

---

**Decision Session –  
Cabinet Member for City Strategy**

1 December 2011

Report of the Director of City Strategy

**Selby Road Double White Line Petition**

**Summary**

1. This report brings to the attention of the Cabinet Member for City Strategy a petition from the residents of Selby Road supporting Cllr Aspden's request for a double white line system adjacent to the bus lane between the A64 and Naburn Lane.

**Recommendations**

2. That the Cabinet Member notes the concern raised in the petition and takes no further action with regards to the installation of a double white line scheme and recommends the issue be taken to the Ward Committee for consideration to fund an island if feasible.

Reason:

Because the location does not meet the very strict visibility criteria set out in the regulations governing the use of signs and lines and there is no budget set aside for any physical highway works in this location.

**Background**

3. Councillor Aspden collected a 25 signature petition (see Annex A for front sheet) from the residents of 12 properties on Selby Road seeking the implementation of a double white line system to prevent overtaking in the vicinity of the bus lane and the residential properties between the A64 and Naburn Lane.
4. At present there is a wide central hatched area between the two opposing lanes on the A19 Selby Road (see Annex B). These markings indicate an area of the carriageway that a driver should avoid entering unless it is safe to do so. Hence, local residents are able to pull into the hatched area when entering their property from the opposite side of the carriageway without holding up through traffic.

5. The use of double white lines is very strictly regulated by the Department for Transport regulations and the advice is they should not be used except where they are clearly justified by the criteria (which is primarily based around the forward visibility depending on the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of traffic) and that they should not be used in built up areas because of the associated prevention on vehicles stopping. Hence, the lines are mainly confined to bends and the crests of hills in rural situations (though we do have them on a number of railway bridges in the City).
6. The length of A19 Selby Road under consideration does not meet the criteria for double white lines; hence the use of a central hatched area is the correct approach to treating the area with regards to a white lining solution. However this issue has been raised previously and consideration was given to installing a central island at a key location to physically prevent overtaking. Although space is tight there are a couple of potential sites for an island, but there are no funds set aside for this work to be progressed through design, consultation and construction.
7. A possible source of funding for additional works may be available through the ward committee process if local residents decide this is something they would be prepared to support. However, it is also worth bearing in mind the likely large scale of works associated with the Germany Beck development a little further towards the city that will lead to this section of the road network changing in the future. This may provide a means to identify / fund improvements.

### **Consultation**

8. Any works as a consequence of a budget being allocated to this request would be taken through a consultation process of some description with the local residents most directly affected.

### **Options**

9. The options available are:
  - A. To note the petition and take no further action at this time other than to suggest the issue be taken to the Ward Committee for consideration to fund an island. This is the recommended option.
  - B. To seek funding from the capital projects budget. This is not the recommended option because there are already more schemes than the budget can progress.

### **Council Plan**

10. Considering this matter does not impact on the council plan.

## Implications

11.

<b>Legal</b>	There are no legal implications.
<b>Financial</b>	As highlighted in paragraph 7, there is no budget at present for works to be carried out at present.
<b>Human Resources</b>	There are no HR implications
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	There are no Crime and Disorder implications
<b>Sustainability</b>	There are no sustainability implications
<b>Equalities</b>	There are no equalities implications
<b>Property</b>	There are no property implications

## Risk Management

12. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

### Contact

#### Details:

#### Author

Alistair Briggs  
Traffic Network Manager  
Tel No. (01904) 551368

#### Chief Officer Responsible for the Report

Richard Wood  
Assistant Director City Strategy

Report  
Approved



Date 5/9/2011

Wards Affected: Fulford

All

Specialist Implications Officer(s) *None*

For further information please contact the author of the report

### Annexes

Annex A – Front page of petition  
Annex B – Plan of the Area