to be struck between prominent and accessible locations and conflict with space that is needed for pedestrians (on the footway) or vehicles (on the carriageway)</li> <li>With more deliveries being undertaken by cycle, their parking needs should be designed into projects and formalised. Early dialogue with key attractors and generators of cycle deliveries should be undertaken</li> </ul>
Vehicle restrictions	<ul> <li>In locations where road space is constrained, where footways need to be widened and/or segregated cycle lanes are to be installed, and in locations with high pedestrian flows, vehicle bans/controls should be considered</li> <li>This could include:         <ul> <li>Restricting HGVs (all day or at peak periods). This approach can be difficult to pursue and requires meeting significant criteria, and therefore will only be appropriate for some secondary distributor roads</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
22	

Element	Issues to be considered in support of the application and delivery of the Streetscape space allocation Policy
	<ul> <li>Promoting the use of designated HGV routes which use roads that have adequate space and minimise impacts on cyclists and pedestrian</li> <li>Ensuring that the existing criteria for designating HGV routes is tested/checked at the start of the design process and applied if met</li> <li>Banning turns, particularly right turns where demand is low and route alternatives exist</li> <li>Providing modal-filters which allow selected users to travel through, but exclude some users should be considered</li> </ul>



#### **Compromises and Trade-offs**

Compromises will need to be considered because at many locations the available street space will be limited, and it will not be possible to deliver against all the desirable outcomes. However, the risks that compromises pose against the aspirations set out in The Transport Strategy and Vision Zero will need to be considered and will be paramount.

The following table aims to summarise some of the key compromises, highlighting the 'red lines', and a range of mitigation or flexibility which could be considered:

Outcome	Circumstance	Compromise	Mitigation
Adequate footway width	Lack of width to meet minimum standard widths	Widen footway using carriageway space	<ul> <li>This is an absolute and over- arching requirement, but should additionally consider</li> <li>Reconfiguration of street furniture to create more useable footway space</li> <li>Introduce constraints on existing use of the carriageway including a range of vehicle and any access restrictions as described earlier</li> </ul>
Segregated cycle lanes	Lack of width to meet a minimum standard width	<ul> <li>May need to consider:</li> <li>shared bus/cycle lanes</li> <li>shared all traffic lanes</li> <li>providing alternative cycle routes off highway, or on side roads</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Additionally consider:</li> <li>speed reductions to improve safety for cyclists</li> <li>vertical deflection with cycle bypasses</li> <li>surfacing to emphasise shared spaces</li> <li>avoiding use of gullies/grids of inadequate design next to kerbs</li> </ul>
24		*	

林系

Outcome	Circumstance	Compromise	Mitigation
			<ul> <li>education and signage to encourage considerate driving (referencing changes to the Highway Code (2022) to protect cyclists)</li> <li>The use of modal filters to benefit cyclist and mange/inhibit general traffic movements</li> </ul>
Bus lanes	Lack of width to meet minimum standard width	<ul> <li>May need to consider</li> <li>gated entry to sections of highway</li> <li>greater use of traffic light priority</li> <li>shared space with general traffic</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Additionally consider</li> <li>complete ban on on-street parking and loading using Red Route principles</li> <li>education and signage to encourage considerate driving</li> </ul>
Pedestrian crossings	Not enough signal capacity to deliver pedestrian phases on all arms, and cater for target design flows	<ul> <li>May need to consider</li> <li>Some arms have no pedestrian phase if demands are low or away from desire lines</li> <li>Banning turns to simplify signal phases</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Additionally consider</li> <li>Additional plans during peak pedestrian flow periods (e.g., school times)</li> <li>Staggered crossings, but only by exception</li> </ul>
Carriageway	Lack of width to meet minimum standard width	<ul> <li>May need to consider</li> <li>removal of all central hatching right- turn pockets, central refuges</li> <li>Further consideration to remove all/parts of central reservation</li> <li>Banning right turns</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Additionally consider</li> <li>Space in the central carriageway could be reallocated to maintain green barriers alongside the footway, and/or space for cycle routes.</li> </ul>
25		kit and a	

Outcome	Circumstance	Compromise	Mitigation
			One way working
Parking and loading	Lack of width to meet minimum standard widths and provision of dedicated road space and parking	<ul> <li>May need to consider</li> <li>Off highway provision</li> <li>Side road parking bays for loading</li> <li>Peak hour bans</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Additionally consider</li><li>Implementing Red Route TROs</li></ul>
Bus stops	Lack of width to provide adequate widths for bus stops	May need to consider relocating stops away from areas of high pedestrian demand	<ul> <li>May also consider</li> <li>Enhancing facilities to mitigate moving the stops, such as greening, shelters, seating, and information</li> </ul>

