

---

MEETING	EXECUTIVE MEMBERS FOR CITY STRATEGY AND ADVISORY PANEL
DATE	27 JANUARY 2009
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS GILLIES (CHAIR), CREGAN, D'AGORNE (VICE-CHAIR), STEVE GALLOWAY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER), POTTER, SCOTT, SUNDERLAND AND WALLER (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)

## 72. 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.

Cllr D'Agorne declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 10 (Fishergate Gyratory Multi-Modal Study) as a member of the Cycle Touring Club (CTC), the York Cycle Campaign and as Ward Councillor.

Cllr Steve Galloway declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 6 (City Strategy – Revenue and Capital Budget Estimates 2009/10) in relation to Concessionary Fares.

Cllr Gillies declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 6 (City Strategy – Revenue and Capital Budget Estimates 2009/10) in relation to Concessionary Fares.

Cllr Gillies declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 5 (Economic Development – Revenue and Capital Budget Estimates 2009/10) as a Director of Visit York.

Cllr Scott declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 10 (Fishergate Gyratory Multi-Modal Study) as a resident of Fishergate.

## 73. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Panel held on 8 December 2008 be approved and signed by the Chair and Executive Members as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

- (i) Minute 53 (Declarations of Interest) – the amendment of Cllr D'Agorne's interest as follows;

Cllr D'Agorne declared personal and non-prejudicial interests in agenda item 5 (2008/09 Second Monitoring Report Economic Development and Partnerships – Finance and Performance) as an employee of York College, in agenda item 7 (Update on Fishergate Ward 20mph Speed Limit Pilot) as Ward Member, in agenda item 8 (Pedestrian Access and Parking,

Broadway Shops, Fulford) as Ward Member and he stood down from the meeting and spoke from the floor, in agenda item 9 (A19 Fulford Road Corridor Update) as a cyclist, former member of Fulford Parish Council and as his partner was a current Parish Council member. He also declared a general personal and non-prejudicial interest in the agenda as a member of the Cycle Touring Club (CTC) and the York Cycle Campaign.

- (ii) Minute 61 (A19 Fulford Road Corridor Update) in the final paragraph of the preamble the deletion of the words 'Local Member' and their replacement with 'Cllr D'Agorne'.<sup>1</sup>

#### Action Required

1. To amend the minutes as indicated.

GR

## **74. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND OTHER SPEAKERS**

It was reported that there had been 2 registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Paul Hepworth of the Cyclists' Touring Club spoke regarding Agenda item 10 (Fishergate Gyratory Multi-Modal Study). He referred to DfT guidance on Cycling Infrastructure Design, which stated that detours along gyratory systems were a deterrent to cycling and that where possible cyclists should be provided with alternative routes to avoid them. He requested Officers to consider the improvement of the existing refuge, which separated Fishergate's clockwise and anti-clockwise flows, to accommodate a single cycle on the thin island. He also asked Officers to consider inserting a gap to create a segregated cycle route when reopening part of the Tower Street roundabout

Mr Woolley spoke as a resident of Chantry Close in relation to Agenda item 9b (Public Right of Way – Proposal to Restrict Public Rights Over Alleyway in the Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward). He stated that he lived close to the Carrfield/Chantry Close snicket, which it was propose to gate. He stated that a better option would be to gate the alley between Carrfield and Woodlands as he felt that there was more anti-social behaviour in that area. The gating of the Carrfield/Chantry Close snicket would he felt cause problems for elderly and disabled residents as any alternative route would be lengthy, a keypad would be awkward for their use and he felt the proposal would contravene the Disability Discrimination Act 2005.

In addition the Chair agreed to hear representations from Liz Young, from UNISON, regarding Agenda item 4 (Chief Executive's Revenue and Capital Budget Estimates 2009/10). She referred to Annex 2 of the report in which a saving of Corporate Trade Union Facility Time was proposed. She stated that this budget reimbursed directorates for the cost of releasing trade union stewards to undertake their trade union duties such as pay and grading negotiations. She confirmed that these duties were a statutory obligation. The budget meant that posts could be back filled to ensure that work did not suffer. UNISON felt that cutting this budget would cause staff pressures. She confirmed that no consultation had been

undertaken in relation to the proposed cut. Officers confirmed that this was only a savings proposal on which no decision had yet been taken.

## **75. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET ESTIMATES 2009/10**

Consideration was given to a report, which presented the 2009/10 budget proposals for the Chief Executive's Directorate. This included:

- the revenue budget for 2008/09 (Annex 1) which showed the existing budgets
- the budget adjusted and rolled forward from 2008/09 into 2009/10
- the provisional allocation of pay and price increases for the portfolio
- proposals for budget service pressure costs and savings options for the portfolio area (Annex 2)
- fees and charges proposals (Annex 3)
- the existing approved capital programme (Annex 4) and
- options for new capital schemes (Annex 5).

The budget proposals had been summarised as follows:

	£'000
Base Budget 2008/09	6,141
Provisional allocation for pay increases	182
Provisional allocation for price increases	-8
Full year effect of 2008/09 growth items	230
Savings proposals (Annex 3)	-399
Proposed Budget 2009/10	6,146

As part of the consultation process Members were asked for their comments or alternative suggestions on the proposals shown in Annexes 2, 3 and 5, before the budget was considered by Budget Council on 26 February 2009.

Officers confirmed that they were aware that the release of trade union representatives to undertake their duties was a statutory obligation but that this could not be met from the Chief Executive's budget and that Officers would work with the Union to monitor the release time. Members questioned whether this would be required as a growth item in departmental budgets.

Members of the Labour Group and Green Party reserved their position for Budget Council.

### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member Advisory Panel note the report and recommends the Executive Leader forward the budget proposals

contained in the report for consideration at the budget Executive meeting on 16 February 2009.

Decision of the Executive Leader

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: As part of the consultation for the 2009/10 budget process.

**76. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET ESTIMATES 2009/10**

Members considered a report, which presented the 2009/10 budget proposals for Economic Development, which included;

- the revenue budget for 2008/09 (Annex 1) to show the existing budgets
- the budget adjusted and rolled forward from 2008/09 into 2009/10
- the provisional allocation of pay and price increases for the portfolio
- proposals for budget service pressure costs and savings options for the portfolio area (Annex 2)
- fees and charges proposals (Annex 3)
- the existing approved capital programme (Annex 4).

As part of the consultation exercise the Executive Leader was asked to consider the budget proposals and identify preferences prior to the Executive meeting on 16 February and Budget Council on 26 February.

The budget proposals had been summarised as follows:

	£'000
Base Budget 2008/09	2,457
Provisional allocation for pay increases	62
Provisional allocation for price increases	-32
One-off savings identified in 2008/09 not available in 2009/10	70
Service Pressure proposals	0
Savings proposals (Annex 2)	-70
Proposed Budget 2009/10	2,487

In answer to a Members question, Officers confirmed that Trade Union facility time had not been built into this budget. Members also questioned the savings proposals in relation to the reduction of support to Science City York and Visit York.

Members of the Labour Group and Green Party reserved their position for Budget Council.

### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member Advisory Panel note the report and recommends the Executive Leader forward the budget proposals contained in the report for consideration at the budget Executive meeting on 16 February 2009.

### Decision of the Executive Leader

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: As part of the consultation for the 2009/10 budget process.

## **77. CITY STRATEGY REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET ESTIMATES 2009/10**

Consideration was given to a report, which presented the 2009/10 budget proposals for City Strategy, which included:

- the revenue budget for 2008/09 (Annex 1) to show the existing budgets
- the budget adjusted and rolled forward from 2008/09 into 2009/10
- the provisional allocation of pay and price increases for the portfolio
- proposals for budget service pressure costs and savings options for the portfolio area (Annexes 2 and 3)
- the existing approved capital programme (Annex 4)
- options for new capital schemes (Annex 5).

The budget had been summarised as follows:

	£'000
Base Budget 2008/09	16,168
Provisional allocation for pay increases	208
Provisional allocation for price increases	-23
Other Budget Pressures:	
Increase in Flood Levy	15
Previously agreed non-recurring growth – impact on 2009/10	550
Service Pressure proposals (Annex 2)	1,736
Savings proposals (Annex 3)	-617
Proposed Budget 2009/10	18,037

The report also included details of the additional funds needed in 2009/10, amounting to £550k in the following areas:

- Waste Strategy
- Advance Purchase Options for Waste Treatment Facility
- York Central/British Sugar
- Local Development Framework

- Section 38 Fees

Details were also given of potential expenditure pressures that may materialise during 2009/10 in relation to the continuance of the national concessionary fare scheme, a shortfall in parking income and the Access York Phase 2 Bid Preparation.

In answer to a Members question, Officers confirmed that Trade Union facility time had not been built into this budget.

Members of the Labour Group and Green Party reserved their position for Budget Council.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member Advisory Panel note the report and recommends the Executive Member for City Strategy forward the budget proposals contained in the report for consideration at the budget Executive meeting on 16 February 2009.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: As part of the consultation for the 2009/10 budget process.

**78. REVENUE BUDGET 2009/10 - CITY STRATEGY FEES AND CHARGES**

Members considered a report, which advised them of the proposed fees and charges for the City Strategy portfolio for the 2009/10 financial year including the anticipated increase in income, which they would generate. These related to:

- Parking
- Transport and Highways
- Road Safety Training and
- Planning

Members referred to the charging for road safety cycle training and questioned whether there would be any assistance through Cycling City and the implications of increases in parking charges.

Members of the Labour Group and Green Party reserved their position for Budget Council.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to note the fees and charges proposals for the City Strategy portfolio as set out in the Annex to the report and forward the proposals for consideration at the budget Executive on 16 February 2009.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: As part of the consultation for the 2009/10 budget setting process.

**79. CITY STRATEGY DIRECTORATE PLAN 2009/10 - 2011/12**

Consideration was given to a report, which asked the Executive Member to approve the City Strategy Directorate Plan for 2009/10 – 2011/12. The document outlined a set of priorities for City Strategy, and for each priority set out a small number of key actions and performance indicators.

It was reported that the Directorate had recently undergone some changes which had involved several services transferring from the Directorate as part of the Corporate Restructure and that these changes were reflected within the Directorate Plan.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Advisory Panel advise the Executive Member to approve the City Strategy Directorate Plan 2009/10 – 2011/12 with the addition of a priority to investigate new methods of persuading people to chose to travel by benign modes. <sup>1.</sup>

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: To provide strategic direction for the Directorate and to act as a consolidated reference point for Service Managers and to put in place an important element in improving the directorate's performance management and monitoring arrangements.

Action Required

1. Priority to investigate new methods of persuading people to chose to travel by benign modes.

SS

**80. PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY - PROPOSAL TO RESTRICT PUBLIC RIGHTS OVER ALLEYWAYS IN THE GUILDHALL AND THE DRINGHOUSES AND WOODTHORPE WARDS**

**80.1 Part 1 - Guildhall Ward (The Groves)**

Members considered a report, which examined the gating of 9 alleyways in the Guildhall Ward in order to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour associated with these alleyways. The alleys were situated in the following areas:

- Amber Street

- Claremont Terrace (North)
- Diamond Street/Emerald Street
- Eldon Street/Markham Street
- Fern Street
- Markham Street/Lowther Terrace
- Markham Street Markham Terrace
- Portland Street/Claremont Terrace
- Stanley Mews

Officers recommended the making of 8 Gating Orders, which would allow the installation of lockable alleygates. The inclusion of Stanley Mews was not recommended owing to cost, the narrow width of the alley and access problems.

Members conveyed the Ward Members thanks to Officers for their work in relation to these proposals.

Consideration was given to the following options:

Option A : Approve all 9 of the proposed Gating Orders. This option is not recommended.

Option B : Do not approve any of the 9 proposed Gating Orders. This option is not recommended.

Option C : Authorise the making of Gating Orders to restrict public use of all alleys excluding Stanley Mews. This option is recommended.

#### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Advisory Panel advise the Executive Member to accept Option C and authorise the Director of City Strategy to instruct the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services to make Gating Orders for the 8 alleys (excluding Stanley Mews), as detailed in Annex 1 of the report, in accordance with Section 129A of the Highways Act 1980, as amended.<sup>1</sup>

#### Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: In order that public rights to those alleyways which meet the requirements of S129A of the Highways Act 1980 be restricted so that crime and anti-social behaviour associated with these alleyways can be reduced.

#### Action Required

1. Gating Orders to be made for the 8 alleys, but excluding Stanley Mews. SS

## **80.2 Part 2 - Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward**

Consideration was given to a report, which examined the gating of a snicket between Carrfield and Chantry Close, Woodthorpe, in order to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour associated with the route.

The Panel had previously agreed to a 24 hour restriction of the snicket but, as the route was considered to be a safer route to school used during the day, Officers had been requested to examine lesser restrictions. Residents and prescribed bodies had been reconsulted and crime figures reviewed. It was reported that three objections had been received to the proposal from residents.

An email received from a resident of Chantry Close in which he expressed his support for the proposal to confirm the gating order had been circulated to Members.

Members were reminded that the snicket did not meet all of the legislative requirements needed for the making of a Gating Order in that a reasonably convenient alternative route was not available. It was reported that the making of an order did risk the order being challenged owing to all the requirements not being met.

Members questioned the alternative walking route distances for residents, details of the timer, magnetic locking system and keypad for the proposed gate. Officers confirmed that, if the Gating Order went ahead, the PIN code would be shared with those people whose properties adjoined or were adjacent to the affected snicket.

Officers confirmed that the Gating Order would be for a 3 month trial period with information gathered during that period being reported back. This would ensure that, at the end of this period, Members could ascertain whether incidences of crime and anti-social behaviour in the area had reduced and the affects of the gating on residents.

Members requested that, if the trial gating should be approved, the PIN code should be shared with elderly and disabled residents in the immediate vicinity and that the keypad should be easy to operate.

Consideration was given to the following options:

Option A : Confirm the making of a Gating Order, as instructed by the Executive Member decision on 29 October 2007, to restrict public use of the snicket at night.

Option B : Do not approve the proposed Gating Order.

### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Advisory Panel, having considered the consultation responses and the legislative requirements for a Gating Order, advises the Executive Member to accept Option A to confirm the decision made at the City Strategy EMAP on 29 October 2007, to restrict public use of the snicket at night subject to the following:

- The key pad being DDA compliant;

- Key pad access code being made available to residents adjacent to the alley and to elderly and disabled residents with mobility problems in the immediate adjacent streets; <sup>1</sup>.
- The Gating Order being reviewed after a 3 month trial period with the results being reported back to the EMAP. <sup>2</sup>.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: To take into account additional information that was not available when the original decision was made.

Action Required

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Gating Order to be made for a 3 month trial period.                   | SS |
| 2. Following the trial period report back on results to be made to EMAP. | SS |

**81. FISHERGATE GYRATORY MULTI-MODAL STUDY**

Members considered a report, which advised on progress of the first stage of the Fishergate Gyratory Multi-Modal Study. The Study had been commissioned to investigate options for improving the traffic flow around the gyratory with the aim of improving accessibility and safety for all road users, but particularly pedestrians, cyclists and air quality.

The report outlined progress to date and set out the key requirements that any future scheme would need to satisfy. It also highlighted how some of these may conflict with each other and therefore compromise solutions were required.

Members thanked Officers for the preparation of this report. They welcomed any measures that would improve this area of the city for pedestrians and cyclists.

The following options were available to members:

- Option 1 - accept the principal that the Fishergate gyratory should be altered to improve the accessibility and safety for all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists. The alterations and enhancements to be considered will have an impact on the operation of the junctions and congestion to varying degrees. Subject to this, scheme options should be presented to a future EMAP for their relative benefits/disbenefits to be considered by Members in order to decide on a preferred option for further evaluation, consultation and detailed design
- Option 2 reject the principal and leave the gyratory in its current format

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Note the report and Annexes;
- (ii) Accept the principal that the Fishergate gyratory should be enhanced to improve the accessibility and safety for all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists. The alterations and enhancements to be considered will have an impact on the operation of the junction and congestion to varying degrees.
- (iii) Receive a further report from officers at a future EMAP describing potential options and how they satisfy, as far as is practicable, the key requirements. <sup>1</sup>.

#### Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: The study confirmed that current facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are less than ideal, evidenced by the number of accidents that have occurred in the past five years. Accepting the principal that the Fishergate gyratory should be enhanced, particularly and ultimately deciding on an option to address the issues as far as is practicable should improve safety for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists.

#### Action Required

1. Report back to EMAP on potential options for this area. SS

## **82. ANNUAL PARKING REPORT 2007/08**

Consideration was given to the Annual Parking Report for the 2007/08 financial year. Annual reports were published to explain to the public how the service was managed and to provide information regarding performance.

The report highlighted a number of points, which included:

- 79% increase in the number of users of the pay by phone service;
- Total number of users of the phone service being 94,087 up from 52,469 in 2006/07;
- Progress in achieving the Park Mark Safer Parking Award;
- Achievements of the parking hotline system;
- Positive impact of enforcement on compliance with parking regulations.

Members thanked Officers for their performance and production of the report.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Advisory Panel advise the Executive Member to note the contents of the report and that the Annual Parking Report for 2007/08 be published.  
1.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and endorsed.

REASON: To explain to the public how the parking service is managed and to provide information regarding performance.

Action Required

1. Publish 2007/08 Annual Parking Report.

SS

Cllr Gillies, Chair

Cllr Waller, Executive Leader

Cllr S F Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 6.10 pm].