
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Economy and Transport
Date	12 September 2023
Present	Councillor Kilbane
Officers in Attendance	James Gilchrist - Director of Environment, Transport and Planning Darren Hobson - Traffic Management Team Leader Geoff Holmes - Traffic Projects Officer Peter Marsland - Traffic Projects Officer Graham Titchener - Parking Services Manager Helene Vergerau - Head of Highway Access and Development
In attendance	Jon Hunter - North Yorkshire Police Jess Walters – North Yorkshire Police

7. Declarations of Interest (10:01)

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 they might have in respect of the business on the agenda. None were declared.

8. Minutes (10:01)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on 11 July be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

9. Public Participation (10:01)

It was reported that there had been 10 registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Councillor Warters spoke on agenda items 4 - Acknowledgement of Petitions and the lack of discussion with ward Councillors. He also spoke on 5 - Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests where he objected to annex P1, explaining that the parking issues at this location

were created by the Council and that the planned action would just displace the problem elsewhere. He requested that this item be rejected and called for Officers to consult with ward and parish Councillors to find a solution.

Councillor Warters then read out a statement on behalf of Dunnington Parish Council on item 8 - Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments - Pre Consultation who objected to the Officer recommendation for a number of reasons, including that the item did not receive any due consideration and that there was no logic in waiting 12 months for the Bishopthorpe Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) to be completed, amongst others.

Gwen Swinburn spoke on unlawful spending and the issue of Officer delegation, which were rarely reported. She stated that Officers pick and choose what to record and this keeps Members and residents in the dark, namely on the suspended Highways Design Guide. She then asked for a written reply on the results of the adoption of Government House Road in 2021.

John Young also spoke on agenda item 4, namely the Race Day petition, and explained that residents were not notified of the erection of the barriers and road closures. He explained that the area had never previously had any issues with race day traffic and that the barriers were often not taken down in time. He noted that there was no support for the barriers from local residents and asked Officers why there was no notification nor consultation for them.

Councillor Nicholls questioned the length of the proposed changes detailed in annex B1 of agenda item 5 before welcoming the Officer recommendations detailed in agenda item 8 in regards to the Bishopthorpe ETO. He explained that without this decision, the partial 20mph speed limits would cause confusion and an increase in road signs. He then stated that the village speed watch and Parish Council supported the recommendations before commenting on some of the objections raised. He concluded by asking for further support for the village speed watch.

Andy D'Arogne spoke on the delay of the transport strategy and the local cycling and walking infrastructure plan. He commented on the need for a basic funded bus priority measures and warned that the stalling of the active travel programme may result in undermined funding bids. He then spoke on agenda item 8, stating that the trials for Bishopthorpe and Dunnington should go ahead and then commenting on agenda item 4, namely the Farrar St petition, stating that the wishes of long term residents should not be ignored.

Christopher Tregellis also spoke on agenda item 5, namely on annex Q4. He supported the Officer recommendations which proposed that the existing no waiting 8am-6pm restriction be extended. He explained that this would alleviate traffic issues and improve pedestrian access on the footpath.

Councillor Smalley spoke on agenda item 7 - Response to Granary Estate Road Adoption Petition and explained that this had created difficult experiences for residents. He stated that residents were not aware that the roads weren't adopted and the issues that this could cause. He concluded by supporting the Officer recommendations, requesting that the Council updates residents on negotiations between parties every 6 months and supported the comments made by Christopher Tregellis.

Councillor Myers spoke on agenda item 4, namely on the Respark scheme detailed in annex B, and asked Officers to check if the existing zones in Clifton were large enough before asking for a timeframe on the consultation process. He then spoke on agenda item 5, namely annex on C, and detailed his support for the proposed changes.

It was reported that there had been 9 written representations received by the Executive Member.

Peter Rollings, Chairman of Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council, wrote in regards to agenda item 9 - Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments (Post Public Consultation), namely on the two items concerning the village of Rufforth. He supported the proposal for a 20mph limit on Wetherby Road but expressed disappointment with the Officer recommendation in relation to Bradley Lane. He explained that a 40mph buffer would improve compliance with the 30mph restrictions and reduce speeds around nearby dangerous bends before asking the Executive Member to reconsider the proposal.

Diane and Dennis Sugden wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely annex J7. They wrote in support of the recommendation and explained that they have had difficulties when exiting from their driveway due to vehicles that were parked outside, limiting their visibility.

Carlton Owen wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely annex Q5. He explained that there was a large number of vehicles parked on the pedestrian path and stated that the no waiting at any time restrictions should be painted on the north side instead. He noted that these issues arose from a house in multiple occupation on the street and asked for a parking permit for each household in Mitchell Way.

Councillor Orrell wrote in regards to agenda item 8, namely on the two items in Huntington. For New Lane, he stated that traffic calming measures were required and asked to move the 30mph sign towards Malton Road. For North Lane, he noted that there was a speeding issue in the residential area of the road and asked for a 30mph sign towards the ring road.

Max West also wrote in relation to annex Q5 in agenda item 5. They noted that the nuisance parking predominantly occurred on the north side of the road and this was also where foot traffic was highest, which caused problems for pedestrians. They asked for the restrictions to be implemented on the north side before stating that the parking problems arose due to the house in multiple occupation. They concluded by asking Officers to consult with residents before any decision was made.

Ann-Marie Richards also wrote in relation to annex Q5 in agenda item 5. She explained that the parking on the north side caused visibility issues and asked for the no waiting at any time restriction to be implemented on the north side.

A resident also wrote in relation to annex Q5 in agenda item 5. They explained that the parking issue was with the north side of the road and asked for the restrictions to be implemented there. They also stated that the volume of vehicles from the house in multiple occupation was the cause of these issues. They also noted that these vehicles caused oil leaks along the road before stating that the parking was a safety hazard.

Mr and Mrs Sheehan Gibbons wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely on annex T4. They wrote in objection to the recommendation and explained that there was no parking issues in the cul-de-sac, there was no public alleyway or right of way as mentioned in the background information. This restriction would mean that other vehicles, e.g. delivery, would not be able to park outside their property and asked that the no waiting at any time restrictions do not extend in front of their property or driveway.

Councillor Pearson wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely on annex I. He supported the proposals detailed in annexes I1, I4, I5, I6, I7 and I8 and asked that the restrictions in I2 and I3 still be advertised. He explained that the proposals in I8 were important to local residents and was currently creating accessibility and visibility issues. On I2, he explained that pavement parking was an issue and was causing problems for residents and pedestrians before asking that no waiting at any time restrictions were imposed on the western side of the road or in the location originally requested. On I3, he asked that it be advertised and that a final decision was made on consultation feedback. He noted parking issues in the area

and asked that no waiting at any time restrictions were extended and filled in on the northern side of Back Lane/Greenshaw Drive.

10. Acknowledgement of Petitions (10:33)

The Executive Member considered a report which acknowledged and addressed a number of petitions that had been submitted to Highways and Transport. The Director for Environment, Transport and Planning provided an overview and recommendations against each petition. It was then;

Resolved: That the Executive Member noted the receipt of the petitions and reviewed the recommendations against each petition below:

(i) Strensall Cycle Path

- Note that connecting Strensall with Huntington and Earswick has provisionally been identified as a priority route as part of the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan.

(ii) Haxby Moor Road Resurface

- Due to the condition and priority of an intervention, no action would be taken in terms of the scheduled highway maintenance programme currently. An inspection of the condition would be undertaken and any reactive maintenance required would be delivered.

(iii) Stockton-on-the-Forest Resurface

- Due to the condition and priority of an intervention, no action would be taken in terms of the scheduled highway maintenance programme currently. An inspection of the condition would be undertaken and any reactive maintenance required would be delivered.

(iv) Improve Road Safety - Hopgrove, York A1036 Malton Road

- More detailed work on measure was requested and would be considered as part of the Transport Capital Programme in 2024/25.

(v) Farrar Street ResPark

- That the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list was approved and the extent of the potential consultation area was considered when it reaches the top of the list.

(vi) Garrow Hill Avenue, petition for inclusion in the Residents Parking Zone

- That the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list was approved and the extent of the potential consultation area was considered when it reaches the top of the list.
- (vii) Removal of Race Day Barriers on the Junctions of Albermarle and Count de Burgh with Queen Victoria Street in South Bank
- Note that the Council would engage with residents and Ward Councillors to review traffic management in the area ahead to the next race season.

Reason: To respond to residents' concerns and implement, if possible, the appropriate measure.

11. Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests (10:38)

The Executive Member considered a report which requested approval to advertise and implement the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order requested to introduce the restrictions detailed in Annexes A to U of the report.

The Director for Environment, Transport and Planning and the Traffic Management Team Leader outlined the report and detailed the objections/questions by Councillors and residents raised to the transport team. It was then;

Resolved:

- i. That each item in the Annexes A to U, with the exception of G2, be progressed as per the Officer recommendations listed.
- ii. That Annex G2 be advertised at a greater length and progressed to the statutory consultation process to amend the Traffic Regulation Order.

Reason: To provide the Council with the opportunity to progress the proposals to the Statutory Consultation for the amendment of the TRO, which is a legal requirement.

12. Moving Traffic Offence Enforcement Consultation Responses (Part 6 Traffic Management Act 2004) (10:57)

The Executive Member considered a report which provided an update on the consultation for the new enforcement powers for Local Authorities under part 6 of the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 and a pilot of these powers to enforce the one-way Micklegate traffic restriction.

The Parking Services Manager detailed the report and noted that a 6-week consultation in line with the Department of Transport guidance was conducted and that the feedback was supportive of both the application to share powers with North Yorkshire Police on moving traffic offences and the Micklegate pilot scheme. He also explained that a traffic survey was completed in July 2023 where approximately 50 vehicles passed through Micklegate bar illegally before noting that North Yorkshire Police supported the scheme in principle.

In response to questions from the Executive Member, the Officer confirmed that the use of these powers and technology would be extended to existing traffic restrictions in the city in the future. He also noted that the aim of traffic restriction was to ensure compliance and that there would be a 6 month warning period for vehicles passing through before a penalty charge notice was issued.

The Executive Member asked Officers to consider the placement of the ANPR cameras and;

Resolved:

- i. That the findings of the public consultation be noted:
 - The feedback was supportive of the application to share measures with North Yorkshire Police on moving traffic offences under part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004;
 - The feedback was supportive of a pilot scheme on Micklegate;
- ii. That it be noted that on the basis of the positive response to the consultation, the Director for Transport, Environment and Planning will apply to the Department for Transport to take on the responsibilities for enforcement of part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 as per the delegation in the April 2022 report.
- iii. That it be delegated to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning for the implementation of the pilot to enforce the one-way Micklegate traffic restriction. This will be funded from existing Transport budgets. This is following the Officer Decision to commence the consultation exercise and change the location from Lendal to Micklegate for the reasons in the officer decision report.

Reason: To ensure the safety of the Highway network is further strengthened

13. Response to Granary Estate Road Adoption Petition (11:04)

The Executive Member considered a report which provided an update on the issues to be resolved for the adoption of the prospective highways within The Granary estate to progress.

The Head of Highways Access and Development outlined the report and explained that the Council had limited powers but would continue to work with Yorkshire Water, Persimmon and Redrow to attempt to find a solution. She also proposed a meeting with the ward Councillors to provide an update.

Resolved:

- i. That the issues which hindered the adoption process be noted.
- i. That the actions taken by Council officers to date to seek to resolve those issues be noted.
- ii. That the Executive Member support continued efforts by officers of the Council to find a solution to the issues, working with Persimmon, Redrow and Yorkshire Water.
- iii. That a meeting with the ward Councillors, Persimmon, Redrow and Yorkshire Water be held.

Reason: to update the Executive Member and petitioners on the role of the Council and progress in resolving the issues.

14. Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments - Pre Consultation (11:06)

The Executive Member considered a report which examined the requests received for speed limits to be amended or extended and was asked to make a decision on whether to undertake the statutory consultation or take no further action on the proposals.

The Director of Transport, Highways and Environment and the Traffic Projects Officer presented the report, and representatives from North Yorkshire Police were present to answer questions. The Traffic Projects Officer outlined each location that had a request for a revised speed limit and it was;

Resolved:

- i. That the statutory consultation process for New Lane, Huntington be deferred

Reason: Owing to submitted planning applications, this may need to be reviewed in the future.

- ii. That the statutory consultation process for North Lane, Huntington be deferred.

Reason: Owing to approved development, this may will need to be reviewed in the future as part of the conditions of planning permission approval.

- iii. That the statutory consultation process for Dunnington be deferred.

Reason: to await outcome of decision for proposal vi. below.

- iv. That no further action be taken on the New Road, Hessay proposal.

Reason: The existing speed limits were appropriate due to the surrounding environment.

- v. That the statutory consultation process for A59 Boroughbridge Road be approved.

Reason: There were indications are these were appropriate speed limits due to the surrounding environment.

- vi. That an Experimental Traffic Order subject to further analysis on permanent speed change be implemented for Bishopthorpe.

Reason: Many of the roads in the village do not satisfy the Department for Transport criteria for 20mph limit so this would allow for data to be captured at 3 and 9 months and would provide reliable data for analysis and to inform future similar requests.

- vii. That it be noted that as part of the review of a new Local Transport Plan the issue of speeds can be reviewed in a wider policy context and that could form part of the consultation on Local Transport Strategy.

Reason: To consider citizen requests and consider against the Department for Transport guidance and Police views alongside the Councils own policies.

15. Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments (Post Public Consultation) (11:24)

The Executive Member considered a report which examined the requests received for speed limits to be amended or extended and was asked to make a final decision on whether to implement the new speed limits.

The Director of Transport, Highways and Environment and the Traffic Projects Officer presented the report, and representatives from North Yorkshire Police were present to answer questions. The Traffic Projects

Officer outlined each location that had a request for a revised speed limit and it was;

Resolved:

i. That the revised speed limit as advertised for the following sites be implemented:

- Haxby Road (Clarence Gardens) - 20mph
- Wetherby Road Rufforth (Primary School) - 20mph

Reason: There were indications are these were appropriate speed limits due to the surrounding environment.

ii. That the revised speed limit for Montague Road and Keble Park Estates be deferred.

Reason: To await the outcome of the Bishopthorpe Experimental Traffic Order as detailed in agenda item 8.

iii. That no further action be taken in the following sites:

- Sutton Road, Wigginton
- Bradley Lane, Rufforth

Reason: The existing speed limits were appropriate due to the surrounding environment.

Councillor Kilbane, Executive Member

[The meeting started at 10:00am and finished at 11:35am].