
MEETING	EXECUTIVE MEMBERS FOR CITY STRATEGY AND ADVISORY PANEL
DATE	30 OCTOBER 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS STEVE GALLOWAY (Executive Leader), REID (Executive Member for City Strategy), VASSIE (Chair of Advisory Panel), SIMPSON-LAING, D'AGORNE, HOLVEY, HYMAN and MERRETT

42. Declarations of Interest

The Chair invited Members to declare at this point any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. The following interests were declared:

Cllr Merrett – a personal, non prejudicial interest in the business generally insofar as it related to cycling issues, as an honorary member of the Cyclist Touring Club (CTC) and a member of Cycling England.

Cllr D'Agorne – a personal, non prejudicial interest in the business generally insofar as it related to cycling issues, as a member of the CTC and the York Cycle Campaign.

43. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2006 be approved and signed by the Chair and Executive Members as a correct record.

44. Public Participation

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

David Trangmar spoke in relation to agenda item 7 (Petition from Residents of Third Avenue Requesting Footway and Carriageway Repairs), on behalf of the petitioners. He commented on the poor condition of the road and residents' health and safety concerns and urged Members to approve Option 2 in the report (carrying out repair works in the current year) or, if this were not possible, to give an assurance that Third Avenue would be included in next year's programme.

Paul Hepworth spoke in relation to agenda item 9 (A19/Wheldrake Lane (Crockey Hill) Junction Improvement Scheme), on behalf of the CTC. He expressed support for the proposal to provide a cycle link between Wheldrake Lane and Howden Lane and asked that consideration be given

in due course to creating a more direct route between Wheldrake and York, via Heslington.

Sally Walker spoke in relation to item 9, as a local resident. She expressed objections to the lighting aspects of the proposals, stating that the number and height of the lights would detract from the rural character of the area, and suggested that an unlit approach to the junction, with traffic calming measures, be considered as an alternative solution.

Alf Deuchars spoke in relation to agenda item 10 (A1079 (Hull Road) / York Road (Dunnington) – Junction Improvement Scheme), on behalf of Dunnington Parish Council. He re-iterated the Parish Council's opposition to the scheme, noting the results of a questionnaire that indicated most Dunnington residents shared this view, and asked that consideration be given to making improvements at the Common Road junction instead.

45. York Central Steering Board Update

Members considered a report which provided an update on the meeting of the York Central Steering Board held on 22 September 2006 and on progress with the York Central project since the last update, in June of this year.

Work to prepare an Area Action Plan for the York Central area had started in July 2006 and the implications for a joint planning approach for the York Central and British Sugar sites were currently being assessed. Further financial modelling work was being carried out as part of the ongoing development appraisal, in parallel with work to look at operational rail issues. This was expected to be completed by the end of December. The next meeting of the Steering Board had now been scheduled for 9 February 2007.

Members commented on the delay caused to the project by the closure of British Sugar and noted that Acomb Ward should have been included in the 'wards affected' section of the report.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Leader be advised to note the report and the comments made by Members.

Decision of the Executive Leader

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

REASON: In accordance with the agreed monitoring procedures.

46. Street Lighting

Members considered a report which provided an overview of the current situation regarding the Council's street lighting contract and introduced proposals for improvements and efficiency savings.

As part of the contract extension with AIS, agreed by the Executive on 2 May 2006, a series of discussions had taken place to identify service improvements and efficiencies. The report listed these as options for Member to consider, in order to address any budget shortfall. Options for the procurement of the street lighting services would be incorporated in a separate report once the outcome of the Highway Maintenance PFI expression of interest was known.

The **options** for efficiencies and improvements outlined in the report were to:

- 1 – Transfer from illuminated to non-illuminated street signage and bollards, where possible.
- 2 – Use the least expensive but more efficient equipment.
- 3 – Assess contract needs re new regulations and good practices, to improve operational efficiency.
- 4 – Continue to trial new technologies to help improve the quality of street lighting systems.
- 5 – Implement regular meetings of Ward Committees and improved management systems.
- 6 – Seek the best value procurement of energy and seek recovery of costs for energy where appropriate.
- 7 – Carry out further work with the energy producer NEDL to enable the Council to move onto the “Half Hourly Rate” for energy.
- 8 – Adopt a “burn to extinction” approach to the maintenance regime in the short term.
- 9 – Seek improvements from NEDL on the turn around time for re-provision of supply in the event of the failure of lighting units due to loss of supply.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Approve the introduction of the options set out in the report for making efficiencies and improvements to the street lighting and illuminated signs service.
- (ii) Ask Officers to explore the implications of introducing technology that would allow street lights to dim during the quiet night hours.
- (iii) Ask Officers to look at including walking and cycle routes within the night time ‘scouting’ arrangements for street lights.
- (iv) Ask Officers to include the sourcing of renewable energy, where available, within the options in the tender document for energy procurement.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASONS: To enable service efficiencies to be introduced, in line with continuous service improvements, whilst taking into account the need to support sustainable transport and energy policies.

47. Speed Management

Members considered a report brought forward in response to increasing complaints about speeding traffic and the high demand for the installation of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) to address speeding issues. The report reviewed the various potential approaches to speed management and provided an assessment methodology against which all speeding issues could be measured.

The Department for Transport (DfT) had recently issued new guidance on the setting of local speed limits and local authorities, requesting local authorities to review the speed limits on all 'A' and 'B' roads and implement any necessary changes by 2011.

The report outlined a data-led method of assessment to be applied to the development of speed management schemes, requests from Ward Committees and complaints from residents. This was based upon the injury accident record and existing speed data for the relevant stretch of road. Other criteria to be taken into consideration if further prioritisation was needed were; traffic flow, evidence of non-injury crashes and pedestrian generators (schools, local shops etc.). A more structured management procedure for dealing with residents' complaints was also proposed; this involved grouping complaints together and producing a twice-yearly report to Members, in May and November. Ward Committee requests would be assessed as and when received, with Officers to report proposals to the ward committee and encourage them to use their own funds to implement these, if agreed. Suggestions for approaches to be taken to speed management generally, under the broad headings of Education, Engineering and Enforcement, were set out in paragraphs 46 to 97 of the report. A full list of proposals arising from the report (proposals A to F) was set out in paragraph 99.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to agree:

- (i) To adopt the data-led method of assessing speeding issues outlined in paragraphs 15-33 of the report (proposal A), whilst acknowledging the need to assess and publish speed statistics for individual roads, in response to complaints forwarded by Council Members, and to support cycling and pedestrian movements by controlling speed.
- (ii) To adopt the procedure for managing complaints from residents and Ward Committees outlined in paragraphs 34-43 (proposal B), with the first report to be presented to the next meeting of the Executive Members and Advisory Panel, and to ask that, where possible, details of the speeds recorded on individual roads be made accessible via the Council's website.
- (iii) That Parish Councils also be given the opportunity, should they wish, to fund or contribute to the funding of speed reduction solutions (implemented by the City of York Council) where the appropriate assessment criteria have been met.

- (iv) To review the speed limits on all 'A' and 'B' roads by 2011, in accordance with the new DfT guidance (proposal C).
- (v) To continue with the existing programme of targeted education to influence driver behaviour (proposal D).
- (vi) To implement the most appropriate speed management engineering treatment, as detailed in Annex A to the report, where justified by the data (proposal E), recognising that VAS should not be restricted only to those locations where there is a casualty record.
- (vii) To work with North Yorkshire Police and support data-led targeted speed enforcement (proposal F), encouraging the Police to adopt a policy which includes appropriate prosecution of those who break the speed limit.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASONS:

- (i) To enable resources to be deployed most efficiently and with maximum benefit to the community, and to ensure parity across the City by applying a consistent and robust approach to all speeding issues.
- (ii) To ensure that issues are dealt with in the most effective manner and to improve transparency.
- (iii) To enable Parish Councils, as well as Ward Committees, to contribute to local improvements where appropriate.
- (iv) To ensure that the work is completed by 2011 in accordance with DfT guidelines.
- (v) To ensure that the Council is able to fulfil the objectives of the Speed Management Plan.
- (vi) In order to manage speeds across the City effectively, particularly in those areas where speeding poses a risk to safety.
- (vii) To ensure that speed enforcement is targeted where appropriate.

48. Petition from Residents of Third Avenue, Heworth Requesting Footway and Carriageway Repairs within the Street

Members considered a report which responded to a petition received from 13 residents on the odd-numbered side of Third Avenue, between Sixth Avenue and Second Avenue, seeking repair and reconstruction of the footway, driveways and carriageway along this length of their street.

Members were asked to consider the following options:

Option 1 – take no action (except for minor repairs) until the condition of the footway and carriageway deteriorated sufficiently to achieve a priority position in a future year's capital programme.

Option 2 – carry out works in the current financial year by dropping a scheme from the approved programme.

Option 3 – make safe any defects breaching the Council’s investigatory levels, monitor the condition of the footway and carriageway and include the scheme in the assessment of “poor” condition schemes for next year, even though the condition of Third Avenue had been assessed as “average”.

Option 3 was recommended, on the basis that it would provide the opportunity for a possible inclusion of Third Avenue in next year’s resurfacing and reconstruction programme, thus addressing the petitioners’ concerns without disrupting the approved programme for the current year. In response to comments made under Public Participation, Officers confirmed that a standard approach was taken to the assessment of all roads and footways and stressed that Option 3 would enable safety issues to be addressed through minor repairs.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Note the receipt of the petition;
- (ii) Approve Option 3, as set out in paragraph 14 of the report.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To address the petitioners’ concerns and ensure that the available highway maintenance budgets are expended in the most cost effective way based on assessed priorities.

49. Proposed Improvements to Hopgrove Roundabouts

Members considered a report which sought approval for a proposed partnership scheme, involving the Highways Agency (HA) and the Council, to improve and signalise the two Hopgrove Roundabouts and the linking section of the A1237 York outer ring road.

Following the de-trunking of the A1237, the Council had become the highway authority for the A1237 and A1036 roundabout, while the HA had retained responsibility for the A64 roundabout. The HA had taken the lead in preparing a scheme which addressed congestion on the trunk and non-trunk elements of the highway. The main measures proposed were detailed in Annex A to the report and included improving and signalising both roundabouts, widening the A1237 between the roundabouts, providing enhanced lighting and signing and introducing speed limits. Work on the scheme was provisionally planned to commence in January 2007 and was expected to take about 9 months.

Members were asked to consider the following options:

Option 1 – agree to proceed with the scheme as proposed

Option 2 – support the scheme in principle but ask Officers to review with the HA any issues about which Members had concerns

Option 3 – not to proceed with the scheme.

Option 2 was recommended, with the proviso that there was a risk the scheme could be postponed should issues be raised that might increase costs or cause delay.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Endorse the proposed improvements to the Hopgrove roundabouts, as detailed in Annex A to the report.
- (ii) Agree that any permanent Road Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the scheme and covering roads for which the Council is the highway authority be advertised and, subject to no objections being received, that the order be made. Any unresolved objections to be referred back to Members for consideration.
- (iii) Delegate authority to the Director of City Strategy to enter into a Section 4 Agreement with the Highways Agency.
- (iv) Delegate authority to the Director of City Strategy to enter into an operation and maintenance agreement with the Highways Agency to cover any equipment on our roads for which they would be responsible to operate and / or maintain.
- (v) Ask Officers to consider installing enhanced signage directing cyclists to the alternative off-road cycle link.

Note: Cllr D'Agorne asked that his vote against the above scheme be recorded.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASONS:

- (i) To improve traffic movements through these roundabouts and reduce the delays at peak times.
- (ii) To enable the implementation of any changes to restrictions on stopping and any changes to speed limits on roads other than the A64.
- (iii) To permit the Highways Agency to carry out works on roads for which this Council is the highway authority.
- (iv) To ensure that operation and maintenance responsibilities are properly defined.
- (v) To improve safety for cyclists.

50. A19 / Wheldrake Lane (Crockey Hill) – Junction Improvement Scheme

Members considered a report which summarised feedback from consultation on proposals to install traffic signals and speed limits at the Wheldrake Lane junction with the A19 at Crockey Hill and sought approval to implement an amended scheme layout.

The scheme had been approved in principle by the Executive Member for City Strategy in February and later revised following detailed design work. A leaflet detailing the revised proposals had been circulated to 45 properties during August, inviting views and comments to be submitted by 15 September. Issues raised during consultation, and Officers' responses to these, were outlined in paragraphs 9 to 17 of the report. Briefly, 11 residents had responded in support of the scheme and some of them had suggested additional improvements. Two residents did not support the scheme. Most of the responses received from organisations had also indicated support for the scheme. However, the Cyclists' Touring Club had expressed concerns about potential hazards for cyclists and made suggestions to address these.

Members were asked to consider the following options:

Option A – to approve the introduction of traffic signals at the Crockey Hill junction, as shown in Annex C to the report. This would provide easier and safer access at a junction that was currently potentially dangerous.

Option B – to approve amended proposals for the introduction of traffic signals, including additional pedestrian and cycling facilities in response to consultation feedback, as shown in Annex G. This was the recommended option, as it would provide the same benefits as Option A and would also enhance the scheme.

In response to comments made under Public Participation, Officers confirmed that lighting the approach to the junction was considered vital to the safety of the scheme. The request for a direct cycle link between York and Wheldrake would be taken into account when considering schemes for next year.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to accept Option B and approve the proposed scheme to install traffic signals at Crockey Hill, with the addition of some extra pedestrian and cycle facilities, as shown in Annex G, for implementation during 2006/07.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To make turning in and out of Wheldrake Lane at the A19 junction easier and safer and to respond appropriately to issues raised during consultation.

51. A1079 (Hull Road) / York Road (Dunnington) – Junction Improvement Scheme

Members considered a report which summarised the results of consultation on proposals to install traffic signals and speed management measures at the York Road junction with the A1079 (Hull Road) at Dunnington, and sought approval to implement the proposals.

The Executive Member had authorised public consultation on the scheme, and advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). No objections had been received to the TRO notices. Consultation on the proposed scheme had been carried out in August. This had resulted in 69 responses from local residents, of which 29 had expressed support for the scheme and 40 had expressed objections. The issues raised in these responses were summarised in paragraphs 11 to 22 of the report. Responses received from organisations were outlined in paragraphs 23 to 32. These included objections from Dunnington Parish Council and the Police. An analysis of the issues raised was set out in paragraphs 34-42.

Members were asked to consider the following options:

Option A – approve the proposals as put forward for consultation.

Option B – approve the proposals but with amendments / additions in response to the concerns raised during consultation.

Option C – abandon plans to introduce traffic signals at the York Road junction.

Option A was recommended, on the basis that, having carefully assessed the concerns raised during consultation, Officers had concluded that none of these issues warranted changes to the current scheme plans. In response to comments made under Public Participation, Officers noted that residents had expressed mixed views in response to the proposals and that it would be very costly to implement an alternative scheme at the Common Road junction, due to the nature of the works required.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Approve the installation of traffic signals and speed management measures at the York Road junction, in accordance with the proposals put forward for public consultation.
- (ii) Request Officers to review the signage of, and enforcement processes applied to, the ban on HGV movements through Dunnington village, in the light of the petition presented to the last Council meeting.
- (iii) Ask Officers to press the Highways Agency to signal the A166 leg of the Grimston Roundabout.
- (iv) Ask Officer to review with the Highways Agency how the traffic light phasing at the Grimston Roundabout can be further refined and optimised.
- (v) Ask Officers to ensure that “before and after” checks of traffic volumes in Dunnington village are undertaken as part of the York Road signals project.
- (vi) Request Officers, when resources allow, to review further the safety arrangements at the Common Road / A1079 junction.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASONS: To make it easier and safer to exit from York Road and to address the issues raised during consultation and in the petition to Council.

S F GALLOWAY
Executive Leader

A REID
Executive Member for City Strategy

C VASSIE
Chair of Advisory Panel
The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 7.45 pm.