



## AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

### Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport and Planning

**To:** Councillor Dew

**Date:** Thursday, 17 May 2018

**Time:** 2.00pm

**Venue:** The George Hudson Board Room - 1st Floor West Offices (F045)

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on **17 May 2018**. The attached additional documents are now available for the following agenda item:

- 3. Public Participation** (Pages 1 - 18)
- At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is **5.00pm on Wednesday 16 May 2018**. Members of the public can speak on agenda items or matters within the Executive Member's remit.

To register to speak please contact the Democracy Officers for the meeting, on the details at the foot of the agenda.

#### **Filming, Recording or Webcasting Meetings**

Please note that, subject to available resources, this meeting will be filmed and webcast, or recorded, including any registered public speakers who have given their permission. The broadcast can be viewed at <http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts> or, if recorded, this will be uploaded onto the Council's website following the meeting.

Residents are welcome to photograph, film or record Councillors and Officers at all meetings open to the press and public. This includes the use of social media reporting, i.e. tweeting. Anyone wishing to film, record or take photos at any public meeting should contact the Democracy Officers (contact details are at the foot of this agenda) in advance of the meeting.

The Council's protocol on Webcasting, Filming & Recording of Meetings ensures that these practices are carried out in a manner both respectful to the conduct of the meeting and all those present. It can be viewed at

[https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/11406/protocol\\_for\\_webcasting\\_filming\\_and\\_recording\\_of\\_council\\_meetings\\_20160809](https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/11406/protocol_for_webcasting_filming_and_recording_of_council_meetings_20160809)

This agenda supplement was published on **18 May 2018**.

# Decision Session: Executive Member for Transport & Planning

## Annex of Written Representations

Thursday 17 May 2018, 2:00pm

Received from	Agenda Item	Comments
M Fisher Resident of Ripley Grove	4 – Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representation	<p>I appreciate that some residents have raised the issue of inappropriate parking on Windsor Drive close to its junction with Ripley Grove, which has resulted in the notice being posted indicating the intention of putting double yellow lines on the road.</p> <p>I would like to point out that I have been a resident in Ripley Grove since the house was built in 1971 and I can say with confidence that in all that time there has never been an incident or accident in or around the junction of Windsor Drive and Ripley Grove.</p> <p>Could I please point out that since the notice went up there have been very few occasions when vehicles have been parked causing a problem.</p> <p>Should you wish to go to the extra expense of putting double yellow lines on the road could you please advise me how it is going to be policed, if at all and be whom.</p> <p>I did send an e mail to Alistair Briggs before Christmas in which I suggested that the strip of grass between the footpath and the road could be replaced with a layby which would provide the much needed extra parking.</p> <p>Over the years the grass has been very poorly maintained by City of York Council and I suspect nothing will change in that regard. It is now the middle of May and at the time of composing this correspondence the maintenance team have yet to put in an appearance with their machinery. As it is they only cut the grass and leave the clippings to disperse over the road and footpath. The edges are never trimmed and ultimately the grass grows over the kerb and footpath. It is only tidy</p>

		<p>now because the footpath has recently been resurfaced, which is looking lovely, but the grass is getting long and not so lovely, unless you want to make hay.</p> <p>It is the residents living on Windsor Drive who now find that they have not got enough parking on their own property, due to grown up families who are not in a position to be able move out of the family home for various reasons.</p> <p>As a resident of 47 years I would much prefer that the monies spent on maintaining the grass and potential yellow lining be put towards creating the layby.</p>
<p>G Graham Resident of Carnock Close</p>	<p>4 – Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representation</p>	<p>I would like to object to the double yellow lines on Geldof Rd Huntington York. I reside on Carnock Close which is a cul-de-sac off Geldof Rd. At the moment on a weekend we have issues with parking by visitors to the residents of Geldof Rd. Carnock Close has five designated parking bays which are shared between six residents vehicles, therefore if parking restrictions are implemented the residents of Geldof Rd will have to find alternative parking to which the closest will be the cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>I drive around the bend in question on Geldof Rd on a daily basis and have never had an issue getting around the local residents parked cars. Rather than install yellow lines which will stop residents being able to park outside their own homes I would like to propose an alternative solution. There is an area between the properties numbers 58-64 Geldof Rd which has bramble type bushes which are always full of litter that could be removed to facilitate off road parking spaces. Surely the one off cost of this alteration could be offset by the current costs of trimming back these bushes which is done to my knowledge at least twice a year.</p> <p>In the twenty plus years that I have lived at this address I have only ever head of 1 minor traffic collision on this bend so it is hardly an accident black spot so hopefully common sense can prevail instead of causing parking issues for residents.</p>

<p>J Hughes Resident of St Olaves Road</p>	<p>4 – Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representation</p>	<p>I am writing to further explain my objection to the Proposed Traffic Amendment No14/29.</p> <p>Removal of this bay was proposed 2 years ago, and I raised an objection and spoke at the meeting held 12.05.16. Councillor Gillies decided that the bay should be retained.</p> <p>I suggested that the wider issue of Traffic calming and parking in the area should be discussed in more depth with residents and the council before any further changes were proposed. Councillor Gillies agreed, but unfortunately this has not happened.</p> <p>Therefore I was very surprised and disappointed that removal of this bay has been proposed a second time.</p> <p>The parking bay in question is outside my property and there has not been a problem or accident to date. In fact removal of the parking space would result in faster traffic and a higher potential for accidents to occur.</p> <p>The road has a blind corner, and the fact that the parking bay exists means that drivers naturally slow down and are more cautious when driving in both directions.</p> <p>When driving from the Bootham end of St Olaves Road towards Grosvenor Road, the fact that the car parking space is at the bottom right hand side of the road just before the road swings sharp right means that the drivers would naturally move more centre of the road and swing across the blind corner potentially into the path of a vehicle driving in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The dropped kerb access to our drive is just before the parking space (when approached from the Bootham end).</p> <p>We are very concerned that access to our drive would be more dangerous as we have to turn right into the drive and cross the road just before the blind corner. The fact the space is there and usually occupied means that drivers coming in the opposite direction i.e. from Grosvenor Road up towards Bootham are more cautious and drive slower. If the space was removed, then drivers travelling in the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>opposite direction would tend to cut the blind corner and accelerate up the street. We therefore request that the car parking space remains in situ.</p> <p>We think that the street should be looked at as a whole in terms of traffic calming measures and if possible made in to a cul de sac at the point of the blind corner.</p> <p>There are other bays on the street which would be more appropriate to amend. The long bay outside No. 15 is on a blind corner and when cars are parked it forces drivers to go across the wrong side of the road and drive into oncoming traffic.</p> <p>The bays opposite the bay referenced in the proposal would be more appropriate to amend. If a vehicle is parked in one of these bays, drivers from Bootham naturally take the centre line of the road which means a tighter angle heading into a blind corner. Removal would mean that drivers would be able to keep to the left hand side of the road, therefore increasing visibility of the blind corner.</p>
Councillors D Myers and M Wells, Labour Councillors for Clifton Ward	4 – Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representation	<p>We are writing in relation to the traffic amendment proposed for St Olaves Road. We support the comments made by Julie Hughes (above representation), resident of St Olaves Road - that the parking bay should be retained.</p>
Councillor I Cuthbertson, Haxby and Wigginton Ward Councillor	4 – Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representation	<p><b>Traffic Order re Windsor Drive/Ripley Grove, Wigginton (p.22 of report)</b></p> <p>Although I would not normally encourage the use of additional road markings of this kind in a residential area, this junction between a cul-de-sac and a relatively well-used estate spine road has poor sight-lines (the map does not show an extension which has been built on the Windsor Drive side of 2, Ripley Grove), the effect of which is exacerbated when vehicles park directly on the junction, as has been the case in recent months. A vehicle known to be visiting 2 Ripley Grove has even been parked on the kerb and parallel to the diagonal garden wall at this point. The lay-by on Windsor Drive opposite Ripley Grove also has a diagonal kerb at its eastern end and vehicles parked there can intrude into the road, giving</p>

rise to a narrowing of the carriageway at the junction.

For these and previously-submitted reasons, I would support a decision which implements the officer recommendations.

**Traffic Order re The Village, Wigginton (p.34 of report)**

The reason for the request for this restriction is related to the regular stream of vehicles which arrive at and depart from Wigginton Village Stores at 64 The Village. Residents (particularly at 58 and 56 The Village) park outside their homes between the 'H' markings on this side of the road, so that vehicles accessing the stores then have to pull out or take an extended line to avoid the parked vehicles. This means that cars parked on the south side of The Village reduce the road to a single lane, causing conflict between opposing vehicles. The issue is made worse by the fact that The Village is a bus route, drivers accessing the Village Store frequently park opposite it, and there is also a pedestrian crossing nearby outside 68 The Village. The issue is not merely one of causing delays to vehicular road users, but is the more serious one of reducing the risk of an accident arising from traffic movements outside the Village Store, particularly involving children using the pedestrian crossing on their way to/from school .

Although the original proposal addressed this problem by ensuring that there should be no narrowing of the carriageway opposite the shop, an amendment to reduce the length of the restriction by removing it from outside 41-47 would mean additional parking opposite the shop, thus nullifying any benefit from the proposed restriction.

For this reason, I would ask that the Executive Member decides to implement the restriction as originally proposed.

<p>Mike Longhurst Vice Chair Dodsworth Area Residents Association.</p>	<p>4 – Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representation</p>	<p><u>Dodsworth Avenue Parking</u></p> <p>I have been asked to send the comments below regarding the proposed imposition of parking restrictions in our area.</p> <p>The proposal to install two lengths of double yellow lines for 20 metres in Dodsworth Avenue has caused some concern as they are totally at odds with the consensus reached when we met on the 16 December 2016. The problem only occurs during the daytime and by introducing a 24 hour no waiting area we feel you are using a sledge hammer to crack a nut. Also, your proposal is likely to create a ‘chute’ of cars parked on either side of the road between the two areas of no waiting in Dodsworth Avenue (Maps D &amp; E) which, coupled with the small area you have allowed for traffic coming in the opposite direction to wait, (a bus is approximately 3.3 metres long, add a couple of delivery vehicles and the space needed to for safety between vehicles) the problem will quickly reappear. This permanent restriction will give problems for residents as times when there is currently no problem with parked traffic (evenings and weekends) and unlikely to help the current situation.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposal for Saxon Place/Dodsworth Avenue will move the congestion caused by people using the local shops further down the road. The layby outside the shop in Dodsworth Avenue has only rarely been used as a bus layby and never signed as one. The bus stop and shelter are several metres further down the road and drivers are instructed to stop opposite a bus stop. The path near the ‘bus layby is narrow where one would mount and dismount from the bus and drivers also do not like to pull in to this layby as they have problems trying to get out because their vision is impeded by parked cars elsewhere and cars turning out of Saxon Place. (Not to mention the need to travel over the broken white lines that force traffic leaving Saxon Place to stop to access the layby.) The layby is successful at allowing cars to park when using the shop so limiting the blocking of the Avenue and we would have thought that, if any restrictions where needed, a no waiting area opposite the Saxon Place junction would be of more assistance to traffic trying to negotiate this area. It would also cut down on the number of people trying to cross the road at this point so</p>
--	--	---



		<p>reducing the possible distractions on drivers.</p> <p>The proposals for Fossway also seem severe and will affect people using the local church. This layby was initially installed as part of the construction of the new estate (Redgrave Close) to enable residents/visitors to park outside their homes and seems to work fairly well. (Several of these houses have no off-street parking.) Should you be including the layby in part of this scheme you will then move the parking into the layby opposite encroaching into the parking area that was built to allow parking for the church so removing vehicles from the junction.</p> <p>The result of this proposal will be to displace vehicles visiting the church to surround streets so causing further problems for residents. It will also cause major problems when the church hosts christenings, weddings, funerals and other services which attract large gatherings. (St Wulstan's church is the sister church of Holy Trinity, Heworth and both churches regularly hold joint services several times a year.) We do not believe there is a serious problem at this junction and would question why it has been deemed necessary for inclusion in your scheme.</p>
<p>A &amp; T Fenech Residents of Lumley Road</p>	<p>5 – Lumley Road/St Luke's Grove Ward Committee Scheme, Parking Restrictions – Traffic Regulation Order</p>	<p>We wholeheartedly support the parking restrictions proposed for Lumley Road, as we feel that they will go a long way towards solving the problems caused by the increased number of cars parked in the street. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Difficulty getting in and out of our drive caused by cars being left over, opposite or too close to our driveway.</li> <li>•Congestion and dangerous driving and parking close to the school. We are often prevented from getting in or out of our drive at the beginning and end of the school day. This is an inconvenience, but even more worrying is the dangerous situation that occurs when parents are unable to get away after dropping off or collecting their children, because of other parents' parking: they sometimes drive along the footpath, or reverse quickly up the road.</li> <li>•The bin lorries are frequently unable to get down the road to empty our bins due to cars parked at the top of the road, and the council is frequently needing to send out a second crew. Emergency vehicles and delivery lorries have also been</li> </ul>

		<p>impeded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The grass verges are badly damaged by vehicles parked on them and/ or driven over them to turn round.</li> <li>•The road has become a car park for workers, shoppers and students at St Peter's School, with some leaving their vehicles for a week or more at a time.</li> </ul> <p>We hope that the restrictions can be put in place very soon as the situation is annoying and stressful. We understand that some residents have individual requirements such as dropped kerbs or may want residents' parking, (we would support this if it was offered) but we would not want these requirements to delay or prevent anything being done and cause the current situation to continue. Please could your proposals be put in place and small scale modifications be considered after that.</p>
<p>S Ward Resident of Lumley Road</p>	<p>5 – Lumley Road/St Luke's Grove Ward Committee Scheme, Parking Restrictions – Traffic Regulation Order</p>	<p>Please record I am objecting to the proposed council plan:</p> <p>It's unnecessarily complex and expensive and does not solve the problem, as even with limited parking available, a steady stream of cars wanting parking will travel down the road causing mayhem when they try and turn round, a situation we have now.</p> <p>The only solution to this problem is residents only parking.</p>
<p>P &amp; P Smith Residents of Lumley Road</p>	<p>5 – Lumley Road/St Luke's Grove Ward Committee Scheme, Parking Restrictions – Traffic Regulation Order</p>	<p>We support the current proposals because we are very concerned that unless some action is taken immediately the problem of non residents parking in both roads will become worse. Whilst we hope the background information provided about the urgent need for a scheme is accurate from our perspective this has gone on for far too long.</p> <p>We can confirm that we first contacted Council Officers 4 years ago in February 2014 and were advised to conduct a survey amongst residents in both Lumley Road and St Luke's Grove to gauge how much support there was for a residents parking scheme. The majority who replied, as shown in the Transport Engineer's</p>

		<p>report did not want a residents parking scheme, probably because of the potential costs on the individual. The local Councillors have organised one public meeting since then. Progress on this matter has been very slow despite our contacts with local Councillors and the Engineer in the Transport Projects section of the Economy and Place Directorate.</p> <p>The character of these two quiet residential roads has changed as a result of non-residents parking in both roads without any consideration to others. Both roads are too narrow to have cars parked on both sides of the road. Many motorists park on the grass verges in Lumley Road or the pavement in St Luke's Grove making it extremely difficult for other vehicles to use the roads. The mud and damage to the verges in Lumley Road is extremely unsightly especially after it has rained and affects the overall impression of the character of the road.</p> <p>All residents have their own space to park within their curtilage yet both roads attract parked cars on a daily basis from patients and staff using the hospital, students from St Peters School and shoppers. This prevents not only residents from using the roads but also emergency services, environmental waste collections and delivery vans and lorries. This is compounded by fans parking when York City Football Club and York City Knights Rugby Football Club are playing at Bootham Crescent.</p> <p>In addition, parents arriving by car to deliver and collect their children twice a day during term time at Clifton Green School have resulted in numerous altercations amongst themselves and residents. This is particularly the case when a driver is attempting to manoeuvre in a small space because there is no turning space at the end of Lumley Road. It is surprising that no one has been injured. Despite the school being aware of the dangers we have not been aware of any action being taken by the school apart from a letter in December 2017 to neighbours which stated that the head teacher regretted that the problem had not been solved and that the School Council was producing a proposal 'in the New Year. 'Nothing has been heard by the neighbours since then.</p> <p>We understand the frustration of those of our neighbours who are now advocating a residents parking scheme as the best solution. We would not be opposed to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>this, but it is not on offer.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions are the best available at the moment and it is our view that it should be implemented without further delay.</p>
<p>D &amp; E Brown Residents of Lumley Road</p>	<p>5 – Lumley Road/St Luke’s Grove Ward Committee Scheme, Parking Restrictions – Traffic Regulation Order</p>	<p>Re: Parking Lumley road.</p> <p>I am writing in support of residents only parking.</p> <p>Over the past two years the parking situation on our street has become impossible. In this time my wife has needed two ambulances. Both could hardly access the street let alone reverse out. Indeed at times we can hardly squeeze cars through. Bin wagons and deliveries have been turned away and how no children have been hurt at school pick up/ drop off is a mystery to me.</p> <p>The current plan is not an option. It would leave us, as residents with around 6-8 parking bays (due to plans for current raised kerbs being dropped) between 60 residencies. Each residence with at least one car. Some with up to three.</p> <p>I feel that residents parking was not properly explained the first time around, and if it had been then that would have been the preference of the majority of residents. A lot of people believed that it would be expensive and therefore went against it.</p> <p>Residents parking allows residents and visitors of residents to park at a small cost per day for the parking books.</p> <p>6-8 parking bays I can see causing social divide and arguments. A space outside my house automatically becomes ‘my space’ is what I envisage. If this plan goes ahead we will be removing the retaining front garden wall and having a parking space put in place of the garden. Thus reducing the value and appeal of our property.</p> <p>Leaving things as they are is also not an option. There will be accidents and the frustration of a lot of people due to the parking is becoming more tangible.</p>

<p>Mike Longhurst Vice Chair Dodsworth Area Residents Association</p>	<p>6 – North Yorkshire Bus Improvement Scheme</p>	<p>I would like to point out the following observations regarding this scheme which I feel has been ill-thought through and a waste of Better Bus Users Funding.</p> <p>Firstly, The Clarence Street, Lord Mayors Walk, Gillygate junction has not improved dramatically. I can only presume that surveys were taken whilst the work on the Lendal Gyrotory was taking place which, for a time, reduced traffic and improved matters.</p> <p>The proposed ‘improvements’ give a total of 40 seconds of, possible, increased time however the report suggestions 90 seconds might be achieved. This needs some explaining as it is not possible to extrapolate this from the information shown.</p> <p>Also the bus stops at Fountain Street are used by people travelling to and from Haxby, Wigginton and Strensall who walk to and from Haxby Road to save time and avoid further delays on their journey. As these two stops are not timing points, in is difficult to see how any time can be saved, especially with the volume of traffic buses encounter in this area. (The timing point is at the stops outside the Hospital.)</p> <p>This whole suggest is, at best, just expensive tinkering with the road and will do nothing to improve bus services. It is therefore my opinion that Better Bus Area Funding should not be wasted on this scheme and the whole idea revisited to look at a better way of solving this problem.</p>
<p>Dave Merrett York Bus Forum</p>	<p>6 – North Yorkshire Bus Improvement Scheme</p>	<p>The Forum would wish to make the following comments following a discussion on these proposals at our committee meeting on Tuesday. The Forum is obviously keen to see measures being undertaken to help local buses to improve their reliability and journey times. A good quality and especially a reliable bus service is important to bus passengers, especially those travelling to work, to appointments, to the train station or the city centre for onward bus journeys. Unreliability can have significant implications for passengers. However we recognise it has wider import. York's traffic problems will only be sorted if a greater proportion of journeys are made by public transport, and growth in custom</p>

		<p>can also allow operators to invest in expanding bus services and improve coverage and frequency, creating a virtuous circle. Clearly a lot of people do not currently see existing bus services being adequate in this regard, so investment in improvements to bus service reliability are crucial, especially in congested locations such as the paper covers.</p> <p>However the paper did raise questions with us as to whether the proposed measures will really deliver what's needed. There was concern that the extra time through the area would simply lead to extra general traffic and the 90 seconds improvement will quickly disappear. We don't understand why there's no discussion of what bus detection and additional green time facility could be provided at the Haxby Road / Wigginton road junction to assist buses, if we really were trying to give them some real priority (in the absence of space for separate bus lanes). One member suggested you could also look to end the right turn facility from Clarence Street into Lowther Street to reduce conflicting movements and give more time to the priority bus movements.</p> <p>The Wigginton road problem really needs further work with the hospital to get a change in the way staff, visitors, and potentially more mobile out-patients access it. The previously discussed proposal for a park and ride service from Clifton Moor to serve the hospital and through to the city centre for interchange might be a far more effective way of addressing the problems here.</p>
<p>Peter Sheaf York Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>6 – North Yorkshire Bus Improvement Scheme</p>	<p>1. Recommendation: That you defer your decision to put this scheme out to consultation until your officers have had time to develop a wider range of options, including improving cycle options, that have higher potential to achieve greater, lasting improvements in bus journey times on Wigginton Road, Haxby Road and Clarence Street at less cost. This would free up funds to be used elsewhere.</p> <p>2. Consideration: There are two key components to the proposals that Council officers are seeking your approval on to put to consultation:</p> <p>a. The improvement in bus journey times on Wigginton Road between Crichton Avenue and Clarence Street by changing traffic prioritisations along Wigginton</p>

		<p>Road and Haxby road;</p> <p>b. The improvement in the design of the junction between Wigginton Road, Haxby Road and Clarence Street to minimise conflict between cyclists and motorists.</p> <p>3. As a cycle campaign we welcome the second component, or as your officers have put it, the “critical importance” in ensuring that conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and motorists is minimised at the junction between Wigginton Road, Haxby Road and Clarence Street. According to Department for Transport road accident statistics, this junction has proved particularly dangerous for cyclists: 10 cyclists have been injured on or close to this junction since 2005, compared to five car occupants and three pedestrians over the same period. Similarly, three cyclists have been injured on or near the turn from Wigginton Road into the hospital since 2014. Quite clearly thus, the southern end of Wigginton Road, from Crichton Avenue to Clarence Street must be made safer for cyclists.</p> <p>4. Turning to the first component, we fully support the aim of seeking to improve bus journey times. We recognise the crucial role that buses play in allowing York’s residents and visitors to traverse the city in a sustainable fashion. We also accept that to become more attractive as a travel choice, bus journeys must become quicker and more reliable. So we are surprised to see the approach recommended by council officers, which will not result in bus journey times that are quicker than those of private cars.</p> <p>5. As your officers state throughout their report, their proposed approach of reprioritising traffic will benefit “all road users.” Two clarifications must be made here: Firstly, that your officers actually mean all <i>motorised</i> road users, as cyclists are largely unaffected by congestion. And secondly, that your officers’ proposals mean that all motorised road users will benefit <i>in equal amounts</i>. This second point is crucial, because it means that bus journey times will not be any quicker than car journey times on this stretch. That, in turn, means motorists will be presented with no incentive in time savings to swap their cars for the bus. This is</p>
--	--	---

despite the stated aim of these proposals being to improve bus journey times, and the fact that it is financed by a fund specifically for this purpose, the Better Bus Area Fund. The Council was awarded this funding following a bid in 2012 in which it stated that “we want to see far more people choosing to travel by bus, train, bike or on foot in York.” It is unclear to us how the proposals presented to you support this aim.

6. Similarly, we must also question the relatively small benefits claimed by your officers’ report: that bus journey times might increase “up to” 90 seconds. “Up to” are the key words, implying that in most cases the journey time savings to car and bus users will be rather less than 90 seconds. Further, by momentarily improving the journey times of bus and car users, it will likely only be a short while until other motorists are drawn to the area (for example by their sat navs or map apps on their mobile phones) to try to enjoy quicker journey times. Thus the improvements to journey times risk being quickly lost. For a spend of £250,000, we have to question whether this outcome really represents value for money for the City of York Council and its residents.

7. Indeed, one of the reasons we passionately believe in cycling as a solution to York’s congestion problems is the value for money cycling offers, with zero to negligible contributions to congestion, noise and air pollution, and carbon emissions, all while boosting the health of the rider. In today’s fiscally constrained times, this sheer value for money offered by cycling means that we believe that making cycling more attractive must be considered alongside the more conventional traffic management approaches suggested here by your officers. That is why we are calling on you to defer putting these proposals out to consultation until your officers have had time to develop and include options that encourage more people to cycle rather than drive, thereby easing congestion. We would be happy to work with your officers to develop these options (just as we would welcome prior consultation by your officers on transport proposals affecting cyclists), but they could include:

a. Establishing how many motorists would need to choose transport modes other



		<p>than their cars for the same or better bus journey time improvements to be achieved. Then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Working with the hospital (whose shift start and end times are acknowledged by your officers to coincide with greatly worsened congestion) to improve its Travel Plan and really encourage more of its staff who currently drive in to take the bus or cycle;</li><li>ii. Researching why people choose to drive through this area and what it would take for them to choose a more sustainable mode of transport like the bus, walking or cycling. Although Wigginton Road enjoys some off-road cycle paths, they are disjointed and confusing, offering much scope for their improvement in line with lessons learned in Dutch, Danish and some British cities. For example, there appears to be space for a southbound protected cycleway along Clarence Street from the Lowther Street junction and past the end of Penley's Grove Street.</li></ul> <p>b. Considering more radical approaches like closing roads and junctions to traffic other than buses, bicycles and emergency vehicles at certain times. Such an approach has been trialled for the last 12 months in the City of London, where Bank junction has been closed to traffic other than buses, bicycles and emergency vehicles between 7am-7pm between Monday and Friday. The results have been spectacular: casualties at the junction have reduced by 52%; casualties in the surrounding areas have reduced by 33%; air pollution is markedly down; bus journey times have improved by five minutes! City of London council officers are now recommending the arrangement become permanent.</p> <p>8. Conclusion: Traffic congestion has blighted York for decades. Significant amounts of time and money have been expended over those years trying to ease this congestion, largely using the same approaches of increasing road capacity and better traffic management, yet congestion remains and is projected to get worse. This congestion amid York's constricted medieval roads has adversely affected bus journey times. We share the desire of you, your officers and York's residents to improve bus journey times, but we believe that residents must be</p>
--	--	---

		<p>able to comment on options that offer a genuine choice of approach and have a better chance of success than those presented to you today. We firmly believe that these options must include one or more that strongly encourage cycling, by making the cycling infrastructure along this stretch safe, convenient and accessible for cyclists. We therefore urge you to defer your decision to put proposals to improve bus journey times on Wigginton Road to consultation, until your officers have developed credible options that greatly promote cycling as a viable choice for people travelling to or through this area.</p>
<p>Councillor I Cuthbertson, Ward Councillor for Haxby and Wigginton</p>	<p>7 - York Road, Haxby Pedestrian Crossing Petition</p>	<p>This proposal arises from the lack of a safe crossing point for pedestrians over a distance of more than 1km between the junction of York Road with The Village, Haxby and its junction with Eastfield Avenue. Both junctions are mini-roundabouts and there is minimal protection for pedestrians wishing to cross at each junction; this takes the form of a small island at each junction, formed by two illuminated bollards but without a pedestrian refuge. Slightly north of the mid-point between these junctions, the junction between Holly Tree Lane and York Road on its west side is a busy junction at peak times with buses turning into and out of York Road from/to Holly Tree Lane.</p> <p>In theory, children walking to Joseph Rowntree School from Haxby could walk along the length of York Road on their 'own' side, using the underpass at the northern ring road and crossing York Road at the light-controlled pedestrian crossing outside the school. In practice, they prefer to walk with their friends and this may involve crossing the road along the length in question. In the other direction, children walking to Ralph Butterfield school do need to cross York Road, usually at some point between Holly Tree Lane and Calf Close. In peak times, York Road is busy and sight-lines for pedestrians are not always good because of cars parked along it, particularly north of the junctions with The Avenue. Users of Ethel Ward playing field experience similar problems.</p> <p>I support the petition organised by Marie Dowling and hope that both the Executive Member and officers will recognise that, having received over 1000</p>

		<p>signatures, this petition represents a considerable body of opinion among residents of Haxby. I hope therefore that the Executive Member will approve the undertaking of a survey and investigation to identify an appropriate form of crossing and a site at which it can be installed in this stretch of York Road.</p>
--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank