
Traffic Congestion Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee

18 May 2010

Report of the Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic Services

Residents Survey Results

Summary

1. This report presents the findings from the recently completed residents survey together with feedback from individual residents on the quality of the survey and their views on the findings from the scrutiny review. Members are asked to consider the information provided and agree any further recommendations resulting from the review in light of the survey responses.

Background

2. In coming to a decision to review this topic, the Committee recognised certain key objectives and the following remit was agreed:

Aim

3. To identify ways including Local Transport Plans 1 & 2 (LTP1 & LTP2) and other evidence, of reducing present levels of traffic congestion in York, and ways of minimising the impact of the forecast traffic increase.

Objectives

Having regard to the impact of traffic congestion (based on external evidence and those measures already implemented in LTP1 or proposed in LTP2), recommend and prioritise specific improvements to:

- i. Accessibility to services, employment, education and health
- ii. Air Quality, in particular looking at the five hotspots identified in the LTP2
- iii. CO₂ Emissions
- iv. Alternative environmentally viable and financially practical methods of transport
- v. Journey times and reliability of public transport
- vi. Economic Performance
- vii. Quality of Life
- viii. Road Safety

Consultation

4. As part of the review the following organisations and individuals were consulted:

- Assistant Director of City Development & Transport
 - Environmental Protection Manager
 - Principal Transport Planner
 - Representatives from the local bus service providers
 - Chair of the Quality Bus Partnership
5. In addition, reference was made to national Government policy documents and the Council's mid-term reports on LTP2, and a number of consultation events were also held:
- 'Road User Charging' (presented by Capita Symonds)
 - 'Broad Strategic Options Available to York' Report (presented by the Assistant Director of City Development & Transport)
 - 'Quality of Life' (presented by Professor John Whitelegg)

Summary of Recommendations Arising from the Review to date

6. The Committee's recommendations relating to their investigative work on the objectives of this review, were presented to the Executive on 3 April 2010, (see recommendations to date shown at Annex A). The Executive agreed to all the recommendations being taken into consideration as part of the LTP3 process, but this decision was subsequently called-in and referred back to the Executive by Scrutiny Management Committee, as Members felt the Executive should indicate whether it wished to approve, reject or amend the recommendations. The Executive reconsidered the final report on 5 May 2010, and approved a number of the recommendations. Some were rejected and others they agreed to feed into LTP3.

Information Gathered & Analysis

7. The recommendations presented to the Executive in April 2010 did not include any recommendations arising from the city wide consultation survey undertaken to gather residents views. An analysis of the survey findings are shown at Annex B, and Annex C (to follow) shows a number of sub-postal area maps, associated with the findings related to question 7 -ranking options, and question 8 – alternative options. Finally, residents comments and feedback on the survey are shown at Annex D.
8. Changes to Government Funding
 The final report presented to the Executive in April 2010, highlighted the Transport Innovation Fund as being a suitable funding mechanism for the more radical solutions identified. This funding mechanism is no longer available and is due to be replaced by an Urban Challenge Fund (UCF). The Department for Transport (DfT) issued a discussion paper on the UCF on 03 March 2010 inviting comments thereon to be returned by 04 June 2010. Whatever format and criteria for the UCF is eventually established, there is huge uncertainty in the future availability of government funding with, at the most optimistic level, 20-25% cuts in funding expected.

9. The discussion paper referred to above, can be viewed at:
[<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/localauthorities/funding/fundingstreams/urbanchallengefund/discussion/>](http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/localauthorities/funding/fundingstreams/urbanchallengefund/discussion/)

Options

10. Having considered the information contained within this report and its annexes, Members may choose to identify and agree additional recommendations relating specifically to the testing of the scenarios, in order that these may be presented to a further meeting of the Executive for approval.

Corporate Strategy

11. This review related to a number of the corporate priorities contained within the Council Corporate Strategy i.e. the recommendations if approved, will support the council's aim of making the city a healthier, more sustainable and thriving city, where residents have improved access to education, employment and health services.

Implications

12. **Financial** – The financial implications associated with implementing the suggested long term transport strategy are outlined in the final report that went to the Executive in April 2010. However in order to pursue these funding streams the scenarios will need to be tested rigorously to confirm the validity of the suggested strategy, which would require Council funding. At this stage it is unclear exactly how much funding would be required and these financial implications would need to be addressed in more detail in any future reports commissioned by the Executive resulting from those recommendations arising from this scrutiny review that they have approved.
13. **Legal** – As Local Highway Authority, Local Planning Authority, Local Environmental Health Authority and Road Traffic Authority, the Council has a wide range of functions it is able to discharge and powers it can exercise in dealing with congestion. In so acting it must adhere both to its own necessary authorisation procedures and all formal statutory requirements.
14. There are no known HR, Equalities, Property, Crime & Disorder, or other implications associated with the recommendations within this report. However, there are likely to be some HR implications associated with any additional recommendations around the testing of the preferred scenarios, which will be made once the survey results have been analysed.

Risk Management

15. There are risks to the Council associated with not adhering to all the legislation associated with the statutory functions listed within the legal implications paragraph above. There is also a potential risk to the Council's reputation if it fails to implement the necessary measures to address the expected increase in congestion levels

Recommendations

16. Members are asked to:

- i) note the findings from the residents survey
- ii) agree any further recommendations arising from this review, relating specifically to the testing of the scenarios outlined in the survey
- iii) agree to the recommendations identified at this meeting being added to the final report, and delegate the signing off of the completed final report to the Chair of this Committee.

Reason: To inform the Executive of the full outcome of the Traffic Congestion Ad Hoc Scrutiny Review.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
Tel: 01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager
Tel: 01904 551030

Report Approved Date 7 May 2010

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

- Annex A – Table of recommendations made to date
- Annex B – Analysis of survey results
- Annex C 1-3 – Maps associated with survey results for questions 7 & 8
- Annex D – Residents comments & feedback on the survey

Background Papers:

The Final Report and its associated annexes dated February 2010, and the Executive Cover Report dated 13 April 2010 can be viewed online at:
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=12962&path=12836>

The background papers to the final report can be viewed online at:
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=12964&path=12836>

Hard copies of the background papers listed above, can also be obtained by contacting the report author.