
MEETING	EXECUTIVE MEMBERS FOR CITY STRATEGY AND ADVISORY PANEL
DATE	14 JULY 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS GILLIES (CHAIR), D'AGORNE (VICE-CHAIR), CREGAN, HOLVEY (SUB FOR CLLR HYMAN), POTTER, RUNCIMAN (SUB FOR CLLR GALLOWAY) SCOTT AND WALLER (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS STEVE GALLOWAY AND HYMAN

16. 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.

Councillor Potter declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 10 (Vibration Survey Results for North Moor Road, Huntington) as her mother had signed the petition.

Councillor Holvey declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 14 (York – Harrogate – Leeds line Tram-train feasibility study) as an employee of Leeds City Council.

Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 9 (Manor School – Highway Improvement) as a member of the Cycling Touring Club (CTC) and the York Cycle Campaign. A personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 12 (Petition seeking the addition of Chapel Alley, Fulford to the List of Streets Maintainable at the public expense) as his partner had signed the petition and he had been a member of the Parish Council when this item had been discussed. A personal non-prejudicial in agenda item 8 (Petition for 20mph speed limits on residential roads in Fishergate Ward) as Local Member.

Councillor Scott declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 9 (Manor School – Highway Improvement) as a Manor School Governor and in agenda item 12 (Petition seeking the addition of Chapel Alley, Fulford to the List of Streets Maintainable at the public expense) as a former Chair and member of the Parish Council. He also declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 6 (Response to Petition on Concessionary Travel Tokens) as he had signed the petition requesting an increase in the token allocation and in agenda item 8 (Petition for 20mph speed limits on residential roads in Fishergate Ward) as he was a local resident and lived near the roads mentioned in the report.

17. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Panel held on 2 June 2008 be approved and signed by the Chair and the Executive Members as a correct record.

18. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

Mr Urquhart spoke regarding agenda item 9 (Manor School – Highway Improvement). He confirmed that he lived at Field View one of two properties on Millfield Lane close to the school site. He stated that he had no objections to the school but to the associated traffic problems that it would generate. From the consultation he had ascertained that it was proposed to site a bus stop outside his property close to a dangerous busy junction used by hgv's. The raised walkway proposed would cause noise and vibration problems and the bus stop would cause access problems to his property. He commented that he did not feel that the bus stop was sited at the safest point on Millfield Lane as indicated by Officers.

Allan Hall spoke regarding agenda item 9 (Manor School – Highway Improvement). He confirmed that he lived on Boroughbridge Road and his objection related to safety issues with the siting of a cycle path adjacent to his property. He stated that the short stretch of cycle path proposed was not logical and that the path should be sited on the road not the path. He also referred to a lack of information from the Authority on the proposals.

Mr Hunter spoke regarding agenda item 9 (Manor School – Highway Improvement). He confirmed that he supported the previous speakers, he was a resident of Newlands Drive. He stated that he felt the increased traffic delay with the traffic lights would prevent residents accessing their properties and create a rat run to avoid them. He stated that residents and cyclists would encounter visibility problems with the cycle path being sited so close to properties.

Cllr Horton spoke regarding agenda item 9 (Manor School – Highway Improvement). He stated that there were six areas of concern, he agreed that this was a complicated scheme to which some minor amendments had been made. With reference to the cycle route on Beckfield Lane he stated that local residents had not been aware of the proposed amendments. He felt that a cycle lane adjacent to driveways was dangerous and should be removed from the scheme. In relation to the No 10 bus stop he supported amendment to the siting. He questioned the need for the cycle lane in Low Poppleton Lane, which he felt, was unnecessary. Finally he questioned what arrangements were in place in the event of a level crossing break down which would lead to properties and the school being hemmed in.

Judy Nicholson spoke regarding agenda item 12 (Petition seeking addition of Chapel Alley, Fulford to the Streets Maintainable at the public expense). She confirmed that Chapel Alley was a busy route used by many people

including children attending school. As the route was so busy she stated that it was important that the path was maintained.

Cllr Aspden spoke regarding agenda item 12 (Petition seeking addition of Chapel Alley, Fulford to the Streets Maintainable at the public expense). He confirmed that he supported the addition of the path to the list of streets maintainable at public expense. The addition of the path would ensure that it was cleaned and maintained he also stated that the path was to be resurfaced during the next financial year.

Anna Semlyen had to leave the meeting and Sonia Petty spoke on her behalf regarding agenda item 8 (Petition for 20mph speed limits in Fishergate Ward). She confirmed that residents supported the imposition of a 20mph speed limit and commented on the difference in the severity of crash injuries at lower speeds. If imposed objector's felt the reduced speed limit would cut congestion and pollution in the area. She stated that there had been a number of unreported minor accidents in the area and that children had to cross Fulford Road to reach the local play area.

Sonia Petty spoke regarding agenda item 8 (Petition for 20mph speed limits in Fishergate Ward). She commented that speed restrictions were not normally imposed until a major accident occurred. She referred to her young son who had been prevented from involvement in a serious accident ,involving a speeding car on Grange Street, by a taxi driver.

Dougie Skilbeck spoke regarding agenda item 10 (Vibration Survey Results for North Moor Road, Huntington). He felt that ground vibration was worse than airborne vibration for residents. He referred to the stress felt by residents following the constant vibrations which they also considered could cause damage to property. He urged the Panel not to ignore the distress and stress these problems were causing local residents and consider alternative measures.

Trudy Redhead spoke regarding agenda item 10 (Vibration Survey Results for North Moor Road, Huntington). She referred to the high vibration levels endured by residents in the vicinity of the speed cushions on North Moor Road. She indicated that residents felt that 3 hour monitoring periods were insufficient to access levels and that the constant vibration was taking a toll on family life. Residents were often awakened during the night with large vehicles clipping the edge of the cushions and she requested Members to examine alternative traffic calming measures.

It was reported that Jacqueline Anderson had registered to speak at the meeting regarding agenda item 13 (Six Monthly Review of Speeding Issues) in particular in relation to speeding issues in Layerthorpe on behalf of residents of Merchants Gate development and Hallfield Road but that she was unable to attend owing to illness.

Ashley Unwin spoke regarding agenda item 13 (Six Monthly Review of Speeding Issues). He confirmed that he had been a resident of Moorgate for 30 years and that this road was used as a rat run for vehicles to Hamilton Drive. He referred to the traffic island erected by the Authority at the Moorgate junction with Acomb Road, which had assisted in slowing

traffic at this point. Yellow lines had also been added at this junction but this had moved parked cars further down Moorgate. He stated that cars now parked outside his property, which caused visibility problems on his driveway, and that local residents felt this was now more dangerous as vehicles increased speed at this point.

19. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DIRECTORATE PLAN 2008 - 2011

Members received the Chief Executive's Directorate Service Plan for 2008/2011, which gave an overview of the department and the challenges that it faced. The Plan outlined a set of priorities for the Directorate together with key actions and performance indicators.

Officers reminded Members that a number of the key actions had not been met as these were part of the staff survey and were not carried out annually. In relation to health and safety and the key measures 'Total number of accidents reported/Number of RIDDOR accidents' marked as 'No target set' the target for 2008/09 would be maintained as '0'.

Members queried the "Risk Owners to be agreed" against the "Failure to implement Hungate 2010 project".

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Leader be advised to approve the Chief Executive's Directorate Plan.¹

Decision of the Executive Leader

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

REASON: To provide strategic direction for the Directorate and for the use of service managers and teams. Also to provide a reference for improving performance management within the Directorate.

Action Required

1. To implement the Directorate Plan.

GR

20. CITY STRATEGY CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2008/09 - CONSOLIDATED REPORT

Consideration was given to a report which consolidated the 2008/09 City Strategy Capital Programme to include the carryover schemes that were not completed in 2007/08 including adjustments to schemes and blocks to reflect individual under spends and overspends within the programme.

Members were presented with a number of amendments to the capital programme for approval, which were required to ensure that the schemes were deliverable within funding constraints whilst enabling the objectives of the approved Local Transport Plan (LTP) to be met.

Officers reported that if the proposed changes were accepted, the total value of the City Strategy Capital Programme for 2008/09 would be £9,405k. The LTP over programming would increase from £604k to £966k, which Officers considered to be a reasonable level at this stage of the year.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to approve

- (i) The carryover schemes and adjustments set out in Annexes 1 and 2 of the report; ¹.
- (ii) The increase to the 2008/09 City Strategy capital budget subject to the approval of the Executive. ².

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To manage the Capital Programme efficiently.

Action Required

- 1. To implement the carryovers and adjustments as detailed in the report. JB
- 2. To refer the increase to the capital budget to the Executive. JB

21. RESPONSE TO PETITION ON CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL TOKENS

Members considered a report, which had been prepared in response to a petition submitted by Cllr Simpson-Laing in April 2008, which requested that the travel token allocation be returned to £40 for the 2008/9 financial year.

The report outlined the recent history of travel token distribution in York and compared the current City of York Council arrangements to the provision in other areas of England. It was also confirmed that a number of authorities had decided to stop issuing Transport Tokens altogether with the introduction of free concessionary bus travel from 2006

Officers pointed out that the main disadvantage of the tokens was that they were not directed towards those people who really needed them. They confirmed that a review of Community Transport was also to be undertaken in parallel with the study of travel concessions, which it was hoped to report back on in the autumn.

Certain Members expressed disappointment with the recommendation not to issue additional tokens for 2008/09 but supported the proposed study for future years. It was confirmed that many people were unable to access local transport and that this impacted on their day to day lives. Members

also felt that abuse of the scheme should be examined together with targeting the allocation to those in need.

Members then considered the following options:

Option A - A report to go before the Executive to consider the issuing of an additional £20 worth of tokens to all token holders and remind national bus pass holders that they are entitled to surrender their pass in exchange for tokens if they so wish. The tokens entitlement diminishes as the year progresses (by £5 per quarter based on a £20 maximum annual distribution).

Option B - Do not issue any additional tokens for 2008/09 and commission a strategic study for presentation to the Executive to consider qualification and cost criteria for 2009/10.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to adopt Option B, not to issue any additional tokens for 2008/09 and commission a strategic study for presentation to the Executive to consider qualification and cost criteria for 2009/10. ¹.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: This will ensure that Council reflects on the major changes that have occurred in the past year with the launch of the national bus pass.

Action Required

1. That the proposed study be commissioned for presentation to the Executive.

JB

22. DEIGHTON (MAIN STREET)/A19 (SELBY ROAD) JUNCTION - IMPROVEMENT OPTIONS

This report examined options for improving road safety at the Main Street Deighton / A19 junction and assessed the potential for a scheme to be funded from the Local Transport Plan Capital Programme. The report concluded that the cost of providing a pedestrian refuge and right turn lane was too high for the benefits it would provide and recommended that the scheme was not re-classified.

Officer's confirmed that the very low number of current bus users meant a pedestrian refuge scheme on it's own would offer low value for money and, in addition to this, the potential for a shift towards increased bus usage was limited due to Deighton's low population. Accident data over the last three years suggested that there were no issues with vehicles turning right into the village which meant that there appeared to be no immediate requirement for a right turn lane into Deighton.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report;
- (ii) Agree not to include a scheme for junction improvements at Deighton in the capital programme for 2008/09 but to consider a scheme for all future programmes.¹

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: That it would require displacement of other schemes from the capital programme that appear to offer greater value for money and the issue of whether a right-turn lane into the village will significantly improve safety at the junction, given that accident data suggests turning right out of the village is more likely to result in a collision.

Action Required

1. To reconsider this scheme when producing future programmes.

JB

23. PETITION FOR 20MPH SPEED LIMITS ON RESIDENTIAL ROADS IN FISHERGATE WARD

Consideration was given to a report that advised Members of the receipt of a petition for a 20mph speed limit to be introduced on seven roads in the Fishergate Ward on a similar basis to the scheme implemented in Portsmouth.

The report looked at the background to the Portsmouth scheme, casualties in York and the options for delivering a similar scheme in York. The report concluded that it would be possible to implement a 20mph speed limit scheme in Fishergate but such a scheme would be contrary to the current data led speed management policy which targeted resources at reducing casualties. The report recommended that a trial site should be identified for a 20mph speed limit area to identify whether such a scheme was appropriate and beneficial within York and that the current speed management plan continued to be implemented to target casualty reduction until such time as the outcome of the trial and the Portsmouth scheme were known.

Officers confirmed that two speed surveys had been carried out in 2003 in Grange Street and Rosedale Street and the results had shown that both roads average speed was 22mph. They stated that there were other areas of the city with greater problems and that the roads in the Fishergate Ward were closed streets mainly used by residents. It was also reported that the trials in Portsmouth had recently commenced and Officers were awaiting further information on the results, which would

be reported back in March 2009. It was felt that Portsmouth had used a blanket approach to educate residents and they were doubtful that this scheme could be transferred to York.

Members stated that a strategic approach was required and that a trial scheme needed to be able to be replicated elsewhere in the city.

Other Members stated that there was a need to provide a safe environment for residents and this was a local issue that needed addressing rather than waiting until March for the results of the Portsmouth scheme. They pointed out that this would not be the only trial scheme that there would be others on different types of roads in other areas of the city.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option one – The Council introduce a 20mph scheme addressing the roads that are the subject of the petition.

Option two – The Council introduce a 20mph limit on residential roads across the city on a similar basis to the Portsmouth city council model. This could be based on a review of the speed management plan map that was developed in 1997 to help develop a framework for implementing traffic measures on different road categories. The current categories are: traffic routes, where no vertical traffic calming measures are implemented; mixed routes, where targeted traffic measures could be introduced at specific locations and residential routes, where if it was appropriate vertical traffic calming measures could be introduced. A citywide scheme would ensure consistency of dealing with speed issues in residential areas and requests for speed reduction measures.

Option three – The Council continues to consider speed issues as part of its existing speed management plan process where priority is given as set out in the table below and reviews the policy when the outcomes of the Portsmouth scheme are made available. Under the current policy measures required for category 1 and 2 take priority for funding within the capital programme.

Category	Speed	Casualties	Priority	Treatment
1	High	High	Very High	Speed Management measures
2	Low	High	High	Casualty Reduction Measures
3	High	Low	Medium	Speed Management Measures
4	Low	Low	Low	None

Option Four – That officers identify a suitable location to conduct a 20mph speed limit trial to run in parallel with the Portsmouth scheme. This would enable the Council to identify how transferable any acknowledged benefits of the Portsmouth scheme would be to York.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Implement a 20mph zone on Grange Street, Grange Garth, Rosedale Street, Levisham Street, Hartoft Street, Farndale Street and Lastingham Terrace in Fishergate;¹.
- (ii) Request Officers to undertake the necessary work to trial this scheme and address the Portsmouth issues;¹.
- (ii) Continue to address speed management issues under the current policy.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To ensure that speed issues are addressed through a data led process that targets LTP resources at casualty reduction but considers whether 20mph limits are appropriate and beneficial within York.

Action Required

1. That work be undertaken to trial this scheme in the streets listed.

JB

24. MANOR SCHOOL - HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Members considered a report which summarised the outcome of consultation on a package of highway improvements linked to the relocation of Manor School to a new site on Millfield Lane. Issues arising were discussed, and possible amendments to the proposals were considered. Approval of a final scheme layout was sought, along with authorisation to advertise some related traffic regulation orders.

Members were reminded that Manor School was set to open early next year and as part of the planning conditions to be implemented, prior to opening, several highway improvements were required to ensure the new school had safe and sustainable transport links. The planning conditions required

- 20mph School Safety Zone on Millfield Lane to enhance road safety around the new school frontage.
- Lowering bollard to facilitate bus and emergency vehicle access through the existing Low Poppleton Lane road closure.

- Widening the existing segregated pedestrian/cycle path along Millfield Lane.
- Widening the existing footway on the west side of Low Poppleton Lane to provide more space for pedestrians.
- Provision of improved crossing facilities on Boroughbridge Road and Beckfield Lane to serve the main pedestrian and cyclist movements at the junction.
- Widening the existing footway along Beckfield Lane, for a distance of at least 70m back from Boroughbridge Road, to provide an off-road segregated cycle path.

Officers circulated a map of the Beckfield Lane junction showing further amendments that had been made following consultation which included:

- Realigning the footpath to retain a greater quantity of verge;
- Extending the right hand turn lane and reducing road widening;
- Localised road widening to reduce land required on the opposite side of the road;
- Moving the traffic signals closer to Low Poppleton Lane;

Officers also reported receipt of additional representations received since the report had been prepared raising further objections to the scheme. Members requested clarification and expressed concern in relation to a number of points including:

- On /off road provision for cyclists;
- Siting of the bus stop on Millfield Lane;
- Vehicle/cycle conflict and safety adjacent to driveways;
- Cyclists heading north on Beckfield Lane needing to cross to access the off road cycle path;
- Wish to encourage as many children as possible to walk/cycle to school;
- What measures could be put in place to prevent Newlands Drive becoming a rat run;
- Problems on Millfield Lane arising from level crossing failure.

Consideration was given to the following options:

Option 1 - approve the highway improvement scheme as consulted on with no changes (i.e. as per the plans in Annexes C to G).

Option 2 - approve the highway improvement scheme as consulted on with the amendments set out in Annexes J and K, plus any further changes Members would like to see made.

Members also thanked Officers and expressed their appreciation for the work undertaken in connection with this scheme at a difficult junction but they felt that additional work was required to address some of the issues raised by residents and Members.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to defer consideration of the highway improvements and Road Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the planning approval for the new Manor School to

the Committees next meeting on 8 September 2008 to allow Officers to re-examine the proposals, in particular:

- the siting of the proposed bus stop;
- the siting of the cycle route along Low Poppleton Lane and Beckfield Lane. ¹.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To respond to issues and concerns raised through consultation on the detailed scheme plans to deliver the required highway improvements as conditioned within the planning approval for the new Manor School.

Action Required

1. Officers to re-examine this scheme in light of comments made and report back to the next meeting.

JB

25. VIBRATION SURVEY RESULTS FOR NORTH MOOR ROAD (WITHIN HUNTINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL SAFETY ZONE)

Members considered a report, which advised them, of the results of vibration monitoring surveys conducted inside residents' properties close to the speed cushions on North Moor Road, within the existing 20mph School Safety Zone. Members were asked to consider options on the way forward.

The 20mph School Safety Zone with traffic calming measures has been in place outside Huntington Primary School since 2002 and residents had first raised concern about vibration levels in the summer of 2004. Additional road markings and signs had been provided in early 2005 and no further complains had been received concerning vibration levels until September 2007. Residents had indicated that vibration levels were much worse and a petition had been presented to the EMAP. Officers had been instructed to undertake vibration monitoring surveys and this had been carried out at two properties closest to the speed cushions. It was reported that the surveys had shown that vibration dose value was very low at both properties.

Members questioned details of the vibration monitoring methods and the possible effects of moving the cushions or the speed table.

Officers explained that the monitoring equipment calculated vdv for a 3 hour period and that these results were then used to calculate results for a 16 hour period. they agreed that there was vibration but not an unacceptable level.

Member then considered the following options:

Option One – make no changes to the existing School Safety Zone;

Option Two – remove the School Safety Zone or make alterations to the traffic calming measures in an attempt to reduce the current traffic vibration levels.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to approve Option One, to make no changes to the existing School Safety Zone on North Moor Road, Huntington and authorise Officers to formally notify the residents of the decision taken. ¹.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: The levels of vibration recorded do not warrant making any changes to the existing layout. Making no changes to the existing School Safety Zone means that an effective form of traffic calming can be retained outside the primary school in order to maintain low vehicle speeds and control traffic speeds on the approach to the speed table crossing point, thereby maintaining a safer environment for school children and village residents.

Action Required

1. Officers to contact local residents to inform them of the decision taken.

JB

26. KNAPTON TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY REVIEW

Consideration was given to a report, which advised Members of the outcome of a study into traffic and road safety issues in Knapton. The report concluded that there were no significant problems to be addressed, and recommended that no further action be taken.

Members were reminded that two petitions had been received from residents of Knapton, one requesting the closure of Main Street with its junction with the A1237 and the other objecting to this proposal. Following consultation it had been clear that many residents had concerns about traffic levels and speeds through the village. Members had requested Officers to prepare a technical appraisal to assess the scale of the problems and possible measures to tackle these. Halcrow had been commissioned to carry out the traffic study.

It was confirmed that the technical assessment carried out by Halcrow had found that there were no significant traffic or road safety issues in Knapton.

Consideration was given to the following options:

Option One - Do nothing (as recommended by Halcrow).

Option Two - To support some of the possible actions put forward in the Halcrow report, and seek the necessary funding for them to be taken forward.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to accept Option One to maintain the existing highway arrangement in Knapton as the best way forward. ¹.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To respond to the findings of the technical assessment of traffic and road safety issues in Knapton, and to take account of feedback from the Ward and Parish Councillors.

Action Required

1. No changes to be made to existing highway arrangements at Knapton.

JB

27. PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY - PETITION SEEKING THE ADDITION OF CHAPEL ALLEY, FULFORD TO THE LIST OF STREETS MAINTAINABLE AT THE PUBLIC EXPENSE

Consideration was given to a report, which followed up a request made the Panel in January 2008 to identify the cost to the Council of adding Chapel Alley, Fulford to the List of Streets Maintainable at the public expense (LoS).

Officers updated that the figure included for the manufacture and installation of a cycle barrier was now £900 and not £2,600 as stated in paragraph 11 of the report.

Members were reminded that both the proposed options would have the same financial implications for the Councils, as the highway authority would ultimately become liable for the maintenance of the surface of Chapel Alley.

Consideration was given to the following:

Option A – Do not accept the presented costing of the scheme, but continue to progress the Definitive Map Modification Order application method, to add the path to the Definitive Map, as and when resources allow.

Option B – Accept the presented costing of the scheme and add the path to the List of Streets Maintainable at the public expense (LoS) with immediate effect.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to select Option B and authorise the addition of Chapel Alley to the List of Streets Maintainable at the public expense (LoS) with immediate effect.
1.

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: In order that Chapel Alley may be maintained to a standard commensurate with its use and to ensure that the works are carried out on a needs and 'worst-first' basis.

Action Required

1. That Chapel Alley be added to the List of Streets Maintainable at the public expense with immediate effect. JB

28. SIX MONTHLY REVIEW OF SPEEDING ISSUES

This report advised Members of the locations where concerns about traffic speeds had been raised, and provided an update on progress towards assessing these against the agreed prioritisation framework.

Based on this assessment process, a number of priority sites had been identified and discussed, leading to the development of proposals for possible future speed management actions.

The report also gave an over view of the proposed Speed Strategy, which was being created in collaboration with the Safer York Partners together with a Community Speed Matrix Programme.

Officers updated that two emails had been received since the report had been published, one from a resident of Moorgate stating that the width of the road encouraged drivers to go over the 30mph speed limit and he requested that the road should be made a 20mph zone. The second was from a resident of Millfield Lane who referred to the long straight road to Poppleton, which was used by some drivers travelling at speeds in excess of 70mph. He suggested that light up warning signs would be a possible solution to this problem.

Members expressed their support for the work undertaken and for the partnership working with Safer York Partnership, the North Yorkshire Police and the North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue to tackle these issues.

Members considered the following proposals:

Proposal A - provides a continuation of the Speed Management Review System put in place in October 2006, and ensures that the greatest rate of return from funding streams is achieved.

Proposal B - ensures that, although not speed related the issues around junctions that the process has highlighted are progressed through the appropriate channels.

Proposal C - provides partnership working to work towards a speeding strategy that should include a proactive approach as well as the reactive approach that already exists through the Speed Management Review process. This should ensure ownership of the issues, across the board at all levels. It also gives a co-ordinated way forward for implementing any further education, publicity or enforcement, which should support the Speed Management Review Process.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Note the outcome of the junction/speeding issue assessments carried out by Officers, and give in principle support to an appropriate funding allocation being made within the 2008/09 and 2009/10 Transport Capital Programme for speed management proposals.¹
- (ii) Give support to the proposal to create a Speed Strategy to ensure speed issues are considered in a proactive as well as reactive and structured way;²
- (iii) Note the feasibility study being undertaken by the 95 Alive partnership and understand that should this recommend the implementation of speed cameras within York and North Yorkshire funding will have to be found for implementation and continuing running costs.³

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: By implementing a robust programme of speed management measures to reduce excessive speeding, which targets the minority of drivers whose driving behaviour poses the greatest risk to others, overall safety can be improved and an increase in active transport use achieved.

Action Required

1. Note the in principle support for funding for speed management proposals. JB
2. Note support for creating a Speed Management Strategy. JB
3. Note that if recommendation received to implement speed cameras in York and North Yorkshire that funding will have to be found. JB

29. YORK - HARROGATE - LEEDS LINE TRAM-TRAIN FEASIBILITY UPDATE

Members received a report, which provided an update on work undertaken to assess the feasibility of proposals to introduce a tram-train service in the Leeds City Region. This was with particular reference to the operation of such a service on the York to Harrogate to Leeds line, including options considered for developing tram-train within the York area and its potential impacts. In addition it detailed the national trial of tram-train technology that had recently been announced.

It was reported that the next steps included:

- Obtaining the perspectives of key stakeholders;
- Consider the process for developing tram-train proposals for the Leeds City Region;
- Hold discussions with Northern Rail, Network Rail and DfT Rail to establish the extent to which Metro are involved in the trial;
- Lobby key industry player for the early introduction of tram-train in the Leeds City Region.

Members welcomed the report and its recommendations. They requested the addition of mention of the policy adopted at Council on 30 June 2008 in the advise. This had requested Officers to report back on proposals to provide a rail service between York Railway Station and Strensall and registered support in principle for the future use of light railway/tram train type systems in the City of York area.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to:

- (i) Note this report including, at Annex A, the brief history of endeavours to re-open local rail stations in the York area;
- (ii) Endorse the approach to the further development of tram-train schemes as set out in paragraphs 31 – 34, and
- (iii) Support the development of future light railway/tram train systems for the City of York, in line with the policy adopted at Council on 30 June 2008.¹

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: This will ensure that the council remains fully aware of proposals for improving local rail services on certain lines within the Leeds City Region, utilising either existing or new rail technology, and enable the council to continue to pursue the reopening of stations in the York area.

Action Required

1. Note support given for the development of future light railway/tram train systems for the City of York.

JB

30. TOWARDS A HERITAGE STRATEGY FOR YORK

Consideration was given to a report, which recommended the production of a Heritage Strategy for York. It suggested:

- an overall aim for the Strategy
- a definition of Heritage in York
- a framework and timetable for the production of the strategy

As heritage was a cross-directorate subject the report was also to be considered by the Executive Member for Leisure and Culture.

Officers pointed out that the City Council had a strong well developed policy framework for the historic environment however the city lacked a Heritage Strategy document. Such a document would provide a strategic overview for the city's heritage. Officers also referred to the Councils appointment of a Heritage Champion and the steps that had been taken towards giving York the status of a UNESCO World Heritage site.

Members then considered the following options:

Option 1 - Do not adopt a Heritage Strategy;

Option 2 - Work with the heritage community through a series of workshops in order to produce recommendations, which, after a review process, can be incorporated into a consultation draft Heritage Strategy.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member for City Strategy be advised to approve the approach set out in Option 2 to produce a draft Heritage Strategy for the City.¹

Decision of the Executive Member for City Strategy

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

REASON: To involve all stakeholders in the production of a draft heritage strategy for the city.

Action Required

1. To produce a draft Heritage Strategy for the City on the lines outlined in the report.

JB

Cllr Waller, Executive Leader

Cllr S F Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 7.20 pm].