
MEETING	SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (CALLING IN)
DATE	28 FEBRUARY 2011
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS GALVIN (CHAIR), ALEXANDER (VICE-CHAIR), FIRTH, GUNNELL, ORRELL, SIMPSON-LAING AND TAYLOR
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS D'AGORNE, STEVE GALLOWAY, HEALEY AND KIRK
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR WAUDBY

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

25. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

A Fishergate resident made representations in support of a citywide 20mph speed limit. He spoke as a pedestrian and user of most forms of transport and urged the Executive Member to improve everyone's quality of life by supporting this citywide limit.

A representative of the 20's Plenty for Us Group, also from Fishergate, expressed concern that it appeared less weight had been given to photocopied Your City forms in support of a 20mph policy. She pointed out that a 20mph default speed limit on residential roads would provide value for money, support a reduction in accidents, encourage walking and cycling and benefit the tourist economy.

Representations were also received from a resident of Scarcroft Hill who expressed concerns in relation to speeding traffic in his neighbourhood close to a school. He referred to support for a previous petition from residents for a 20mph limit in his area. He went on to refer to progress with 20mph schemes in other European cities and to the need for York to follow suit.

26. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Scrutiny Management Committee (Calling-In) held on 10 January 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

27. CALLED-IN ITEM: 20MPH SPEED LIMITS: YOUR CITY RESULTS AND AN UPDATE ON POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Members received a report which asked them to consider the decisions made by the Executive Member for City Strategy at his Decision Session on 1 February 2011 in relation to residents opinions gathered through recent consultation on citywide 20mph speed limits undertaken through Your City and the initial impact of the trial in the Fishergate area.

Details of the Executive Members decisions were attached as Annex A to the report. The original report to the Executive Member Decision Session was attached as Annex B. The decision had been called in by Cllrs Merrett, Potter and Simpson-Laing, on the grounds that:

- *the decision failed to recognise and respond appropriately to the majority response to the city-wide speed limit consultation;*
- *the Executive Member has not given fair consideration to other related benefits such as increased walking and cycling, and more outside play;*
- *no significant, yet available, evidence was produced to detail the effectiveness of 20mph speed limits in improving road safety; and*
- *the decision also failed to acknowledge that there are more cost-effective ways to introduce a lower city-wide speed limit than the £1m reported.*

Councillor Merrett, spoke on behalf of the Calling In members who felt that the Executive Member had made the wrong decision in relation to this key issue for the city. He confirmed support for the earlier speakers sentiments and the benefits a 20mph limit would bring with improved road safety and reduction in city pollution. He also referred to DfT support for a lower limit and the need to back this up with work on hearts and minds. Reference was also made to the results of the Your City consultation and to the Executive Members failure to respond to the results of the speed limit consultation.

The Executive Member for City Strategy confirmed that none of the points raised were new and affected his views in relation to confirmation of the Councils current policies on setting speed limits with the city. He went onto point out that with limited Police enforcement and to the reduction in the number of killed and seriously injured that the focus should be on locations where there was a proven accident risk. He pointed out that the costs of implementing a citywide scheme would not guarantee a reduction in accident numbers.

Certain Members pointed to other local authorities implementation of 20mph schemes and questioned the need for a local scheme to be fully signed. They suggested phasing over a number of years, thereby reducing costs. Officers confirmed that they recommended adherence to national guidance in relation to signing to ensure that such a scheme was enforceable. In answer to questions, Officers pointed out that more research would be required on the impact of lower speeds on air quality, carbon reduction and noise.

Other Members questioned implementation with Officers having to justify exceptions to a 20mph default limit on residential roads.

In relation to timescales and the affect of any decision on the Local Transport Plan 3, Officers confirmed that the Plan was subject to full Council approval and could be amended as necessary.

After a full debate, it was

RESOLVED: That Option B be approved and that the matter be referred to the Executive (Calling-In) meeting, for the reason that the Executive Member for City Strategy failed to take account of the comments raised by the calling in Member as set out above.

REASON: In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

28. CALLED-IN ITEM: CITY OF YORK LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 - 'SUMMARISED DRAFT' LTP3

Members received a report which asked them to consider the decisions made by the Executive Member for City Strategy at his Decision Session on 1 February 2011 in relation to the Summarised Draft Full 'City of York Local Transport Plan, 2011 Onwards' (LTP3), as part of the procedure leading up to the publication of the LTP3 by 31 March 2011.

Details of the Executive Members decision was attached as Annex A to the report. The original report to the Executive Member was attached as Annex B. The decisions had been called in by Cllrs Merrett, Potter and Simpson-Laing, on the grounds that the Local Transport Plan (LTP3):

- *lacks the necessary vision and ambition that will enable the city to tackle the very real transport problems it faces now and in the coming years, including most notably ongoing and illegally high levels of air pollution and heavy traffic congestion, as well as rising CO2 emissions;*
- *does not address the challenges to economic prosperity and quality of life posed by the problems cited in bullet one;*
- *pays insufficient regard to the challenge of significantly improving the offer of public transport in the city, in order to address the above problems;*
- *does not address the need for smart and cross-ticketing on buses and integrating services for cross-city journeys; and*
- *fails to adopt the majority supported comprehensive 20mph strategy (see also item 4 call in) to significantly increase road safety and the attractiveness of walking and cycling.*

Councillor Merrett addressed the Committee on behalf of the Calling In Members making reference to cross party support for the recommendations of the traffic congestion scrutiny review which had suggested a number of ambitious solutions and visions in respect of traffic

in the city. He stated that a major bid was required to tackle the transport problems of the city and higher ambitions which included improvements in public transport.

The Executive Member for City Strategy referred to the lengthy consultation over a 2 year period undertaken on the Plan and to the constraints on capital funding over the next few years. He pointed out that all groups had been consulted and made reference to the few representations received with some changes being made to the draft plan as a result of these comments. He stated that he would require specific proposals to consider prior to making any changes to the plan.

In answer to Members questions Officers confirmed that the plan did include measures for cross ticketing and improvements for air quality.

After a full debate, it was

RESOLVED: That Option B be approved and that the matter be referred to the Executive (Calling-In) meeting, for the reason that the Executive Member for City Strategy failed to take account of the comments raised by the calling in Members as set out above.

REASON: In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

CLLR J GALVIN, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 6.35 pm].