
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport and Planning
Date	9 February 2017
Present	Councillor Gillies (Executive Member)

52. Declarations of Interest

At this point in the meeting, the Executive Member was asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests that he might have had in relation to the business on the agenda. He declared that he had none.

53. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the last Decision Session held on 7 December 2016 be signed and then approved by the Executive Member as a correct record.

54. Public Participation - Decision Session

It was reported that there had been two registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Both speakers spoke in relation to Agenda Item 5 (Consideration of Objections received to the proposed amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014: Proposed no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) on Opus Avenue, White Rose Way and White Rose Close):

Simon Nellar from Heatherton's Solicitors spoke in objection to the proposal. He stated that the current parking situation of cars parked on the pavements and footpath, was far from ideal. However this led to a lack of obstruction on the road and allowed for HGV and car transporters to access the site. He informed the Executive Member that a licence had been agreed between Heatherton's Solicitors and Arnold Clark for 40 of their staff to park in a designated off site space owned by Arnold Clark. It was requested that the decision be deferred for a few

months to allow for the staff of Heatherton's to use the parking facility to assess its impact on the parking on the surrounding streets.

John Watts from Future Cleaning which was a business on the opposite side of Opus Avenue to Heatherton's Solicitors spoke. He informed the Executive Member that the Future Cleaning side of the street had double yellow lines installed. His main concern was regarding the future growth of all the businesses on the business park, and the car parking spaces needed for these. He suggested that if the road scheme was re-examined that double yellow lines be installed on only one side of Opus Avenue and this would allow for cars to park legally on the road side, and in his case, would allow for traffic sweepers from his business to pass safely.

55. Better Bus Area Programme- Fourth Avenue Lay-bys

The Executive Member received a report which updated him on progress with a small scheme to construct a series of lay-bys on Fourth Avenue. He was informed that the lay-bys were needed as parked cars can make it impossible for larger vehicles to pass along Fourth Avenue. It also caused disruption for bus services and made other activities, such as refuse collection, difficult.

It was noted that there had been broad consultation and no opposition to the scheme.

Resolved: That progress with the scheme be noted and the proposal to proceed with the scheme's construction be supported.

Reason: To improve the reliability of bus services on Fourth Avenue and to reduce occasions when parked cars on Fourth Avenue are struck by moving vehicles.

56. Consideration of Objections received to the proposed amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014: Proposed no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) on Opus Avenue, White Rose Way and White Rose Close

The Executive Member considered a report which asked him to agree to implement a an amendment to the York, Stopping Parking and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce waiting restrictions (yellow lines) to enable larger vehicles (car transporters) to access development site on York Business Park.

The Executive Member stated that as a Ward Councillor he had concerns about the original planning decision and the condition attached. He felt that if he agreed to a TRO he would displace the cars that were already parked on the pavements and the roundabout to surrounding streets and that he could not go against a planning condition. He therefore had entered into discussions with Arnold Clark who would offer to a secure off road car parking compound for 30-40 cars. All vehicle owners that used this facility would have to sign a disclaimer to say that they parked there at their own risk.

The Executive Member considered all the comments made by the public speakers before coming to his decision. He underlined that the current state of parking on the pavements could not continue as it was illegal. He felt that further discussions were needed with Arnold Clark and businesses on the site in regards to the off road compound, but by implementing the proposal he would not be favouring one business over another.

Resolved: To implement the proposal as advertised subject to the confirmation that the off road compound has been made available by Arnold Clark to other businesses on the site.

Reason: To remove the obstruction caused by parked vehicles and enable better access for car transporters and other HGV.

57. Directorate of Economy & Place Capital Programme - 2016/17 Monitor 2 Report

The Executive Member considered a report which set out progress to date on schemes in the 2016/17 Directorate of Economy & Place Capital Programme, including budget spend to the end of December 2016. The report also proposed adjustments to scheme allocations to align with the latest cost estimates and delivery projections.

Resolved: (i) That the amendments to the 2016/17 Directorate of Economy & Place Capital Programme as set out in Annexes 1 and 2 of the Officer's report be approved.

(ii) That the reduction to the 2016/17 Directorate of Economy & Place Capital Programme and the movement of funding to 2017/18, subject to the approval of the Executive.

Reason: To enable the effective management and monitoring of the Directorate of Economy & Place Capital Programme.

58. E Petition: Ownership of Property and Land in York

The Executive Member considered a report which outlined an proposed response to an EPetition, entitled 'Ownership of Property and Land in York Plans', which was submitted by lead petitioner, Geoff Beacon on 10th July 2016 (this was subject to a further wording amendment by the petitioner). This EPetition had initially been considered by the Local Plan Working Group on 5 December 2016.

The following Options were considered by the Executive Member:

Option 1: To continue to publish the identity of landowners (but excluding individuals) through the Local Plan and Development Management processes, in accordance with its current practices, which are within the scope of the Data Protection Act and the Council's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement; or

Option 2: Ask Officers to explore an alternative approach in terms of making the information available, within the remit of the Council's Data Protection duties.

Resolved: That the content of the EPetition be noted and that the recommendation based on Option 1 be agreed.

Reason: To ensure that the Council does not breach the requirements of the Data Protection Act.

Cllr I Gillies, Executive Member

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 2.40 pm].