
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	17 May 2022
Present	Councillor D'Agorne

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 confirmed he had none to declare.

66. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session of the Executive Member for Transport held on 19 April 2022 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record with the amendment to the resolution to minute 61 to read:

Resolved:

- i. That Option 3 be approved to uphold the objections and take no further action to formalise a residents priority parking scheme at this time but to continue to monitor and maintain on the list for future consideration if residents petition for residents parking and maintain.

Reason: To listen to residents' concerns whilst taking into account the number of properties against the number of objections received. Consequently not disadvantaging residents by formalising parking restrictions which in turn reduces the available on street parking amenities.

67. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been 12 registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Cllr Myers presented a petition to the Executive Member relating to parking on Clifton Green since residents parking was introduced in the area.

Cllr Warters noted that he did not support the restrictions proposed on Cavendish Grove, Tranby Avenue and Moore Avenue/Osbaldwick Lane junction. He stated that the Council needed to address the issue of university parking.

Claire Hanchard stated that she supported restrictions proposed on Cavendish Grove, Tranby Avenue and Moore Avenue/Osbaldwick Lane junction. She asked that restrictions be used to mitigate against speed issues and parking issues and was unsure why other residents opposed.

Cllr Rowley noted that in principle that he was against the use of restrictions to address parking issues, however, he would support to address safety concerns and therefore asked if implemented that restrictions stop at 1 Tranby Avenue and that restrictions not be taken all the way to Cavendish Grove.

Lynne Wilson welcomed the officer recommendations for East Parade and asked that double yellow lines be added to the junction to improve safety for users.

Matthew Barker noted that he did not think double yellow lines on East Parade would address issues and enquired whether bollards or other restrictions could be implemented? He noted that he felt speeding was the biggest issue on the street and asked that the Council explore addressing this.

Jamie Wood representing the York Cycle Campaign noted his disappointment in the proposals for Piccadilly highlighting a lack of safe cycle route on the street. He suggested that the Council follow LTP120 guidance and deliver safe direct cycle route into the city. He also asked that the Copmanthorpe foot bridge be delayed and a cycle route be considered using the crossing.

Flick Williams stated that the Network Rail foot bridge proposal in Copmanthorpe was not accessible for those with disabilities

and therefore closing the current crossing reduced accessibility. She asked that alternative more accessible and safer crossings be explored. She also noted that without provision for blue badge parking Piccadilly failed to offer a replacement for the loss of parking.

Tony May representing York Civic Trust raised concern that the plans for Piccadilly excluded cyclists and planned for mainly car travel. He noted that Piccadilly should be wide enough for cyclists and blue badge parking to be included. He also noted he would support the use of zebra crossings on the street.

68. Consideration of results from the consultation about Parking restrictions in relation to Cavendish Grove, Tranby Avenue and Moore Avenue/Osbaldwick Lane junction

Officers introduced the report noting that lesser restrictions were proposed to address safety concerns raised by residents. It was noted that residents had highlighted parking issues related to university parking in the area. Officers confirmed that long term parking in the area suggested that some university parking was taking place in the area, however, surveys had shown that university car parks were well used and the University of York discouraged students from being cars. Officers confirmed that residents were not in support of a priority residents parking scheme.

The Executive Member noted that he did not wish to move university parking issues around the city. He acknowledged the Council working with the University to encourage less car usage by staff and students and appropriate parking. Considering the safety concerns highlighted in the report, the Executive Member agreed to support the introduction of the lesser restrictions but using restrictions to number 1 Tranby Avenue as suggested by Cllr Rowley in public participation.

Resolved:

- i. Implement junction protection on Tranby Avenue at its junction with Hull Road and Cavendish Grove with its junction with Tranby Avenue and explore possibility of restrictions to maintain safety at the bus stop on street.

Reason: The Junction protection will increase safety at these

locations and also allow York Council Civil Enforcement Officers the ability to enforce obstructive parking near the junctions, which was the original complaint. This will also respect the views of the residents and not remove their ability to park in the area if required.

- ii. Approved implementation as proposed for the Moore Avenue/Osbaldwick Lane Junction.

Reason: The introduction of restrictions at this location will provide clearer sight lines for pedestrians using the tactile crossing while crossing this junction and improve pedestrian safety.

69. Consideration of representations received to the advertised R30 extended Residents Priority Parking scheme for East Parade

The proposed extension of the R30 residents priority parking scheme was discussed and it was confirmed that following the nearby streets voting against extending the scheme, lots of residents of East Parade had raised objections to being included within the scheme. The Executive Member agreed to take no further action as adding one street would not address commuter parking in the area. He did support however, the restrictions on the junction to address safety concerns. Wider issues raised in public participation such as speeding issues the Executive Member recommended residents discuss these issues with Ward Councillors.

Resolved:

- i. No further action is taken in relation to the advertised resident's priority parking scheme on East Parade. In addition it is recommended that approval be given to implement the advertised No Waiting Restrictions (double yellow lines) on East Parade at the entrance to Parade Court only. The No Waiting restrictions to be implemented are annotated in Annex A, along with the advertised proposed residents parking scheme in Annex B.

Reason: To acknowledge residents objections and comments received from both, within the advertised affected area of East Parade and nearby adjoining streets, who would all be disadvantaged by the proposals. Previous responses for the whole area were against the introduction of a scheme and the received representations confirms the existing thoughts of residents relating to implementing restrictions on a partial area.

The no waiting restrictions either side of Parade Court provide the necessary junction protection for safety when vehicles are entering and exiting the junction and maintain a visibility splay for drivers vision of oncoming vehicles.

70. PROW – Copmanthorpe Level Crossing Closure, proposed diversion of Public Footpath Copmanthorpe No2

Network Rail had requested that the Executive Member provide approval for the closure of a rail crossing to allow for improvements on the track and a replacement footbridge be installed. Officers confirmed that the decision could be taken to the Secretary of State if objections were received.

The Executive Member noted that he felt the proposed footbridge would not be accessible to some users with disabilities and that while not ideal the current crossing was more accessible. It was confirmed that officers had proposed a ramped bridge to increase the accessibility. However, it was confirmed that there had been some challenges with land access for a ramped bridge to be built on and Network Rail currently were not including one within their design. The Executive Member noted that he also had concerns about the foot bridges proposal lacking lighting and being enclosed, noting that safer provisions for pedestrians could have been proposed. Finally he also noted that while it was currently an ambition and not identified as a cycle route, he would like to see a route which provided a cycle path linking Copmanthorpe and Bishopthorpe explored.

Resolved:

- i. Rejected Network Rail's application to divert the footpath via a stepped footbridge at Beckett's Crossing.

Reason: As the proposed footbridge would not provide provisions to allow disabled pedestrians to use the crossing. The footbridge proposal being unlit and enclosed was also considered to be an unsafe crossing particularly at night.

71. Piccadilly city living neighbourhood – Highway changes

Officers introduced the report and noted that they planned for new signage to show relevant restrictions for cars travelling on Piccadilly. It was confirmed that bus providers had requested an additional bus stop on Piccadilly and that this was being explored further with providers. Discussion took place regarding the provision of cycle routes and whether these would be on safer quieter routes or whether these could be delivered on Piccadilly. The challenges on kerb side loading was also raised and whether loading bays could be built into developments rather than using the road. Officers confirmed that they could explore kerb side loading options but highlighted concerns of creating awkward and potentially dangerous lorry turning points.

Concerns relating to air quality on Piccadilly was discussed officers noted that while there was an existing car park on Piccadilly they did not expect new developments to increase this, they confirmed that developments were being designed as low car and that with a move to electric buses this should prevent a worsening of air quality in the area.

The Executive Member asked that officers look into signage options to ensure traffic is not incorrectly passing through Piccadilly. He also asked that temporary cycle lanes be added as soon as possible while progress on the other highway changes be progressed.

Resolved:

- i. Agreed to the implementation of Options B and C. Option B proposes to continue to work with developers and Council led projects in the area to

implement the “preferred option” as set out above, with the following elements added:

- Creation of an additional “integrated”, on carriageway bus stop (with associated facilities and Kassel kerbs) in front of the Banana Warehouse site;
 - Further work to assess the feasibility of implementing an alternative cycle route through quieter streets or segregated cycling provision on Piccadilly (linked to work being undertaken through the City Centre Bus Routing Study/LCWIP/LTP4 processes); and
 - Review opportunities to provide additional public seating within the “preferred option”;
 - Implementation of a 20mph speed limit on Piccadilly.
- ii. Option C adds a Review of on street parking provision aiming to maximise Blue Badge parking provision, and to provide a taxi rank and motorcycle parking if possible.
 - iii. Review what action could be taken on addressing unauthorised vehicle access along Piccadilly – Pavement – Stonebow.

Reason: To support the delivery of the Castle Gateway Masterplan approved by the Council’s Executive in April 2018 and deliver the Masterplan’s vision for Piccadilly, whilst providing adequate public transport facilities, considering options to improve cycling provision and considering options to improve seating and Blue Badge parking provision. This includes consideration of the Council’s duties under the Equality Act (public sector equality duty).

72. Stadium Parking impact – Huntington Area

Challenges of residents parking in the Huntington area on match days were discussed. It was confirmed that with York City Football Club’s successful season attendance had risen. Therefore, the Executive Member supported further investigations take place and noted that he was hopeful that the club would continue to encourage fans to use public transport for match days.

Resolved:

- i. Approved further investigation into the match day parking on New Lane and Priory Willow Glade including the side streets to develop a proposal on these streets for parking restrictions.
- ii. Delegated approval of the proposal and authority to commence statutory consultation to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning.
- iii. Agreed that if objections are received to the statutory consultation to bring these back to a future Executive Member for Transport Decision Session

Reason: To respect the views of the residents on those streets about their requests for additional restrictions to help with issues related to match day parking.

- iv. Approved a review of parking in the Huntington area, due to the concerns raised around the daily issues of vehicles parking too close to the junction and obstructive parking on Hambleton Way at School times. Add any areas that are highlighted as part of the review to the annual review process to be taken forward for statutory consultation.

Reason: The consultation was undertaken to get a clear view of issues related to match day parking but we should not ignore other issues that were raised as part of the process.

- v. To take no further action on the remaining streets within the consultation area.

Reason: The residents of the area are not in favour of restrictions due to the personal impact that the restrictions will have on their personal lives as the restrictions will reduce the ability for visitor parking.

Cllr A D'Agorne, Executive Member for Transport
[The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 12.05 pm].