
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport and Planning
Date	12 July 2018
Present	Councillor Dew (Executive Member for Transport and Planning) and Councillor Waller (Executive Member for Environment and Deputy Leader)
In Attendance	Councillors Carr, D'Agorne and Warters

5. Declarations of Interest

The Executive Members were 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 that they might have in respect of the business on the agenda. They confirmed they had none.

6. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session of the Executive Member for Transport and Planning held on 14 June 2018 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

7. Public Participation

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

Peter Sheaf spoke on behalf of the York Cycle Campaign in relation to agenda item 4 (A Bike Share Scheme for York). He advised that there was strong support from the York Cycle Campaign for the introduction of a Bike Share Scheme in York, with a preference for a docked scheme over a dockless one, due to concerns over bikes being dumped and blocking streets. He asked that the scheme be introduced in as flexible a way as possible, with flexible payment options and suitable and

conveniently located bikes. He offered to work with the council on the introduction of the scheme.

Cllr D'Agorne spoke in relation to agenda item 4 (*A Bike Share Scheme for York*) stating that the introduction of the scheme would promote the practical benefits of cycling but expressed the view that finding suitable locations for bikes as part of a dockless scheme may be more difficult to manage and needed to be looked at carefully. In relation to agenda item 9 (*Consideration of results from the consultation in Rosedale Street and surrounding areas following petitions received requesting Residents' Priority Parking*) he gave his general support for the officer recommendation. He advised that the high cost of permits had put people off from neighbouring streets but due to the knock on effect asked that the decision included a fast track review and a second ballot for the excluded streets 6 months after implementation if they decided they needed a scheme. With regard to the yellow lines on Rosedale Street opposite the end of Grange Garth he suggested there was space for marked parking bay in addition to what was already identified as part of proposals. If provision was agreed for weekdays only, he suggested this be from 8am to take account of refuse collections.

Cllr A Waller spoke in relation to agenda item 5 (Street Lighting Policy Update). He circulated a photograph of Westfield Ward which showed examples of new street lights which have been positioned within tree canopies or in close proximity to trees which raised legacy issues as it would be some years before these were due to be replaced. He asked the Executive Member to ensure the system for replacing lights was flexible with regard to where new columns were located. He also advised that there was a problem with the system for reporting faulty lights and asked officers to look into this.

Cllr M Warters also spoke in relation to the Street Lighting Policy Update. He expressed concern that the revised policy would remove Ward Councillors, Parish Councillors and residents ability to have any say in the number, siting, aesthetics and quality of street lighting in their area. He also raised concern that the 2014 street scape guidance would be lost and that the proposed revised policy sought to impost 6m high columns outside city's historic core with no regard to

aesthetics and the impact on imposing these on streets of bungalows and terraced streets.

Darryl Smalley addressed the Executive Member, on behalf of local residents, in relation to agenda item 6 (*Petition requesting that the Council adopt streets on a Persimmon Homes estate, including Arlington Road and Tamworth Road*). He commended officers on the report and voiced residents support for the adoption of the roads on the estate. He expressed his thanks on behalf of local residents for the hard work which had been done to date and asked if an adoption date could be given.

Mark Grant, of Portland Consulting Engineers, spoke in relation to agenda item 7 (*Lysander Close: Proposed Amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order*) on behalf of his client, Inchape Retail who would operate the car dealership being constructed on Lysander Close. He drew the Executive Member's attention to a photograph which showed the extent of parking on the street which prevented access to other industrial units as well as theirs and asked that parking restrictions be extended to the end of Lysander Close as detailed in the report.

Catherine Laing, a local resident, spoke with reference to agenda item 9 (*Consideration of results from the consultation in Rosedale Street and surrounding area following petitions received requesting Residents' Priority Parking*) in relation to Respark in Hartoft Street. She expressed her support for residents parking which she felt would reduce the amount of traffic in the area, making it safer for everyone and improving air quality. She explained that residents feelings towards Respark were mixed due to the high cost of permits.

Councillor D Carr, spoke with regard to agenda item 11 (*Pedestrian Crossings – Review of Requests*). He advised that the areas marked as crossings on the map were not currently perceived as such, due to lack of signage and road markings. He also expressed concern that the proposed timber bollards could easily be damaged by brewery and food delivery vehicles and taxis dropping off and manoeuvring outside the pub as this had happened in other locations. He asked officers to consider amending the proposed bollard material to something which was more robust.

8. A Bike-share Scheme for York

The Executive Member for Transport and Planning and the Executive Member for Environment considered a report which proposed the introduction of a 'Bike Share' scheme for York. The report updated Members on changes which had occurred in the bike share sector over the last two years and reflected on how the industry had developed across the UK. It highlighted how such a scheme might be introduced in York and asked the Executive Members to give their support for the appointment of an industry partner who would deliver a bike share scheme which met the standards required by the Council and its key partners.

Officers advised that on 3 July they had attended the York Walk and Cycle Forum to give a brief presentation and to address questions arising. Attendees had included representatives from the York Cycle Campaign, York Blind and Partially Sighted Society and York Civic Trust. Attendees had been asked to direct any further comments to officers for them to consider incorporation into the tender documents subject to the decision made at this meeting.

Officers informed the Executive Members that a bike share scheme should be targeting modal shift, dissuading short journeys by car. To achieve modal shift, some of the bike hubs should be located in the York district centres such as Tang Hall, South Bank and Acomb to better enable trips for shopping, leisure, personal business and to work. Furthermore the location of any dock less bike parking should be clear in so that people with disabilities, including the blind and partially sighted community were not impeded.

Officers provided an industry verbal update in order that the two Executive Members were aware of developments in London and elsewhere in the country including Leeds. They acknowledged York Cycle Campaign's preference for a docked scheme but advised that this was not the recommend option due to issues around finance and space.

The Executive Member for Environment noted that there had been an interesting discussion from a wide range of groups at the York Cycle Forum Meeting and comments which had been made, noting concerns from the Blind and Partially Sighted Society that bikes left in unfamiliar positions would pose a

danger to those with sight impairments. He noted the pressure to park bikes in the city centre and stated that racks which had previously been removed were in the process of being put back into the city centre. He stressed the need to engage with a wide range of people before the contract was agreed and asked that the scheme to be brought back to the Executive Members before it was implemented. He asked that safeguards be included to prevent risk of harm to public safety or the environment.

The Executive Member acknowledged that although the dockless system was not favoured by York Cycle Campaign, it was the option recommended by officers for the reasons given in the report and confirmed at the meeting.

Resolved: That the Executive Member for Transport and Planning, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment, approve Option B as follows:

- (i) Agree to the undertaking of a procurement exercise to secure a dock-less bike share scheme for York for an initial one year period. The scheme must not require ongoing public sector revenue to ensure its continued operation;
- (ii) Delegate authority to officers to agree the detailed specification of the scheme with the following key York partners (LNER, University of York, York NHS Trust and York St John University) and with the preferred Scheme provider and,
- (iii) (a) Agree to undertake further consultation and, as appropriate, incorporate representation in the interview stage of the procurement from the following groups: Make it York, The York Bid, York Walk and Cycle Forum, and The York Cycle Campaign and,

(b) In preparation of the tender documents, seek views from the following groups:
 - groups representing people with mobility impairments (such as the

York Blind and Partially Sighted Society)

- representatives from bike retailers
- representatives from Como UK (the body representing much of the bike share industry)
- parties implementing counter-terrorism measures

- (iv) Agree to build in safeguards into the scheme which would allow the scheme to be withdrawn in the case of evidence or harm to public safety or to the environment.
- (v) Agree that the proposed scheme is brought back to the Executive Member for final approval before implementation.

9. Street Lighting Policy Update

The Executive Member considered a report which proposed updates to the Street Lighting Policy to reflect changes identified as part of a recent review. The key changes were to strengthen the policy about sensitive areas of the city and differentiate between the historic core and conservation areas, and to improve the policy with regards to managing the risk between trees and lamp columns. The review had also highlighted that the Street Lighting Policy and the Streetscape Strategy and Guidance did not give consistent advice and that the Streetscape Strategy and Guidance needed updating and should be confirmed as guidance only.

The Head of Highways and Fleet and the Assistant Director, Transport, Highways and Environment were in attendance at the meeting. In response to concerns raised during public participation officers confirmed that if moving a lighting column from the front to the back of the pavement would mean it was impeded by trees, this would not be done. In relation to consulting with Ward Members, officers noted that a balance needed to be struck – if one lighting column needed replacing, it would be replaced to match with the surroundings as stated in the policy, without consultation, however if lighting needed to be replaced on a whole street, they would be happy to consult with the relevant ward councillors.

The Executive Member expressed the view that, due to the number of comments which had been received in relation to the policy, the updated policy should be referred to scrutiny so that scrutiny members had the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes before bringing it back to the Executive Member for approval. He noted that the Streetscape Strategy and Guidance also needed updating and that this could go ahead as planned.

Resolved: (i) That the redrafted Street Lighting Policy be referred to the relevant scrutiny committee for their consideration prior to coming back to the Executive Member for approval.

(ii) That a review of the Streetscape Strategy and Guidance take place as planned and that officers be advised to treat the Streetscape Strategy and Guidance as guidance only.

Reason: To ensure a proportionate and consistent approach to the management of street lighting across the city.

10. Petition requesting that the Council adopt streets on a Persimmon Homes estate, including Arlington Road and Tamworth Road

The Executive Member considered a report which provided an update on progress towards the adoption of streets on a Persimmon Homes estate including Arlington Road and Tamworth Road in response to a petition received.

Officers advised that they had agreed with Persimmon what repairs and updates were needed to bring the streets up to adoptable standard and remedial works to the roads/footpaths had been completed as well as landscaping work. Work to the sewerage system had also been addressed. The only remaining issue was that of highway drainage. Road gullies had been cleaned out and found to be largely acceptable but with a few defects and officers were currently liaising with Persimmon to determine whether they would remedy these themselves or agree a sum for the council to rectify them. In terms of a timeframe, officers were unable to give exact date but advised that the adoption should be concluded later in the summer.

Resolved:

- (i) That the recent progress on progressing towards adoption of the streets (as shown in Annex B to the report) be noted.
- (ii) That the verbal update on progress given provided at the meeting be noted.
- (iii) That upon completion of the adoption of the streets (as per the plan annexed to the report), officers will notify the lead petitioner, the ward councillors and Executive Member.

Reason:

- (i) This will respond to residents request to adopt the streets concerned.
- (ii) To provide a comprehensive and up to the minute picture and provide assurances as to the timeline for adoption.
- (iii) To confirm that the adoption has been completed.

11. Lysander Close: Proposed Amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order

The Executive Member considered a report which sought approval to advertise waiting restrictions on Lysander Close. He noted that authorisation had recently been given for restrictions to be implemented on part of the access route on Lysander close and that the remaining part of unrestricted access suffered from obstructive parking during the working week at all times and this could worsen after implementation of the new restrictions. He acknowledged the developer's request to extend the 'no waiting at any time restrictions' (double yellow lines) to cover the remaining carriageway to keep the footway and access to the new dealership for the larger transporter vehicles unobstructed.

Officers advised that, due to the current state of the road, the agreed restrictions (double yellow lines) had not yet been implemented and that, if no objections were received to the

proposal to extend the restrictions, the restrictions could be implemented on the whole road at the same time.

Resolved: (i) That Option 1 be approved: to advertise a proposal to amend the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order to introduced waiting restrictions on Lysander Close as outlined in Annex A to the report.

(ii) That authority be given to officers to implement as advertised if no objections are received.

Reason: To remove obstructive parking for access to business outlets and footway parking.

12. Turner Close & Huntington Road: Proposed Amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order - Consideration of objections received

The Executive Member considered a report which asked him to consider the representations received to the recently advertised waiting restrictions on Turner Close and Huntington Road.

Officers advised the Executive Member that a representative of Vets 4 Pets had registered to speak at the meeting under the public participation scheme but had been unable to attend. They drew the Executive Member's attention to their objection which was outlined in the report and confirmed that although it had been proposed to shorten the length of waiting restrictions at the vehicle access points on the western side of Turner Close to provide additional parking and to implement a reduced length of restrictions on Huntington Road, they still objected to the scheme.

The Executive Member acknowledged that officers had listened to residents' concerns and made necessary amendments to the proposals and were recommending implementing a shortened length of waiting restrictions on both Turner Close and Huntington Road.

Resolved: That Option 1 be approved, to advertise a proposal to amend the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order to:

- (i) Implement as advertised with a reduced length of waiting restrictions on the west side of Turner Close as outlined in Annex B to the report
- (ii) Implement a shorter length of waiting restrictions on Huntington Road as outlined in Annex B

Reason: To remove obstructive parking and improve sight lines whilst taking into consideration the objections received during the consultation process

13. Consideration of results from the consultation in Rosedale Street and surrounding area following petitions received requesting Residents' Priority Parking

The Executive Member considered a report which presented the results of the consultation undertaken in April for Rosedale Street and the surrounding area to determine what action was appropriate following petitions received requesting Residents Priority Parking.

He acknowledged the views of residents who had submitted written representations and the local resident and Ward Member who had spoken earlier in the meeting in relation to this item under public participation.

The Executive Member acknowledged that the officer recommendation was in line with the majority of residents' opinions. Officers advised that, in response to a request from residents, two additional parking spaces could be provided on Rosedale Street. The Executive Member confirmed he was happy with this as long as it did not compromise access for refuse collection vehicles.

Resolved: (i) That approval be given to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the R20 Residents' Priority Parking Area to operate 24 hours, 7 days a week in Rosedale Street, Grange Garth and to include 154 Fulford Road within the R20 property Boundary. Officers to amend the recommended option to provide additional space for 2 vehicles on Rosedale Street

as long as this does not compromise access for larger vehicles (refuse wagons).

(i) That no further action to be taken for Farndale Street, Hartoft Street, Lastingham Terrace and Levisham Street. Officers are authorised to re-consult in this area if further representations are received within 18 months from the implementation of a scheme on the neighbouring streets. This consultation to take place in priority to other areas on the current waiting list.

Reason: To progress the majority views of the residents consulted

14. Directorate of Economy & Place Transport Capital Programme - 2018/19 Consolidated Report

The Executive Member considered a report which identified the proposed changes to the 2018-19 Economy and Place Transport Capital Programme to take account of carryover funding and schemes from 2017-18, and new funding available for transport schemes. The report also provided details of the 2017-18 Economy and Place Transport Capital Programme Outturn.

Resolved: (i) That the carryover schemes and adjustments set out in the report and annexes be approved.

(ii) That the increase to the 2018/19 Economy & Place Transport Capital Programme, following the approval of the Corporate Capital Programme Outturn report by Executive in June 2018, be noted.

Reason: To implement the council's transport strategy identified in York's third Local Transport Plan and the Council Priorities, and deliver schemes identified in the council's Transport Programme.

15. Pedestrian Crossings - Review of Requests

The Executive Member considered a report which sought his approval to implement proposals to improve pedestrian crossing

facilities at various locations throughout York. The report included a summary of the objections raised against some of the schemes (including a petition for Wetherby Road)

The Acting Transport Projects Manager was in attendance at the meeting and took the Executive Member through the proposed schemes listed in Annex C to the report and responded to any questions.

In response to the comments raised by the Ward Councillor for Copmanthorpe under public participation about the bollards proposed for Main Street Copmanthorpe, officers explained that they had proposed timber bollards for the crossing as these were considered to be more sympathetic to the local environment, however more robust bollards could be used instead and they agreed to consult Copmanthorpe Ward and Parish Councillors with regard to using steel ones if this was feasible.

In relation to the petition submitted raising concerns over the bus stop being located outside the Sun Inn on Acomb Green, officers advised that the only service which would use the stop would be the infrequent Wetherby/Rufforth service which would drop off bus users at the stop.

Resolved: That the following proposed schemes, as shown in Annex C to the report, be approved for implementation.

- (i) Heworth Green
- (ii) Huntington Road
- (iii) Main Street, Copmanthorpe
- (iv) New Lane, Huntington
- (v) University Road, Heslington
- (vi) Wetherby Road, Acomb Green

Reason: The proposals serve to provide much needed improvements to crossing facilities at various locations within York, where requests for improvement had been made.

Cllr P Dew, Executive Member for Transport and Planning
[The meeting started at 2.00pm and finished at 3.20 pm].