

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport and Planning
Date	13 April 2017
Present	Councillor Gillies (Executive Member)

65. Declarations of Interest

The Executive Member was asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests that he might have had in respect of business on the agenda. He declared that he had none.

66. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the last Decision Session held on 9 March 2017 be signed and then approved by the Executive Member as a correct record.

67. Public Participation - Decision Session

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

Three Members of Council had also registered to speak. One Member of Council had been unable to attend but requested that his statement be included within the minutes.

Councillor Doughty commented on Agenda Item 4 (Strensall Road Petition for Speed Limit Reducation). He gave the following statement:

I am pleased that the Traffic Team Leader is not recommending option 1 which was to take no action but am concerned that referring the proposal to consideration as part of a wider periodic 'accident reduction process' (option 3) could mean the issue being lost amongst other schemes and for want of a better description, 'being kicked into the long grass.' **I am therefore asking that serious consideration is given to**

approving option 2, to approve the advertising of a 40mph speed limit on this section of road.

Option 2 is the wish of the residents who signed the petition, including residents who live on Strensall Road and was a direct request in the interest of safety. Not one single person throughout the process thus far has shown any indication other than this. It is also the will of Earswick Parish Council, through which the road passes and also of neighbouring Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council, the residents of which would also be protected by a speed reduction.

The report indicates that “there may be a justification for considering a reduction in the speed limit to 50mph” and later states further investigation would also consider the potential for the implementation of a 40mph speed limit 'if appropriate'. While a reduction of 10mph would be better than nothing, I do not believe it would provide the required benefit and could muddy the waters in adding yet another speed limit level to the current 30, 40 and 60 sections that currently exist between Earswick and Strensall settlements. Far better in my opinion to have the 60 section reduced to 40mph and the fully built up part of each village at 30mph which is the norm and much less complicated for motorists to understand and adhere to.

Coupled with this, suggestions of further investigating a scheme after an initial alteration to possibly change again would not appear to make financial sense? Particularly as the report suggests cost as a factor in decision making. Cost over safety as a reason for decision would concern me in any event. **In this respect, I would be interested to receive a cost estimate of the scheme as replacement of speed roundels on signage posts that already exist, could surely not be excessive?** While I accept there will always be a small and irresponsible minority who flout limits regardless of limits set, the majority of road users do follow guidelines and this would see a safer Strensall Road in my opinion.

The Officer has provided a map with indication of the 6 most recent recorded accidents, 3 each in 2013 and 2016. One of these falls within the current 60mph section, one very near to the boundary of the 60 into 30 at the Earswick end and 4 at the Towthorpe crossroads. I believe this strengthens an argument that large drops from 60 to 40 at Towthorpe and 60 to 30 at Earswick results in some drivers continuing at speeds above the

lower levels well beyond and likewise act as an encouragement to step up the gas long before entering the higher limits.

I would also somewhat question the report description of this being a rural road and residents being familiar with surroundings and dangers. Strensall has the population of a small town comparable with Malton or Pocklington, it is a really busy road and while many residents will know the road, not all do. There are several guest houses and a small caravan site behind one of the properties all within the 60mph section, with caravans, motorhomes and agricultural vehicles all requiring to emerge into the highway. Not to mention the residents who find it difficult at times for an appropriate gap in traffic. **The map does not in my opinion best reflect that for a large part of the 60mph section, there is a row of properties along one side** with some more widely spaced properties on the opposite side of the carriageway.

I reiterate the reasons why there has been support for the petition and a call for a safer speed limit on Strensall Road:-

1. Traffic has increased considerably in recent years.
2. It is difficult and dangerous for those living in properties to get out of driveways as well as for visitors staying at the Guest houses and caravan site.
3. Crossing the road is difficult and dangerous for pedestrians and those using the bus service.
4. The route is extremely dangerous for cyclists and we are particularly concerned for schoolchildren. Ward Councillors (and both Parishes) have previously pressed for a safe cycle route linking Strensall with Huntington through Earswick but this has not yet been possible due to the significant finance required.
5. The 60mph national speed limit is giving a false sense of security about the potential hazards along this route. Some drivers and motorcyclists are prone to exceeding the current high limit and thought to cause danger by accelerating and braking when leaving or entering the 30mph and 40mph zones at either end.
6. ** The reduction in the speed limit is **supported by Earswick Parish Council and Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council** **

The CYC Chief Executive refreshed the 'Council Values' last week and as a listening Council that purports to "support and

enable our communities" and suggests our communities and residents "guide us in day to day situations as well as our decision-making processes", I ask, as a ward representative, that the Council 'listens'.

Please give serious consideration to option 2 and the reduction to 40mph.

Barrie Stephenson of Claremont Terrace Residents' Association spoke in relation to Agenda Item 5 (Claremont Terrace Petition). He thanked the Executive Member for considering the petition and informed him that he felt that all options to resolve the problems of parking had been tried before. He added that the Residents' Association had contacted North Yorkshire Police who had advised them that the Council's powers were greater for enforcing parking offences. He welcomed a creative solution as business owners could currently not park on Claremont Terrace due to the area being a residents only parking zone.

In regards to Agenda Item 6 (Speed Management 16-17 Experimental Traffic Orders, Speed Limits Copmanthorpe, Dunnington, Hopgrove and Murton) the following speakers spoke:

Stuart Kay Chair of Dunnington Parish Council and the Friends of the Activity Park, strongly objected to the proposals for Common Road Dunnington. He felt that a number of lower cost actions could be taken but understood that national guidelines suggested that it was not appropriate for this particular part of the road. He outlined that the 40mph speed limit would finish closer to the centre of the village and that the Sports Club located on Common Road was used extensively at the weekend. He commented that the level of resident support for the proposals was low.

Another registration to speak had been received but the speakers did not attend.

Councillor Brooks spoke about how the 30mph signs on Common Road had been moved too far towards the village and visibility was restricted due to the bend in the road. The lack of pavement on the right side of the east side of the green meant that children who would be using the Sports Club would be crossing at the limit of the 30mph and 40mph zone. She added that traffic accessing Common Road to use the Industrial Estate

from the A166 did not realise that they were passing a Sports Club, and requested that a speed indicator be installed.

Councillor Warters questioned why the proposal for Murton was dropped due to lack of support but the Common Road was recommended for approval. He felt that the further meaningful engagement should be carried out with the Parish Councillors and Ward Members within the next three months.

Councillor Orrell spoke in regards to the Hopgrove Lane South proposal, he informed the Executive Member how tailbacks had been problematic since the opening of the Vangarde Shopping Centre. He asked for careful consideration of the junction to look into how it could be improved.

68. Strensall Road Petition for Speed Limit Reduction

The Executive Member considered a report which informed him of the receipt of a petition which requested the reduction of the speed limit to 40mph on the rural road between Earswick and Strensall.

In making reference to comments made by Councillor Doughty, the Executive Member felt that Strensall Road should be added to the list of streets in the annual accident and prevention measures.

Officers confirmed that it would be added in this year.

Resolved: That the petition be noted and that the issue be considered as part of the annual accident and prevention measures across the city.

Reason: To respond to residents concerns in a practical manner whilst prioritising the resources available to the reduction of injury on the highway in the authority area.

69. Claremont Terrace Petition

The Executive Member considered a report which informed him of the receipt of a petition which requested the introduction of

waiting restrictions in the back lane to Claremont Terrace, off Gillygate.

The Executive Member considered all the comments made by the public speaker. He felt that there were further new options which could be explored, which could satisfy residents and deal with the problem.

Resolved: That;

- (i) The Claremont Terrace Access Only Traffic Regulation Order be rescinded.
- (ii) That the residents parking scheme be changed to a zone entry scheme with the same times and conditions as now.
- (iii) That a proposed additional parking space as put forward in the previous recommendation with a 30 minute maximum stay be advertised.
- (iv) That these changes be carried out as part of the next annual review of city wide traffic regulation orders expected to be brought forward in early summer.

Reason: To resolve the issue of vehicles obstructing the back lane without the need for yellow lines.

70. 2016/17 Speed Management Programme - Relocation of speed limits - Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's)

The Executive Member considered a report which sought approval to implement experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) at up to four sites on the 2016/17 speed management programme.

The Executive Member considered all the comments made by the public speakers and all written representations received.

Common Road, Dunnington

The Executive Member felt that he could not ignore the strength of public feeling when making his decision and asked Officers to re-examine the recommendation. He noted that it was a temporary order and that time needed to be given to see whether the order was effective.

Officers commented that they could trial the speed limit change near the Sports Club, whilst retaining the existing VAS, and speed data could be monitored and reported back to the Executive Member. Additional signage would be provided at the Sports Club to highlight its location.

The Executive Member added that this option be trialled for six months and requested that Officers kept in contact with Parish Councillors and Ward Members.

Hopgrove Lane South

The Executive Member considered the comments made by Councillor Orrell under Public Participation.

Officers confirmed that there would be a package of road improvements included within the Monks Cross Plan.

Tadcaster Road

The Executive Member considered a written representation made by Peter Whitfield. In response to the representation, he felt that when traffic entered a built up area they were more likely to slow down.

Resolved: That;

(i) Implementation of experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to relocate the start of the 30mph speed limit at the three proposed sites be approved:

- Hopgrove Lane South, Hopgrove
- Tadcaster Road, Copmanthorpe

Reason: To trial the proposal to relocate the speed limit with the aim of achieving improved compliance with the 30mph speed limit within the built up areas.

- (ii) Officers report back the results of the trials to a future meeting, with a recommendation on either making the TROs permanent or returning to the existing arrangements.

Reason: The experimental order is limited to a maximum of eighteen months, and a decision will be required on making each speed change permanent.

- (iii) That an experimental speed limit order is progressed at Common Road, Dunnington with the change between the 30 and 40 mph positioned close to the Vehicle Activated Sign.

Reason: To trial the proposal to relocate the speed limit with the aim of achieving improved compliance with the 30mph speed limit within the built-up areas.

- (iv) That additional signs are provided at the Sports Club to increase the visibility of the facility to drivers on Common Road.

Reason: To increase the visual impact of the Sports Club.

- (v) Changing the existing 30mph speed limit start point on Murton Way, Murton be re-considered when the results from the initial trial sites are known.

Reason: Consultation has shown there is currently no support for including Murton Way as one of the initial trial sites.

71. Increase in National Planning Fees

The Executive Member received a report which asked him to confirm to the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) that the Authority will invest the proposed increase in the National Planning Application Fee rates in the City of York, by 20% from July 2017 into the planning service.

Officers reported that fees had not increased since 2012 and were set at a national level of 20%. It was noted that all Local Authorities were increasing their Planning Application Fee rates. The increase in monies would allow for more investment in back

office functions, specialist services such as conservation and highways.

The Executive Member commented that York as a city had particular challenges with heritage in regards to planning applications and the timeframe for determination of applications. If further investment could help overcome this, some of the issues could be corrected at the beginning of the process.

Resolved: (i) That the CLG offer to the 20% increase in planning fees be accepted and it take effect in July 2017, with any additional income reinvested in the Development Management function.

(ii) The principles of reinvesting £128k into the planning service as set out in Paragraph 10 of the Officer's report be approved.

Reason: The increase in planning fees relates to the Council's corporate priorities by enhancing frontline services to help to ensure acceptable planning proposals are delivered on site more expediently.

Cllr I Gillies, Executive Member

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

This page is intentionally left blank