



Notice of a public meeting of

Decision Session - Executive Member for Economy and Transport

To: Councillor Kilbane

Date: Tuesday, 12 December 2023

Time: 10.00 am

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

AGENDA

Notice to Members – Post Decision Calling In:

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item* on this agenda, notice must be given to Democratic Services by **4:00 pm on Thursday, 14 December 2023.**

*With the exception of matters that have been the subject of a previous call in, require Full Council approval or are urgent, which are not subject to the call-in provisions. Any called in items will be considered by the Corporate Services, Climate Change and Scrutiny Management Committee.

Written representations in respect of items on this agenda should be submitted to Democratic Services by **5.00 pm on Friday, 8 December 2023.**

1. Declarations of Interest (Pages 1 - 2)

At this point in the meeting, the Executive Member is asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest, or other registerable interest, they might have in respect of business on this agenda, if they have not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. The disclosure must include the nature of the interest.

An interest must also be disclosed in the meeting when it becomes apparent to the member during the meeting.

[Please see attached sheet for further guidance for Members].

2. Minutes (Pages 3 - 16)

To approve and sign the minutes of the Decision Sessions held on 12 September 2023 and 19 October 2023.

3. Public Participation

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. Members of the public may speak on agenda items or on matters within the remit of the committee.

Please note that our registration deadlines have changed to 2 working days before the meeting. The deadline for registering at this meeting is at **5.00pm on Friday, 8 December 2023.**

To register to speak please visit www.york.gov.uk/AttendCouncilMeetings to fill out an online registration form. If you have any questions about the registration form or the meeting please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting whose details can be found at the foot of the agenda.

Webcasting of Public Meetings

Please note that, subject to available resources, this public meeting will be webcast including any registered public speakers who have given their permission. The public meeting can be viewed on demand at www.york.gov.uk/webcasts.

During coronavirus, we've made some changes to how we're running council meetings. See our coronavirus updates (www.york.gov.uk/COVIDDemocracy) for more information on meetings and decisions.

4. Review and Decision on the Parking Permit Emission Level, Daily Property Permit and City Parking Waiver Policies (Pages 17 - 50)

In February 2023 the approved Council budget committed to review the eligibility criteria that the low emission discount applies to for both season tickets and residents parking schemes. This report seeks a decision on what the emission rate will be where a discount is applied.

5. Directorate of Place 2023/24 Transport Capital Programme (Pages 51 - 84)

This report sets out the proposed programme of schemes to be delivered through the 2023/24 Place Transport Capital Programme.

6. Urgent Business

Any other business which the Executive Member considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer: Reece Williams

Telephone No- 01904 55 4447

Email- reece.williams@york.gov.uk

Notice to Members – Post Decision Calling In:

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item* on this agenda, notice must be given to Democratic Services by **4:00 pm on Thursday, 14 December 2023.**

*With the exception of matters that have been the subject of a previous call in, require Full Council approval or are urgent, which are not subject to the call-in provisions. Any called in items will be considered by the Corporate Services, Climate Change and Scrutiny Management Committee.

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak

- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports and
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

This information can be provided in your own language.

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

 (01904) 551550

Declarations of Interest – guidance for Members

- (1) Members must consider their interests, and act according to the following:

Type of Interest	You must
Disclosable Pecuniary Interests	Disclose the interest, not participate in the discussion or vote, and leave the meeting <u>unless</u> you have a dispensation.
Other Registrable Interests (Directly Related) OR Non-Registrable Interests (Directly Related)	Disclose the interest; speak on the item <u>only if</u> the public are also allowed to speak, but otherwise not participate in the discussion or vote, and leave the meeting <u>unless</u> you have a dispensation.
Other Registrable Interests (Affects) OR Non-Registrable Interests (Affects)	Disclose the interest; remain in the meeting, participate and vote <u>unless</u> the matter affects the financial interest or well-being: (a) to a greater extent than it affects the financial interest or well-being of a majority of inhabitants of the affected ward; and (b) a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest. In which case, speak on the item <u>only if</u> the public are also allowed to speak, but otherwise do not participate in the discussion or vote, and leave the meeting <u>unless</u> you have a dispensation.

- (2) Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to the Member concerned or their spouse/partner.
- (3) Members in arrears of Council Tax by more than two months must not vote in decisions on, or which might affect, budget calculations,

and must disclose at the meeting that this restriction applies to them. A failure to comply with these requirements is a criminal offence under section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Economy and Transport
Date	12 September 2023
Present	Councillor Kilbane
Officers in Attendance	James Gilchrist - Director of Environment, Transport and Planning Darren Hobson - Traffic Management Team Leader Geoff Holmes - Traffic Projects Officer Peter Marsland - Traffic Projects Officer Graham Titchener - Parking Services Manager Helene Vergerau - Head of Highway Access and Development
In attendance	Jon Hunter - North Yorkshire Police Jess Walters – North Yorkshire Police

7. Declarations of Interest (10:01)

The Executive Member was 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 they might have in respect of the business on the agenda. None were declared.

8. Minutes (10:01)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on 11 July be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

9. Public Participation (10:01)

It was reported that there had been 10 registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Councillor Warters spoke on agenda items 4 - Acknowledgement of Petitions and the lack of discussion with ward Councillors. He also spoke on 5 - Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests where he objected to annex P1, explaining that the parking issues at this location

were created by the Council and that the planned action would just displace the problem elsewhere. He requested that this item be rejected and called for Officers to consult with ward and parish Councillors to find a solution.

Councillor Warters then read out a statement on behalf of Dunnington Parish Council on item 8 - Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments - Pre Consultation who objected to the Officer recommendation for a number of reasons, including that the item did not receive any due consideration and that there was no logic in waiting 12 months for the Bishopthorpe Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) to be completed, amongst others.

Gwen Swinburn spoke on unlawful spending and the issue of Officer delegation, which were rarely reported. She stated that Officers pick and choose what to record and this keeps Members and residents in the dark, namely on the suspended Highways Design Guide. She then asked for a written reply on the results of the adoption of Government House Road in 2021.

John Young also spoke on agenda item 4, namely the Race Day petition, and explained that residents were not notified of the erection of the barriers and road closures. He explained that the area had never previously had any issues with race day traffic and that the barriers were often not taken down in time. He noted that there was no support for the barriers from local residents and asked Officers why there was no notification nor consultation for them.

Councillor Nicholls questioned the length of the proposed changes detailed in annex B1 of agenda item 5 before welcoming the Officer recommendations detailed in agenda item 8 in regards to the Bishopthorpe ETO. He explained that without this decision, the partial 20mph speed limits would cause confusion and an increase in road signs. He then stated that the village speed watch and Parish Council supported the recommendations before commenting on some of the objections raised. He concluded by asking for further support for the village speed watch.

Andy D'Arogne spoke on the delay of the transport strategy and the local cycling and walking infrastructure plan. He commented on the need for a basic funded bus priority measures and warned that the stalling of the active travel programme may result in undermined funding bids. He then spoke on agenda item 8, stating that the trials for Bishopthorpe and Dunnington should go ahead and then commenting on agenda item 4, namely the Farrar St petition, stating that the wishes of long term residents should not be ignored.

Christopher Tregellis also spoke on agenda item 5, namely on annex Q4. He supported the Officer recommendations which proposed that the existing no waiting 8am-6pm restriction be extended. He explained that this would alleviate traffic issues and improve pedestrian access on the footpath.

Councillor Smalley spoke on agenda item 7 - Response to Granary Estate Road Adoption Petition and explained that this had created difficult experiences for residents. He stated that residents were not aware that the roads weren't adopted and the issues that this could cause. He concluded by supporting the Officer recommendations, requesting that the Council updates residents on negotiations between parties every 6 months and supported the comments made by Christopher Tregellis.

Councillor Myers spoke on agenda item 4, namely on the Respark scheme detailed in annex B, and asked Officers to check if the existing zones in Clifton were large enough before asking for a timeframe on the consultation process. He then spoke on agenda item 5, namely annex on C, and detailed his support for the proposed changes.

It was reported that there had been 9 written representations received by the Executive Member.

Peter Rollings, Chairman of Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council, wrote in regards to agenda item 9 - Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments (Post Public Consultation), namely on the two items concerning the village of Rufforth. He supported the proposal for a 20mph limit on Wetherby Road but expressed disappointment with the Officer recommendation in relation to Bradley Lane. He explained that a 40mph buffer would improve compliance with the 30mph restrictions and reduce speeds around nearby dangerous bends before asking the Executive Member to reconsider the proposal.

Diane and Dennis Sugden wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely annex J7. They wrote in support of the recommendation and explained that they have had difficulties when exiting from their driveway due to vehicles that were parked outside, limiting their visibility.

Carlton Owen wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely annex Q5. He explained that there was a large number of vehicles parked on the pedestrian path and stated that the no waiting at any time restrictions should be painted on the north side instead. He noted that these issues arose from a house in multiple occupation on the street and asked for a parking permit for each household in Mitchell Way.

Councillor Orrell wrote in regards to agenda item 8, namely on the two items in Huntington. For New Lane, he stated that traffic calming measures were required and asked to move the 30mph sign towards Malton Road. For North Lane, he noted that there was a speeding issue in the residential area of the road and asked for a 30mph sign towards the ring road.

Max West also wrote in relation to annex Q5 in agenda item 5. They noted that the nuisance parking predominantly occurred on the north side of the road and this was also where foot traffic was highest, which caused problems for pedestrians. They asked for the restrictions to be implemented on the north side before stating that the parking problems arose due to the house in multiple occupation. They concluded by asking Officers to consult with residents before any decision was made.

Ann-Marie Richards also wrote in relation to annex Q5 in agenda item 5. She explained that the parking on the north side caused visibility issues and asked for the no waiting at any time restriction to be implemented on the north side.

A resident also wrote in relation to annex Q5 in agenda item 5. They explained that the parking issue was with the north side of the road and asked for the restrictions to be implemented there. They also stated that the volume of vehicles from the house in multiple occupation was the cause of these issues. They also noted that these vehicles caused oil leaks along the road before stating that the parking was a safety hazard.

Mr and Mrs Sheehan Gibbons wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely on annex T4. They wrote in objection to the recommendation and explained that there was no parking issues in the cul-de-sac, there was no public alleyway or right of way as mentioned in the background information. This restriction would mean that other vehicles, e.g. delivery, would not be able to park outside their property and asked that the no waiting at any time restrictions do not extend in front of their property or driveway.

Councillor Pearson wrote in relation to agenda item 5, namely on annex I. He supported the proposals detailed in annexes I1, I4, I5, I6, I7 and I8 and asked that the restrictions in I2 and I3 still be advertised. He explained that the proposals in I8 were important to local residents and was currently creating accessibility and visibility issues. On I2, he explained that pavement parking was an issue and was causing problems for residents and pedestrians before asking that no waiting at any time restrictions were imposed on the western side of the road or in the location originally requested. On I3, he asked that it be advertised and that a final decision was made on consultation feedback. He noted parking issues in the area

and asked that no waiting at any time restrictions were extended and filled in on the northern side of Back Lane/Greenshaw Drive.

10. Acknowledgement of Petitions (10:33)

The Executive Member considered a report which acknowledged and addressed a number of petitions that had been submitted to Highways and Transport. The Director for Environment, Transport and Planning provided an overview and recommendations against each petition. It was then;

Resolved: That the Executive Member noted the receipt of the petitions and reviewed the recommendations against each petition below:

(i) Strensall Cycle Path

- Note that connecting Strensall with Huntington and Earswick has provisionally been identified as a priority route as part of the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan.

(ii) Haxby Moor Road Resurface

- Due to the condition and priority of an intervention, no action would be taken in terms of the scheduled highway maintenance programme currently. An inspection of the condition would be undertaken and any reactive maintenance required would be delivered.

(iii) Stockton-on-the-Forest Resurface

- Due to the condition and priority of an intervention, no action would be taken in terms of the scheduled highway maintenance programme currently. An inspection of the condition would be undertaken and any reactive maintenance required would be delivered.

(iv) Improve Road Safety - Hopgrove, York A1036 Malton Road

- More detailed work on measure was requested and would be considered as part of the Transport Capital Programme in 2024/25.

(v) Farrar Street ResPark

- That the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list was approved and the extent of the potential consultation area was considered when it reaches the top of the list.

(vi) Garrow Hill Avenue, petition for inclusion in the Residents Parking Zone

- That the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list was approved and the extent of the potential consultation area was considered when it reaches the top of the list.
- (vii) Removal of Race Day Barriers on the Junctions of Albermarle and Count de Burgh with Queen Victoria Street in South Bank
- Note that the Council would engage with residents and Ward Councillors to review traffic management in the area ahead to the next race season.

Reason: To respond to residents' concerns and implement, if possible, the appropriate measure.

11. Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests (10:38)

The Executive Member considered a report which requested approval to advertise and implement the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order requested to introduce the restrictions detailed in Annexes A to U of the report.

The Director for Environment, Transport and Planning and the Traffic Management Team Leader outlined the report and detailed the objections/questions by Councillors and residents raised to the transport team. It was then;

Resolved:

- i. That each item in the Annexes A to U, with the exception of G2, be progressed as per the Officer recommendations listed.
- ii. That Annex G2 be advertised at a greater length and progressed to the statutory consultation process to amend the Traffic Regulation Order.

Reason: To provide the Council with the opportunity to progress the proposals to the Statutory Consultation for the amendment of the TRO, which is a legal requirement.

12. Moving Traffic Offence Enforcement Consultation Responses (Part 6 Traffic Management Act 2004) (10:57)

The Executive Member considered a report which provided an update on the consultation for the new enforcement powers for Local Authorities under part 6 of the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 and a pilot of these powers to enforce the one-way Micklegate traffic restriction.

The Parking Services Manager detailed the report and noted that a 6-week consultation in line with the Department of Transport guidance was conducted and that the feedback was supportive of both the application to share powers with North Yorkshire Police on moving traffic offences and the Micklegate pilot scheme. He also explained that a traffic survey was completed in July 2023 where approximately 50 vehicles passed through Micklegate bar illegally before noting that North Yorkshire Police supported the scheme in principle.

In response to questions from the Executive Member, the Officer confirmed that the use of these powers and technology would be extended to existing traffic restrictions in the city in the future. He also noted that the aim of traffic restriction was to ensure compliance and that there would be a 6 month warning period for vehicles passing through before a penalty charge notice was issued.

The Executive Member asked Officers to consider the placement of the ANPR cameras and;

Resolved:

- i. That the findings of the public consultation be noted:
 - The feedback was supportive of the application to share measures with North Yorkshire Police on moving traffic offences under part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004;
 - The feedback was supportive of a pilot scheme on Micklegate;
- ii. That it be noted that on the basis of the positive response to the consultation, the Director for Transport, Environment and Planning will apply to the Department for Transport to take on the responsibilities for enforcement of part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 as per the delegation in the April 2022 report.
- iii. That it be delegated to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning for the implementation of the pilot to enforce the one-way Micklegate traffic restriction. This will be funded from existing Transport budgets. This is following the Officer Decision to commence the consultation exercise and change the location from Lendal to Micklegate for the reasons in the officer decision report.

Reason: To ensure the safety of the Highway network is further strengthened

13. Response to Granary Estate Road Adoption Petition (11:04)

The Executive Member considered a report which provided an update on the issues to be resolved for the adoption of the prospective highways within The Granary estate to progress.

The Head of Highways Access and Development outlined the report and explained that the Council had limited powers but would continue to work with Yorkshire Water, Persimmon and Redrow to attempt to find a solution. She also proposed a meeting with the ward Councillors to provide an update.

Resolved:

- i. That the issues which hindered the adoption process be noted.
- i. That the actions taken by Council officers to date to seek to resolve those issues be noted.
- ii. That the Executive Member support continued efforts by officers of the Council to find a solution to the issues, working with Persimmon, Redrow and Yorkshire Water.
- iii. That a meeting with the ward Councillors, Persimmon, Redrow and Yorkshire Water be held.

Reason: to update the Executive Member and petitioners on the role of the Council and progress in resolving the issues.

14. Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments - Pre Consultation (11:06)

The Executive Member considered a report which examined the requests received for speed limits to be amended or extended and was asked to make a decision on whether to undertake the statutory consultation or take no further action on the proposals.

The Director of Transport, Highways and Environment and the Traffic Projects Officer presented the report, and representatives from North Yorkshire Police were present to answer questions. The Traffic Projects Officer outlined each location that had a request for a revised speed limit and it was;

Resolved:

- i. That the statutory consultation process for New Lane, Huntington be deferred

Reason: Owing to submitted planning applications, this may need to be reviewed in the future.

- ii. That the statutory consultation process for North Lane, Huntington be deferred.

Reason: Owing to approved development, this may will need to be reviewed in the future as part of the conditions of planning permission approval.

- iii. That the statutory consultation process for Dunnington be deferred.

Reason: to await outcome of decision for proposal vi. below.

- iv. That no further action be taken on the New Road, Hessay proposal.

Reason: The existing speed limits were appropriate due to the surrounding environment.

- v. That the statutory consultation process for A59 Boroughbridge Road be approved.

Reason: There were indications are these were appropriate speed limits due to the surrounding environment.

- vi. That an Experimental Traffic Order subject to further analysis on permanent speed change be implemented for Bishopthorpe.

Reason: Many of the roads in the village do not satisfy the Department for Transport criteria for 20mph limit so this would allow for data to be captured at 3 and 9 months and would provide reliable data for analysis and to inform future similar requests.

- vii. That it be noted that as part of the review of a new Local Transport Plan the issue of speeds can be reviewed in a wider policy context and that could form part of the consultation on Local Transport Strategy.

Reason: To consider citizen requests and consider against the Department for Transport guidance and Police views alongside the Councils own policies.

15. Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order Amendments (Post Public Consultation) (11:24)

The Executive Member considered a report which examined the requests received for speed limits to be amended or extended and was asked to make a final decision on whether to implement the new speed limits.

The Director of Transport, Highways and Environment and the Traffic Projects Officer presented the report, and representatives from North Yorkshire Police were present to answer questions. The Traffic Projects

Officer outlined each location that had a request for a revised speed limit and it was;

Resolved:

i. That the revised speed limit as advertised for the following sites be implemented:

- Haxby Road (Clarence Gardens) - 20mph
- Wetherby Road Rufforth (Primary School) - 20mph

Reason: There were indications are these were appropriate speed limits due to the surrounding environment.

ii. That the revised speed limit for Montague Road and Keble Park Estates be deferred.

Reason: To await the outcome of the Bishopthorpe Experimental Traffic Order as detailed in agenda item 8.

iii. That no further action be taken in the following sites:

- Sutton Road, Wigginton
- Bradley Lane, Rufforth

Reason: The existing speed limits were appropriate due to the surrounding environment.

Councillor Kilbane, Executive Member

[The meeting started at 10:00am and finished at 11:35am].

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Economy and Transport
Date	19 October 2023
Present	Councillor Douglas
Apologies	Councillor Kilbane
Officers in attendance	James Gilchrist - Director of Environment Transport and Planning Michael Howard - Interim Head of Highways and Transport Brendan Murphy - Senior Transport Project Manager

16. Declarations of Interest (15:02)

The Executive Member was 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 they might have in respect of the business on the agenda. None were declared.

17. Minutes (15:02)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Economy and Transport Decision Session from 12 September 2023 be deferred to the next Committee meeting.

18. Public Participation (15:02)

It was reported that there had been 5 registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Peter Chilman opposed proposals to remove parking on the grounds it would negatively affect the disabled, deliveries, and trades people. He stated that residents were on the lowest rung with LNER getting parking spaces and cyclists getting better cycle infrastructure.

Anna Semlyen asked that the Council introduce a 20 mph speed limit on Queens Street. She argued that the area in front of the station had many

pedestrians, cyclists and cars all moving through it and it would be safer at 20mph.

Virginia Leadley stated that the residents of Queen Streets needs had not been considered properly and no impact assessment had been undertaken. She highlighted that some residents that required care had moved away because of moving parking to Toft Green was too far. She noted that removing the bridge added more road space and asked that parking be maintained for residents.

Stuart Allen outlined that he had initially supported the proposal as a resident of Queens Street when parking was shown within the plans. However, now that parking bays were removed he asked the Council to rethink as Toft Green was too far for parking.

Mark Harris stated that the loss of parking would decrease the value of homes on Queen Street by about 13%. He noted that the loss of parking could create unplanned hazards for cyclists and pedestrians when delivery or trades people park.

19. The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (Amendment) (No 14/58) Queen Street, York – Traffic Order 2023 (15:21)

Officers introduced the item confirming that, an independent safety audit had been undertaken and had recommended the removal of parking spaces on Queens Street as outlined in the report. It was confirmed that this approach was in line with the Councils transport hierarchy which prioritised pedestrian and cyclists. Officers noted that as part of a residents parking scheme the current spaces did not guarantee parking outside of a residents home and that the proposal would see additional spaces added on Toft Green. Finally they confirmed that during construction works on Queen Street residents would be provided with parking on “ in the adjacent NCP car park”.

The Executive Leader enquired as to how these changes would affect blue badge holders, trades people, delivery drivers, and carers accessing the properties. It was confirmed that outside of loading hours blue badge holders could park for 3 hours on double yellow lines, delivery drivers could stop briefly for delivers, and trade work such as requiring a skip could be granted a permit to place a skip in front of the property. It was also confirmed that carers could apply for parking permits within the zone they required access. These are all in accordance with the existing resident permit area restrictions.

The Executive Leader acknowledged the determination of the safety audit which meant that original designs which included both parking and cycling would not be suitable. They also enquired about whether there was a case for a 20mph zone and officers confirmed they could review this. Finally the Executive Member asked that a minimum of 12 months access to parking during construction work was provided to residents to ensure no delay in construction work prevented residents to park.

Resolved:

- i. Approved Option 3a for the amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised (Annex J) including the revocation of residents' priority parking bays on Queen Street for use by R15SC permit holders and the introduction of Residents' Priority parking bays on Toft Green for use by R15SC permit holders as shown on the plan shown in Annex G.

Reason: In consideration of traffic and road safety concerns between pedestrian, cycles and motorised vehicles raised in an independent safety review and approved in the subsequent planning consent.

- ii. Approved alternative private parking for a minimum of 12 months, in the neighbouring NCP car park for all resident car owners to mitigate loss of residents' parking particularly for blue badge holders during scheme construction.

Reason: To provide ongoing residents' parking for permit holders during scheme completion.

Cllr Douglas, Chair

[The meeting started at 3.00 pm and finished at 3.39 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting:	Executive Member for Economy and Transport Decision Session
Meeting date:	12 December 2023
Report of:	James Gilchrist - Director of Environment, Transport and Planning
Portfolio of:	Councillor Kilbane, Executive Member Economy and Transport

Decision Report: Review and decision on the parking permit emission level, daily property permit and city parking waiver policies

Subject of Report

1. In February 2023 the approved Council budget committed to review the eligibility criteria that the low emission discount applies to (i.e., the emission level below which discounts will apply) for both season tickets and residents parking schemes.
2. The discount is typically around 50%. The report recognised that it would lead to fewer vehicle owners being eligible for the discounted rate. See link below to the budget savings annex from February which detailed that regardless of the review a saving would be made:
<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s165376/Annex%202020Savings%202023-24.pdf>
3. This report concludes that review and seeks a decision on what the emission rate will be where a discount is applied. Should the Executive Member agree to a change in eligibility criteria this would lead to a statutory consultation to amend the current Traffic Regulation Order to propose a change in the emission bands that the Council should use, this needs to be a specific option and the statutory consultation cannot be a consultation with options.
4. In addition, there are two further minor changes to specific parking permits proposed, impacting on the “daily property permit”

(formerly known as the “daily builders permit”) and the “annual parking waiver”.

5. It is proposed that the daily property permit will now be available for residents not just trades to purchase and that the eligibility criteria broadened from unoccupied to also include occupied properties. It is proposed the number of permits will also be increased from 1 to 3.
6. The annual parking waiver is issued to 39 business that require their vehicle with them to undertake works, eg. window cleaners and security alarm companies. It is proposed that their use is limited to two hours for each parking event.

Benefits and Challenges

7. The proposal to change the low emission eligibility criteria within the report will ensure that the saving identified in the budget will be delivered. Other options are available to the Executive Member.
8. Making the low emission discount available to less people will mean more people paying more.
9. The changes proposed to the annual parking permit and limiting this to two hours will ensure that the permit is used as intended.
10. The change to the daily property permits broadening their use will meet the needs of residents.

Policy Basis for Decision

11. Changes to when the low emission permit level discount will apply may help drive the climate and environmental ambitions set out in the Council Plan 2023-2027 and consideration has been given to this. Transport makes up just under 28% of CO2 emissions for the city and the emerging Local Transport Plan will need to address the reduction required.
12. But how much the discount off an annual residents parking permit of circa £100 influences resident’s vehicle choice is debateable but may be part of individual decision making when replacing their vehicle.

13. Equally it is a political choice whether parking charges designed to manage parking pressure and ensure turnover should include a discount for low emission vehicles.
14. The proposal for a two hour limit, where currently there isn't any time limit, for the annual parking waiver should not impact on the vast majority of the 39 current users. However, this will have beneficial impact on parking capacity and reduce the number of vehicles parked on the road for long periods of time freeing up the space for those who need it most. As such it supports the equalities objectives of the Council Plan.

Financial Strategy Implications

15. These 3 items have a positive impact on revenue generation with little to no financial impact other than the standard Traffic Regulation Order charge of approximately £3,000 (that the Council will need to fund) and requests for increase numbers of paper daily property permits, which can be subsumed within the current resourcing we have. This may need to be reviewed if the increase grows to such an extent beyond existing resource capacity, but this will be kept under review.
16. The permit emission discount is part of an agreed budget decision process, but this report provides options to extend this further and help reduce the complexity of the York permit scheme by having a uniformed discount level for all parking permits that has a discount element to it.
17. The expansion of the use and those who can purchase these will support calls for these daily property permits to be available for residents to use and allow an additional 2 vehicles to use these per property per day. This will see an increase in revenue from the sale of these permits.
18. There are no negative financial implications for these recommendations including the reduction in the time a vehicle can park for with an annual parking waiver however there will be a cost for the advertisement of the amendment in the Traffic Regulation Order of approximately £3000.

Recommendation and Reasons

19. The Executive Member is asked to:

- i. Approve that the vehicle emission discount level will only be available to Ultra Low Emission vehicles (those with an emission level of 0 to 75g/km). The Executive Member may wish to choose option A or B as outlined in paragraph 34 to further reduce the number of vehicles eligible for a discount;

Reason: It will deliver the required savings as identified in the budget.

- ii. Approve that all “annual parking waivers” used by businesses e.g., window cleaners to be time limited to 2 hours only per parking event, currently there is no time limit;

Reason: To free up the road space for those that need it most, 2 hours should be sufficient for these business types.

- iii. Approve that residents as well as trades people will be able to purchase the daily property parking permits;

- iv. Approve that daily property parking permits can be used in occupied properties, they are currently only available in unoccupied properties;

- v. Approve that the maximum number of daily property permits issued per day be increased from 1 to 3;

Reasons: To respond to requests we have had from customers and where officers feel there is room for flexibility. Gives residents flexibility when tradesman don't buy their own permit and reduce the impact on residents having to use their visitor vouchers. To recognise the need to have more than one trades vehicle per day per property where trades jobs may well require more than one vehicle. However, to protect the parking capacity it is deemed to extend this only to 3 trades vehicles per property per day from the current 1 trades vehicle per day.

- vi. To note that following the decisions that were required the changes will be advertised as an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order through the statutory consultation process;

Reason: to start the legal process of giving effect to the decisions made by the Executive Member.

Background

20. This report is in response to the 2023/24 budget decision to review when the discount for low emission vehicles will apply.
21. At the moment the low emission discount in York is available for vehicles when:
 - You have a light passenger vehicle that has a low CO2 emission figure that qualifies the vehicle for a reduced rate of vehicle tax;
 - The vehicle is in vehicle tax bands A to C (CO2 emission level of vehicles in Bands A to C is up to 120g/km);
 - The vehicle is electric or liquid propane gas (LPG) powered.
22. There is also a premium permit for the most polluting vehicles which pay more than the standard rate.
23. In addition, officers have received comments from the public on two specific parking permits. The annual waiver and the daily property permit, so changes are considered in this report.

Consultation Analysis

24. Any decision to change the low emission discount eligibility will need to be formerly consulted upon through a statutory consultation on the traffic regulation order. This requires a firm proposed change to the traffic regulation order. The public will be able to note, support or object to that proposal. This report seeks to define that proposal.
25. Changes to the daily property permits have been requested by many members of the public (residents and trade). However, it will need to be formerly consulted upon through a statutory consultation on the traffic regulation order. This requires a firm proposed change to the traffic regulation order. The public will be

able to note, support or object to that proposal. This report seeks to define that proposal.

26. While there are only currently 39 of these annual parking waivers issued, currently these allow users to park for as long as they want, such permits are useful e.g for window cleaners and security alarm companies. However, Civil Enforcement Officers have observed abuse of this where the vehicle is parked but no work is taking place. This is not subject to a statutory consultation, but permit holders will be notified about this change, they will have the opportunity to write in.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

Low Emission Discount for some Parking Permits

27. At the moment the low emission discount in York is available for vehicles when:
 - You have a light passenger vehicle that has a low CO₂ emission figure that qualifies the vehicle for a reduced rate of vehicle tax;
 - The vehicle is in vehicle tax bands A to C (CO₂ emission level of vehicles in Bands A to C is up to 120g/km);
 - The vehicle is electric or liquid propane gas (LPG) powered.
28. The correlation to vehicle excise duty is confusing as this has changed since the Council policy was developed.
29. For vehicles registered since 2017 the discount for emissions on vehicle excise duty only applies to the first year. For future years there is a standard rate regardless of emissions unless its emissions are 0g/km. There are also 13 bands. This link sets out the background
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vehicle-excise-duty/vehicle-excise-duty>
30. In addition the government announced in the Autumn Statement 2022 that Zero emission cars first registered on or after 1 April 2017 will be liable from 2025 to pay the lowest first year rate of Vehicle Excise Duty which currently applies to vehicles with CO₂ emissions 1 to 50g/km. They will no longer be free and from the second year of registration onwards, zero emission cars will move to the standard annual rate. See link below
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/introduction-of->

vehicle-excise-duty-for-zero-emission-cars-vans-and-motorcycles-from-2025

31. Officers therefore consider it is too confusing to link a York Low Emission Discount to Vehicle Excise Duty.
32. The UK Vehicle Certification Agency currently defines a low emission vehicle as one that produces less than 100g of CO₂ per KM. It defines ultra low emission vehicles as those that produce less than 75g of CO₂ per km. Zero emission vehicles generate no tail-pipe emissions of CO₂.
33. The current discount is offered to vehicles which are not even considered low emission vehicles.
34. Therefore the options for review of when a low emission discount should apply are as follows:
 - i. The option is to remove any discount for low emission vehicles on the basis that parking permits are to control parking pressure and not the emissions they produce;
 - ii. Discount only on zero emission vehicles which generate no tail pipe emission of CO₂;
 - iii. Discount on zero emission vehicles which generate no tail pipe emission of CO₂ and ultra low emission vehicles that produce less than 75g of CO₂ per km;
 - iv. Discount on all low emission vehicles that produce less than 100g of CO₂ per KM.
35. Option A is to not offer a discount for any low emission vehicles. The rationale for this is that the government discount will only apply for the first year on vehicle excise duty and the parking permits are to manage parking pressure. How much a discount of circa £50 has on peoples car choice is hard to define. However, it will be an influencing factor on people buying cars that produce less emissions. It is a political choice whether parking charges designed to manage parking pressure and ensure turnover should include a discount for lower emission vehicles.
36. Option B would offer the discount to the fewest number of vehicles which are the cleanest vehicles and would deliver the revenues identified in the budget.

37. Option C would offer the discount to ultra low emission vehicles as well as zero emission vehicles. It would deliver the revenues identified in the budget.
38. Option D would not deliver the revenues identified in the budget report and therefore officers cannot support this.
39. Officers therefore recommend option C as it deliver the revenues identified in the budget and is likely to impact on fewer people.
40. The following table provides a summary of the current number of permits. The second column details the number of permits which pay more as the vehicle is a high polluting vehicle. The third column details the number of standard permits. The fourth column details the number of people who currently receive a discount but would not under option C and would in future pay the standard rate. The final column details the number that would receive the discount under option C.

Permit type	Premium charge - Emissions +180g/CO2 per km	Standard charge - Emissions 120 to 179 g/CO2 per km	Currently receive a discounted rate which would no longer apply 75 to 119 g/CO2 per km	Recommended option B discounted rate - 0 to 74 g/CO2 per km
Household Parking Permit	316	1955	1454	87
Additional Household Parking Permit 1	60	295	234	34
Additional Household Parking Permit 2	2	18	29	0
Business Permit	7	22	15	4

Commercial Permit ALL ZONES	4	13	9	0
Commercial Permit ONE ZONE	15	34	15	7
Community Permit	17	191	207	4
Resident Contract (Car Parks)	1	11	17	0
Resident Contract Foss Bank	2	6	6	0
Resident Special Control Permit	5	30	22	2
Season Ticket	19	78	142	1
Landlord permit	0	5	7	0
House of Multiple Occupancy permit	0	12	24	0
Commercial Permit - R60 school only	0	12	6	0

Annual Parking Waiver

41. Based on observations from Civil Enforcement Officers, it is deemed the lack of any time restriction is having an impact of available parking capacity in and around the city centre. This impacts on blue badge and loading/unloading parking capacity.
42. In light of most of these businesses apply for these waivers being window cleaners, it is deemed 2 hours should be sufficient and helps to balance the available parking capacity.

43. Adding a time limit allows officers to move a vehicle on after this period of time to free up capacity. It is however a choice and the Executive Member could choose not to add a time limit.
44. The change proposed would not require a statutory consultation therefore it is proposed that any decision to amend the terms and conditions of the waiver will be communicated to the current holders and any existing waivers will continue to be valid until their expiry.

Daily Property Permit

45. There have been many calls by both residents and trades people to allow for residents to buy these and to be allowed for these to be used in occupied properties and increase the number of permits used per property per day.
46. Currently these permits can only be used in unoccupied properties and one vehicle per property per day. Officers propose this could be extended to occupied properties and up to 3 permits per property per day. However, it should be noted that the issuing of this or any parking permits does not guarantee a parking space but only the eligibility to park in the location the permit covers.
47. With every street in York varying in parking capacity this general increase from 1 to 3 permits used per day per property may see an increase in vehicles parking that will impact on the available capacity. However, as trades parking and works are done mainly during the daytime and resident parking tends to be higher in the evening, it is deemed this impact should be minimal and strikes the right balance based on enforcement officers' observations.

Organisational Impact and Implications

48. The following implications related to this report and below under the relevant sub-headings.
 - **Financial:** - In the 2023/24 budget decision, Members agreed to a saving of £50k which would be realised by rationalising the number of vehicles that were available for low emission discounts. Whilst this saving will not be delivered in year it is important to implement in order for the budget to be in balance over future years. There will be a reduction in the number of owners who are eligible for a

discount and it is anticipated that there will be a reduction in demand for a number of the permits (notable season tickets).

- **Human Resources (HR)**, for the daily property permits, as this decision will see an increase in availability and use of these permits, there will likely be a HR implication on staff in Customer Services and Business Support who take the calls, payments and issuing of these permits. It is deemed that this is manageable within current resources but we cannot foresee what if any the increase in these permits being bought and issued are. Given this is a revenue generating item, if the administration of these increases beyond current capacity, then a review will be undertaken to seek an increase in staffing capacity.
- **Legal.** The proposals require amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Order 2014: Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 apply.

The statutory consultation process for Traffic Regulation Orders requires public advertisement through the placing of public notices within the local press and on-street. It is a requirement for the Council to consider any formal objections received within the statutory advertisement period of 21 days. Formal notification of the public advertisement is given to key stakeholders including local Ward Members, Town and Parish Councils, Police, and other affected parties.

The Council, as Highway Authority, is required to consider any objections received after formal statutory consultation, and a subsequent report will include any such objections or comments, for consideration.

The Council has discretion to amend its original proposals if considered desirable, whether or not, in the light of any objections or comments received, as a result of such statutory consultation. If any objections received are accepted, in part or whole, and/or a decision is made to modify the original proposals, if such a modification is considered to be substantial, then steps must be taken for those affected by the proposed modifications to be further consulted.

- **Procurement**, we are not aware of any contracting or procurement issue that this will impact upon. Therefore this report does not appear to be any impact on procurement.
- **Health and Wellbeing**, Public Health supports the implementation of policy changes which have a positive impact on health. Low emissions reduce air pollution which has a negative impact on health. Both long and short term exposure to air pollution can lead to a wide range of conditions including stroke, some cancers, asthma and other respiratory tract infections.

However, the impact on the increase cost of parking or up grading a current car to a low emissions model for those who have low incomes should not be underestimated and Public Health agree that wider consultations with York Older People's Assembly, York access and those who currently have access to discount is required to fully understand the impact and avoid exacerbating any health inequalities.

- **Environment and Climate action**, Tightening the criteria for a discount of lower emission vehicles may help to encourage greater uptake of lower emission vehicles. The reduction in the time a vehicle can park for with the annual parking waiver will see vehicles parking across the city being reduced that will reduce the environmental impact when other vehicles are trying to find a space. This will help to make more parking capacity available.
- **Affordability**, with the lowering of the emission level for permits that have a discount element, this will mean some of those who currently are entitled to the discount will fall outside of this new level and pay a higher rate for their permit.
- **Equalities and Human Rights**, the Council recognises, and needs to take into account its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions).

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out and is annexed to this report in Annex A.

The moving of the vehicle emission threshold will mean some of those who currently fall within the low emission discount will no longer benefit from the discount and may feel these permits are unaffordable and to buy/lease a lower emission vehicle may not be possible for them.

- **Data Protection and Privacy**, as there is no personal data, special categories of personal data or criminal offence data being processed, there is no requirement to complete a DPIA. This is evidenced by completion of DPIA screening questions - reference AD-01831.
- **Communications**, if agreed a communication exercise will need to be taken forward to make all permit holders aware of these changes.
- **Economy**: The emissions proposals in this report would affect up to 138 commercial and business permit holders and are thus considered to have minimal overall economic impact. The proposal to increase the availability of daily permits is stated to have widespread support from tradespeople and is thus seen as a positive economic impact. The proposal to introduce a 2 hour limit for commercial permit holders would have minimal economic impact on approximately 40 permit holders.

Risks and Mitigations

49. The following risks have been identified:
- i. Reputational impacts seeing the council increase parking income. This report will state this risk and the decision to accept these options will ensure there is due consideration in place and reasoning for this decision;
 - ii. Permits to become less affordable or not affordable for some. This is a factor that little can be done about other than presenting the list of options to the Executive Member but in the knowledge that the emission-based permits have been agreed but where this report provides options to consider increasing this new emission level to all permits;
 - iii. Ensuring everyone is aware of these changes. Officers will work with the council's communications team to make sure the decisions of this report are communicated as effectively as possible, including writing out to all permit holders about these changes.

Wards Impacted

50. All

Contact details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

Author

Name:	Graham Titchener
Job Title:	Parking Services Manager
Service Area:	Parking
Telephone:	01904 551495
Report approved:	Yes
Date:	04 December 2023

Background papers

- Background paper: Reference PLA02 in the attached annex to the budget decision report. 'Annex 2 Savings 2023-24' - <https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s165376/Annex%20%20Savings%202023-24.pdf>

Annexes

All annexes to the Decision Report must be listed.

- Annex A: Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)

City of York Council
Equalities Impact Assessment

Who is submitting the proposal?

Directorate:	Place		
Service Area:	Parking Services		
Name of the proposal:	Graham Titchener		
Lead officer:	Graham Titchener		
Date assessment completed:	30/08/2023		
Names of those who contributed to the assessment :			
Name	Job title	Organisation	Area of expertise
Graham Titchener	Parking Services Manager	City of York Council	Transport and Highways

Step 1 – Aims and intended outcomes

1.1	<p>What is the purpose of the proposal? Please explain your proposal in Plain English avoiding acronyms and jargon.</p>
	<p>This proposal is to assess any impacts on the public in line with the Equality Act for the implementation the following items that are being put forward for a decision by the Executive Member for Economy and Transport. The following will be referred to in the rest of this assessment by their bullet point number:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and decrease of the emission level criteria for discount permits. 2. Increasing the access and use of daily property permits 3. Reduction in the time a vehicle is allowed to park with an annual parking waiver <p>The Exec Member decision report covers these points where this EIA is to help assess the impacts of these decisions, where it is considered item 1 will have the most negative impact for those who current enjoy the discount associated with their permit but if their vehicle emission is above the new agreed level, they will need to pay the full 50% increase for their permit. For those on limited means this may well have a significant financial impact for them where they may not have the means to buy a lower emission vehicle.</p>

1.2	Are there any external considerations? (Legislation/government directive/codes of practice etc.)
	New DVLA guidance updating the old vehicle emission bands to emission ratings that the Executive Member Decision report refers to and informs the options around the emission levels for item 1. The York Traffic Regulation Order will need to be changed.

1.3	Who are the stakeholders and what are their interests?
	<p>All motor vehicle users and York residents who can access York parking permits that have an emission-based discount, daily property permits and those who are granted an annual parking waiver.</p> <p>Their interests pertain to if they currently received a discount on their parking permit and if this will continue given the emission level of their vehicle meeting the new emission level.</p> <p>For those with an annual parking waiver this decision will impact on the length of time they can park for using this waiver, however given the reasons for granting this waiver the suggested time of limiting the parking permitted to 2 hours should suffice based on the requests for these permits, such as window cleaners and property maintenance (security). This will allow enough time to either undertake the required work or asses the required work and make the area safe.</p> <p>Increasing of access to the daily property permits to residents/property owners and allowing these to be used in occupied as well as unoccupied properties is seen as a positive and in response to many requests from property owners. In addition in response to trades people and property owners to allow for the number of these permits to be used per property per day from 1 to 3 is also in recognition that property repair and renovation will sometimes require more than 1 vehicle to be parked but balance against the need to protect the parking capacity for other permit holders.</p>

1.4	What results/outcomes do we want to achieve and for whom?
	To record the possible impacts of these decisions and bring them to light to support and help inform the decisions requested in the main report.

Step 2 – Gathering the information and feedback

2.1	What sources of data, evidence and consultation feedback do we have to help us understand the impact of the proposal on equality rights and human rights? Please consider a range of sources, including: consultation exercises, surveys, feedback from staff, stakeholders, participants, research reports, the views of equality groups, as well your own experience of working in this area etc.	
	Source of data/supporting evidence	Reason for using
	These decisions and options are informed by the need to update our parking permit emission based policies that are based on old UK Government vehicle bands.	To update York's outdated policy for vehicle emission bands, contribute to the reduction in vehicle emissions and support an increase in revenue for the council.
	The Council Civil Enforcement Officers reported seeing an increase in vehicles parking with an annual parking waiver on display for extended periods of time, without any movement to/from the vehicle. This gave an indication that the vehicles	This waiver was originally proposed for window cleaners, that had water tankers on their vehicles and security companies to ensure that they could park as close as possible when required. The operations were not expected to be long term and should only require short term parking whilst operations were undertaken in the vicinity.

<p>were not required for the works, as all the tools/machinery were unloaded for the works to commence.</p> <p>A number of requests from trades people and property owners and in consultation with Parking Services enforcement officers.</p>	<p>To positively respond to these requests to increase the access and use of daily property permits.</p>
<p>Decisions 1 and 3 will need to go through a Traffic Regulation Order consultation, which will be brought back to the Exec Member and will help inform this EIA. Decision 2 is a policy amendment.</p>	

Step 3 – Gaps in data and knowledge

3.1	What are the main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your proposal? Please indicate how any gaps will be dealt with.		
Gaps in data or knowledge		Action to deal with this	
Permit holders views who currently receive a discount of the parking permit.		The TRO consultation process will allow for those who currently have a permit that has a discount element to it, to be informed of this TRO consultation process and whose views will be complied and added to a later report to the Exec Member to decide on the TRO changes based on this consultation process.	

Step 4 – Analysing the impacts or effects.

4.1	Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments? Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.		
Equality Groups and Human Rights.	Key Findings/Impacts	Positive (+)	High (H)
		Negative (-)	Medium (M)
		Neutral (0)	Low (L)

Age		+ & -	M
	<p>Those who currently benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p> <p>Those who fall into the older age categories who currently benefit from the discounted parking permits but who may fall outside of the new emission limit will need to pay the standard permit price. For those on a tight budget or smaller pension this may not be affordable for them and buying a lower emission vehicle may also not be affordable or an option for them. While this will need to go out through the TRO consultation process, which will help inform this decision, the Executive Member may deem further consultation is required for those in these age groups, e.g. engagement with the York Older People's Assembly.</p> <p>For those in these older age categories who currently have the annual parking waiver may find the 2 hour limit not long enough to do their work.</p>		

	As this is a policy decision, there would not need to be a TRO consultation, so the decision to consult on this would be one for the Executive Member to decide upon.		
Disability	<p>Those who currently benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission level is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level, will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p> <p>On the whole this is consider positive for blue badge holders who can park for free in restricted areas but also help increase parking capacity where currently those with the city parking waiver may be taking up space for any blue badge holders.</p> <p>However it is understood that not all disabled people have a blue badge. As a result those without a blue badge who currently benefit from the discounted parking permits but who may fall outside of the new emission limit will need to pay the standard permit price. For those on a tight</p>	+	M

	<p>budget this may not be affordable for them and buying a lower emission vehicle may also not be affordable or an option for them. While this will need to go out through the TRO consultation process, which will help inform this decision, the Executive Member may deem further consultation is required with disabled people, e.g. engagement with the York Access Forum.</p> <p>For disabled people who don't have a blue badge and who currently have the annual parking waiver, may find the 2 hour limit not long enough to do their work, dependant on their impairment. As this is a policy decision, there would not need to be a TRO consultation, so the decision to consult on this would be one for the Executive Member to decide upon.</p> <p>Due to some of the issues caused by those with this waiver parking in areas that are used by Blue Badge holders, such as Duncombe Place, this should help to reduce the impact on capacity by these permit holders parking in this and other areas used by Blue Badge holders.</p>		
Gender	<p>Those who current benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p>	+ & -	M

	The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.		
Gender Reassignment	<p>Those who current benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p>	+ & -	M
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>Those who current benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking</p>	+ & -	M

	<p>waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p>		
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Those who current benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p>	+ & -	M
Race	It is deemed this will not impact of any issues connected to Race.	0	L
Religion and belief	This shouldn't have any impact on this group other than the impacts on parking capacity that may restrict church goers who go to the churches on or nearby Duncombe Place, impacted on by those with an annual parking waiver.	0	L

Sexual orientation	It is deemed this will not impact of any issues connected to sexual orientation.	0	L
Other Socio-economic groups including:	Could other socio-economic groups be affected e.g. carers, ex-offenders, low incomes?		
Carer	<p>Those who current benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p> <p>As the attendance permit used by carers is free it is deemed this will not have an impact on carers unless they do not qualify for one of these and would have another permit that would be impacted on these decisions.</p> <p>Capacity of parking may be positively and negatively impacted on as with other permit holders such as those in a resident parking zone.</p>	+ & -	M

Low income groups	<p>Those who current benefit from a discount but depending on the decision as to which emission band is agreed and whose vehicle would fall outside of that new level will have to pay the standard permit price.</p> <p>Those who currently enjoy the no time limit to park with a parking waiver will not be limited to the amount of time they can park for and where their business may require them to park for longer than 2 hours, would be impacted on. Conversely this will help increase the parking capacity for other users such as blue badge holders, other users of the city parking waiver and those legality entitled to park in restricted areas for loading and unloading.</p> <p>The increase in use and availability of the daily property permit will be positively impacted but conversely if 2 or more properties in the same zone have up to 3 trades vehicles per property will impact on the parking capacity of that street and zone.</p> <p>This is considered High due to those who currently enjoy the 50% discount but for those who will fall outside of the new emission level will need to pay the standard amount that is a 50% increase in costs that may be unaffordable for those of low incomes and who may not be able to afford a lower emission vehicle.</p>	-	H	
Veterans, Armed Forces Community	It is deemed this will not impact of any issues connected to armed forces but to state that this would impact on the users of these permits.	0	L	
Other				

Impact on human rights:			
List any human rights impacted.	As a result of accepting a lower emission level, those who currently receive the permit discount where their vehicle may not meet the new emission level, will see a 50% increase in their permit price as they move to the standard emission level. This may mean that this is unaffordable for them, denying their use of getting around and parking by private vehicle. For those who are able there are alternative means to get around but for those with impairments their blue badge will negate these issues given they can park for free in any car park, resident parking one and on-street pay and display bays. However for those with impairments who do not qualify for a blue badge where alternative forms of transport may not be an option for them and in addition on a low income, may mean this would impact on those in that situation and disadvantaged as a result.	-	M

Use the following guidance to inform your responses:

Indicate:

- Where you think that the proposal could have a POSITIVE impact on any of the equality groups like promoting equality and equal opportunities or improving relations within equality groups
- Where you think that the proposal could have a NEGATIVE impact on any of the equality groups, i.e. it could disadvantage them
- Where you think that this proposal has a NEUTRAL effect on any of the equality groups listed below i.e. it has no effect currently on equality groups.

It is important to remember that a proposal may be highly relevant to one aspect of equality and not relevant to another.

<p>High impact (The proposal or process is very equality relevant)</p>	<p>There is significant potential for or evidence of adverse impact The proposal is institution wide or public facing The proposal has consequences for or affects significant numbers of people The proposal has the potential to make a significant contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights.</p>
<p>Medium impact (The proposal or process is somewhat equality relevant)</p>	<p>There is some evidence to suggest potential for or evidence of adverse impact The proposal is institution wide or across services, but mainly internal The proposal has consequences for or affects some people The proposal has the potential to contribute to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights</p>
<p>Low impact (The proposal or process might be equality relevant)</p>	<p>There is little evidence to suggest that the proposal could result in adverse impact The proposal operates in a limited way The proposal has consequences for or affects few people The proposal may have the potential to contribute to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights</p>

Step 5 - Mitigating adverse impacts and maximising positive impacts

5.1	Based on your findings, explain ways you plan to mitigate any unlawful prohibited conduct or unwanted adverse impact. Where positive impacts have been identified, what is been done to optimise opportunities to advance equality or foster good relations?
<p>The TRO consultation process, supported by targeted communications to those impacted on this will help to better understand the impacts of the decisions to review the emission level that are considered to have a negative impact of some of these users.</p> <p>These findings will then be taken to a follow up report to the Exec Member to decide on these changes in the TRO.</p>	

Step 6 – Recommendations and conclusions of the assessment

6.1	<p>Having considered the potential or actual impacts you should be in a position to make an informed judgement on what should be done. In all cases, document your reasoning that justifies your decision. There are four main options you can take:</p>
<p>- No major change to the proposal – the EIA demonstrates the proposal is robust. There is no potential for unlawful discrimination or adverse impact and you have taken all opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitor and review.</p>	
<p>- Adjust the proposal – the EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. This involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance quality or to foster good relations.</p> <p>- Continue with the proposal (despite the potential for adverse impact) – you should clearly set out the justifications for doing this and how you believe the decision is compatible with our obligations under the duty</p> <p>- Stop and remove the proposal – if there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, you should consider stopping the proposal altogether. If a proposal leads to unlawful discrimination, it should be removed or changed.</p> <p>Important: If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason in the justification column.</p>	
Option selected	Conclusions/justification

Continue with the proposal	In support of the following this is considered to continue with this proposal however to highlight the possible impacts and advise that the TRO consultation process will help to inform this EIA and the TRO decision making process.
-----------------------------------	--

Step 7 – Summary of agreed actions resulting from the assessment

7.1	What action, by whom, will be undertaken as a result of the impact assessment.		
Impact/issue	Action to be taken	Person responsible	Timescale
Comments from the TRO consultation process to inform this EIA/	Comments will be reviewed by officers and summarised in an Exec Member decision report to agree the TRO.	Graham Titchener & Network Management	EIA to be updated when the TRO process is followed and feedback to the Exec Member.

Step 8 - Monitor, review and improve

8. 1	How will the impact of your proposal be monitored and improved upon going forward? Consider how will you identify the impact of activities on protected characteristics and other marginalised groups going forward? How will any learning and enhancements be capitalised on and embedded?
	Once the decision is made to agree or change the TRO process, this will then become policy. The TRO consultation process will inform the decision making process and balance comments up against the reasoning to take these decisions forward.



Meeting:	Executive Member Decision Session for Economy and Transport
Meeting date:	12 December 2023
Report of:	Neil Ferris, Director of Place
Portfolio of:	Cllr Pete Kilbane, Deputy Leader for Economy & Transport

Decision Report: Directorate of Place 2023/24 Transport Capital Programme

Subject of Report

1. This report sets out the proposed programme of schemes to be delivered through the 2023/24 Place Transport Capital Programme, following the approval of the 2023/24 Transport Capital Budget at Budget Council and subsequent reports to Executive, and asks the Executive Member to approve the programme.
2. The Transport Capital Programme aims to deliver infrastructure improvements to support the Local Transport Plan, the council's Transport Strategy, and the aims of the Council Plan, and approval is needed to allow the proposed schemes to be progressed from feasibility through to implementation.

Benefits and Challenges

3. Approval of the 2023/24 Transport Capital Programme will allow a number of transport schemes to be implemented, which aim to improve transport infrastructure across the city, address safety issues, and encourage the use of sustainable transport.
4. The key risks for the Transport Capital Programme are cost increases to proposed schemes, which could cause schemes to be delayed or postponed until further funding is available; the risk that the proposed measures will not resolve the issues they are expected to address, and the potential that proposed schemes will not be supported by residents or local businesses.

Policy Basis for Decision

5. The Council Plan has four core commitments to achieve our vision of a healthier, fairer, more affordable, more sustainable, and more accessible city, where everyone feels valued:
 - i. Equalities and Human Rights - Equality of opportunity;
 - ii. Affordability - Tackling the cost-of-living crisis;
 - iii. Climate - Environment and the climate emergency;
 - iv. Health - Health and wellbeing.
6. The schemes in the Transport Capital Programme aim to support the core commitment to improve the environment and address the climate emergency by providing infrastructure for sustainable transport measures to support the aims of carbon reduction and working towards net zero. Measures to address air quality issues will also contribute to the core commitment to improve health and wellbeing.
7. The Transport Capital Programme also aims to support the seven priorities of the Council Plan, in particular the Economy and good employment; Transport; and Sustainability priorities.
8. The schemes included in the Transport Capital Programme aim to support the economy of the city by improving the effectiveness, safety, and reliability of the transport network, making York a more attractive place for residents, visitors, and businesses. The programme aims to provide sustainable and accessible transport and support the aims of carbon reduction and improving the environment, through measures to improve public transport, provide better facilities for walking and cycling, address road safety issues, and increase the numbers of Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging points in York.

Financial Strategy Implications

9. Following a review of the proposed 2023/24 Transport Capital Programme, a revised budget of **£35,662k** was approved by the Executive at the meeting of 16 November 2023, which has included the addition of carryover funding from 2022/23, and the transfer of funding to 2024/25 to reflect the expected timescales for scheme implementation.

10. The majority of funding for the Transport Capital Programme is from external funding sources, with funding allocated from council resources to support the programme. The external funding includes the Local Transport Plan grant, the Bus Service Improvement Plan grant, the Active Travel Fund grant, developer funding, and grant funding for the major schemes in the programme from the West Yorkshire Transport Fund, the Transforming Cities Fund, the Zero Emission Bus Regional Area grant, and the Department for Transport for the Outer Ring Road Dualling scheme.

Recommendation and Reasons

11. The Executive Member is asked to:

- Approve the proposed programme of schemes to be delivered in 2023/24.

Reason: To implement the council's transport strategy identified in York's third Local Transport Plan and the Council Priorities and deliver schemes in order to achieve these aims.

Background

12. Following approval at Budget Council meeting on 23 February 2023, the budget for the 2023/24 Transport Capital Programme was set at £71,695k. The approved budget has since been amended to include carryover funding from the 2022/23 Transport Capital Programme, and funding has been reprofiled to reflect the expected progress and costs of schemes in 2023/24, as set out in this report.
13. Full details of the 2023/24 budget and funding are shown in Annex A to this report.

2023/24 Transport Schemes

14. The proposed allocations for Transport Schemes aim to deliver the strategic aims of the council's third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and the Council Priorities. The majority of these schemes are funded from the Local Transport Plan grant and supplemented by the council's capital resources, developer funding, and government grants such as the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) grant.

15. Following a successful bid to the government for funding for York's Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP), the council was awarded funding for a three-year programme of improvements to bus services and bus infrastructure. The BSIP capital grant funding has been included in the transport capital programme for the proposed bus priority schemes, Park & Ride interchange improvements, bus stop upgrades, and real-time screen upgrades, which will be implemented over the next eighteen months.
16. The allocation for Traffic Management schemes includes funding for the continuation of the Traffic Signals Asset Renewal (TSAR) programme; improvements to signs and lining throughout the city; feasibility work on renewal of the existing Car Park Counters system; the Bus Lane Enforcement schemes at Coppergate and Low Poppleton Lane; completion of The Groves scheme; and upgrades to the CCTV network at the Hungate development. The proposed review of improvements on Piccadilly will now be progressed through the work to develop the council's fourth Local Transport Plan.
17. The allocation for Pedestrian & Cycle schemes includes funding for the review of access barriers on the walking and cycling network; the review and implementation of requests for new pedestrian crossings; smaller-scale schemes to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities across the city, including the provision of new dropped kerbs; improvements to structures on the Public Rights of Way network to ensure the routes continue to be accessible; and improvements to the section of the Solar System cycle route between Tadcaster Road and the new Bishopthorpe White Rose playing fields. The proposed feasibility studies for priority schemes from the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) have been deferred until further work has been carried out to develop the LCWIP.
18. Funding has also been allocated for carrying out improvements to the section of National Cycle Network Route 65 that runs through York, which includes work to raise the level of the existing paths on the approaches to Millennium Bridge to allow pedestrians and cyclists to access the bridge when river levels are high. Due to the length of time required for the Environment Agency to approve the works, implementation of this scheme has now been deferred to 2024 as the work cannot be carried out during the winter flood season.

19. The allocation for safety schemes will fund measures to improve walking and cycling facilities and address safety issues on routes to school; schemes to improve safety at accident cluster sites; measures to address safety issues raised by the public through the Danger Reduction programme; and schemes to address issues with vehicle speeds raised through the Speed Review process, including funding for the ongoing review of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS).
20. The safety schemes programme is developed based on the following criteria:
 - Local Safety Schemes: Annual review of accident data to identify accident clusters where an engineering solution is appropriate. The schemes are ranked in terms of the number of incidents per site and severity.
 - Danger Reduction Schemes: Review of perceived safety issues raised by residents/ councillors that would not meet the Local Safety Schemes criteria, but where an engineering solution could address the issues.
 - Speed Management Schemes: Review of requests from the public to address speed concern issues, which are prioritised and identified as suitable for engineering measures or road safety interventions/ campaigns following initial review by North Yorkshire Police.
21. The safety schemes programme includes funding for feasibility and design work to develop schemes for future years, and funding to implement schemes where feasibility and design was completed in 2022/23, including measures at Black Dike Lane in Poppleton to address safety issues raised by residents following a petition submitted to the Council in October 2021, and improvements at the Foss Islands Road/ Navigation Road junction.
22. There are three schemes where feasibility and design work was carried out in 2022/23 but no further action will be taken as the issues will be resolved through other means. The review of the A166/ Bore Tree Balk junction identified missing signs, and the review of the Front Street/ Askham Lane junction identified lining and maintenance work, both of which have been passed to the Highways Maintenance section to be addressed. The issue of the pedestrian refuge island at the entrance to Union Terrace car park being struck by vehicles has been monitored and no further incidents have occurred, so no further work is required at present.

23. Funding has been allocated for the costs of schemes completed in previous years, such as final completion works, retention payments, and items identified during safety audits of schemes. An allocation for the continuing costs of the Smarter Travel Evolution Programme (STEP) has also been included in the programme.
24. Funding has also been allocated for the Flood Sign Renewal scheme, which will replace existing flood signage around the city, including the provision of new signage in areas where flood risk has increased in recent years.
25. Full details of the programme are shown in Annex B to this report.

2023/24 Active Travel Programme

26. The council's Active Travel Programme includes funding allocated for Cycling Schemes in the Summer 2019 budget, grant funding awarded from the government's Active Travel Fund (ATF) for schemes to encourage the use of active travel modes (walking and cycling) through the provision of new/ improved infrastructure across the city, and match funding from the council's capital resources.
27. A revised Active Travel Programme was approved at the November 2022 Executive meeting, and work has continued on progressing the schemes in the programme through feasibility and design to implementation. Work to improve cycle facilities at the build-outs along Skeldergate was completed in the summer, and a new pedestrian crossing at Tower Street near St George's Field car park was installed in November.
28. Feasibility and design work on other schemes in the programme is being progressed to develop schemes for implementation, including the proposed improvements to the Riverside Path between Jubilee Terrace and Scarborough Bridge, improvements to the area around Badger Hill school to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists, and installation of new cycle parking in the city centre including spaces for non-standard bicycles such as cargo bikes. However, a further review of the Active Travel Programme will be carried out to confirm which of the remaining schemes can be progressed to delivery with the available funding.

2023/24 Major Schemes

29. The allocations within the Major Schemes block will deliver a significant programme of improvements to the city's infrastructure. Funding for these schemes has been secured from several external funding sources, with contributions from the council's capital budgets agreed to support these projects.
30. A planning application for dualling the York Outer Ring Road (A1237) is proceeding through the determination period, and the project team are working on the other key elements in the scheme such as acquiring land (where possible), developing the business case, and completing the detailed design for the scheme. Construction works are anticipated to take two years to complete, but there are a number of milestones to achieve, including securing planning consent, before funding is released for the construction of the scheme. It is proposed to reduce the 2023/24 allocation for the scheme to £1,100k and transfer the remaining funding to 2024/25, to reflect the expected costs in 2023/24.
31. Work on the first phase of the York Station Gateway scheme started on site in October with the work to remove the footbridge to the York Railway Institute. This will be followed by work to construct part of the new road, and preparatory work for the removal of Queen Street Bridge, with implementation of the scheme to continue into 2024. It is proposed to reduce the 2023/24 allocation for the scheme to £9,151k and transfer the remaining funding to 2024/25, to reflect the expected spend profile for the scheme.
32. Work to install the Hostile Vehicle Mitigation measures at key locations around the city centre began in April 2023, and the installation works have now been completed at the majority of the sites, with work at Pavement/ Parliament Street and Blake Street to be carried out in early 2024.
33. Work is continuing to progress the design work for the new rail station at Haxby whilst awaiting a decision on funding from government, following submission of a revised business case in March earlier this year. This follows the approval of a preferred site for the station by Executive in December 2021, and further approvals given at Executive in October 2022 to progress the scheme to the next stages, including the submission of a planning application, scheduled before the end of 2023. It is proposed to

reduce the allocation for this scheme to £157k and transfer the remaining funding to 2024/25, to reflect the expected spend profile for the scheme.

34. Funding has been carried forward from 2022/23 for the completion of the Tadcaster Road Transport Improvements scheme, which started on site in January 2023 and will be completed in early 2024. The transport improvements are being carried out as part of a wider scheme to address drainage issues and structural maintenance works.
35. The Castle Gateway Transport Improvements scheme aims to improve transport infrastructure in the area of the Castle Gateway development scheme. However, as the timescales for any proposed schemes are dependent on the wider development proposals and are not known at present, it is proposed to slip the majority of the funding for this scheme to 2024/25.
36. Work has continued on the Electric Vehicle Fleet Infrastructure, Union Terrace Hyper Hub, and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure schemes. The installation of charging infrastructure for electric vehicles at the council's Hazel Court depot is ongoing. A planning application has been submitted for the proposed Hyper Hub at Union Terrace car park, and work is also progressing on the installation of new electric vehicle charging points across the city, with the final works at Bishopthorpe Road and Monkbar car parks to be completed in 2023/24.
37. Preparatory work for the St Mary's Ramp Cycle Scheme was carried out earlier in the autumn, and the work to construct the ramp started in November. Due to additional utility diversion work required for the construction of the new ramp, the cost of the scheme has increased, and the allocation for the scheme has been increased to £320k.
38. The council was awarded grant funding from the government's Zero Emission Bus Regional Area (ZEBRA) fund to support the purchase of electric buses, and £9.5m grant funding has been awarded to First York for the purchase of 53 electric buses, with 40 of these already delivered to First York.
39. Full details of the budgets for the Major Schemes programme are shown in Annexes A and B to this report.

Consultation Analysis

40. While consultation is not undertaken on the capital programme as a whole, consultation is carried out for individual schemes with residents, local councillors, and other stakeholders who could be affected by the proposed scheme.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

41. The Executive Member has been presented with a proposed programme of schemes for approval, which have been developed to implement the priorities of the Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and the Council Plan. A decision not to approve the proposed programme will limit the ability of the council to meet these priorities.

Organisational Impact and Implications

42. The following implications have been considered:

- **Financial**

This report provides the Executive Member with details of the schemes that are included within capital budgets that have been set and amended by Executive and Full Council. The report details the impact on individual scheme lines within the high level budgets that have reduced from £71,695k since last reported to the Executive Member to £35,662k which was considered by the Executive at the meeting on 16 November 2023.

- **Human Resources (HR)**

There are no resource implications identified at the current time. Staffing implications would need to be assessed following any changes to planned works and managed in accordance with the Council's policies.

- **Legal**

For any grant funding, it needs to be clarified whether it can be carried forward into this financial year or into 2024/25 where relevant. It is recommended that Legal Services are consulted to review any relevant grant funding terms and conditions.

In terms of governance, it has been confirmed that any changes to the overall budget must be approved by the Executive and Full Council where appropriate through the Corporate Capital Programme Monitor reports system.

Any contractors commissioned to carry out the programme works must be procured under a robust procurement strategy in line with the Council's statutory obligations under the Public Contract Regulations 2015, and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules set out within Appendix 11 of the Constitution. Commercial Procurement and Legal Services must be consulted with where appropriate on any procurement carried pursuant to said programme.

Equality legal issues have been picked up in relevant section above.

- **Procurement**

Any proposed works or services will need to be commissioned via a compliant procurement route under the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and where applicable, the Public Contract Regulations 2015. All tenders will need to be conducted in an open, fair, and transparent way to capture the key principles of procurement. Further advice regarding the procurement routes, strategies and markets must be sought from the Commercial Procurement team.

- **Health and Wellbeing**

The transport capital programme presented in the report addresses a range of sustainability, safety, and accessibility issues which can have wide-ranging positive effects on residents' health, contributing to improving physical activity, air quality, road safety, mental health, and social equity.

- **Environment and Climate action**

The schemes contained within this report are broadly in line with the Council plans and environmental ambition of the Council. Each scheme through its evolution to delivery will consider the environmental impacts.

- **Affordability**

The schemes in the capital programme will contribute to safer infrastructure for all travel methods including cheaper and

healthier options such as walking and cycling, in addition to improved public transport options.

- **Equalities and Human Rights**

The Council recognises its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions). An EIA has not been completed for the transport capital programme as a whole as comprehensive EIA's will be completed for the individual schemes within the Transport Capital Programme.

- **Data Protection and Privacy**

Data protection impact assessment (DPIAs) are an essential part of our accountability obligations and is a legal requirement for any type of processing under UK GDPR. Failure to carry out a DPIA when required may leave the council open to enforcement action, including monetary penalties or fines. DPIAs helps us to assess and demonstrate how we comply with all of our data protection obligations. It does not have to eradicate all risks but should help to minimise and determine whether the level of risk is acceptable in the circumstances, considering the benefits of what the council wants to achieve.

The completion of the screening questions identified that a DPIA was required and as this is an ongoing risk assessment that will help us to analyse, identify and minimise the data protection risks. This will be completed following the outcomes of the Decision Session meeting on this report.

- **Communications**

The report identifies a number of major schemes and projects in 2023/24. Projects currently underway have already received significant support and resources from the communications team over the last year. These include the Local Transport Strategy consultation, Bus Service Improvement Programme (BSIP), Tadcaster Road and Hostile Vehicle Mitigation

measures. All major projects or schemes identified as taking place in 2024 will be supported by communications in the same way, to help inform and support residents, businesses and visitors of any planned works taking place, offer advice on how to move around the city while they take place to minimise disruption. Messaging will also need to reinforce that York is open for business.

- **Economy**

The schemes set out in this report respond to key elements of York's Economic Strategy 2022-32 and represent an important step in implementing that strategy. The Major Schemes included in the Programme – in particular the dualling of the outer ring road, a new station at Haxby, improvements to the station frontage, access and security improvements to the city centre and enabling infrastructure for Castle Gateway – will underpin economic growth by making York an easier and more attractive place to get to and to get around. Active travel and public transport schemes will help York's residents to get to work and York's businesses to attract and retain the talent on which they depend. It is important that close and timely dialogue continues with businesses as they experience the short-term disruption which is inevitable when delivering improvements to the transport system.

- **Specialist Implications Officers**, as appropriate.

N/A.

Risks and Mitigations

43. A risk assessment is carried out for each of the schemes in the Transport Capital Programme as part of the feasibility and delivery process, and measures are taken to reduce and manage risks as schemes are progressed throughout the year.

Wards Impacted

44. As the schemes in the Transport Capital Programme cover the whole of the City of York area, all wards are impacted by the decision.

Contact Details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

Author

Name:	James Gilchrist
Job Title:	Director of Transport, Environment and Planning
Service Area:	Directorate of Place
Telephone:	01904 552547
Report approved:	Yes
Date:	04 December 2023

Background papers

Directorate of Place Transport Capital Programme 2022/23 Monitor 2 Report - 17 January 2023 Decision Session

Annexes

Annex A: 2023/24 Transport Budget;
Annex B: 2023/24 Transport Capital Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

2023/24 Transport Capital Budget

Funding	2023/24	Amendments	Revised
	Budget		2023/24
	£1,000s	£1,000s	Budget
			£1,000s
Transport Schemes			
Local Transport Plan Grant	1,582		1,582
Bus Service Improvement Plan Grant	4,390	-396	3,994
Traffic Signal Asset Renewal (DfT Grant)		72	72
Transport Schemes Funding (CYC)	638	359	997
Access Barrier Review	71	27	98
Pedestrian Crossing Review	40		40
NCN Route 65 Improvements	348	8	356
Developer Funding		38	38
Smarter Travel Evolution Programme	668	-368	300
Active Travel Programme			
Cycling Schemes	232	139	371
Active Travel Fund Grant	265	1,387	1,652
Active Travel Fund Match Funding (CYC)	542	486	1,028
Maintenance			
Flood Sign Renewal	180	15	195
Major Schemes			
Outer Ring Road Dualling	24,205	-23,105	1,100
York Station Gateway	12,420	-3,269	9,151
City Centre Access & Security	2,522	-105	2,417
Haxby Station	15,065	-14,908	157
Tadcaster Road Transport Enhancements		922	922
Castle Gateway Transport Development	3,527	-2,962	565
Electric Vehicle Fleet Infrastructure		38	38
Hyper Hubs		201	201
Electric Vehicle Charging		131	131
ZEBRA Grant	5,000	5,258	10,258
Total	71,695	-36,033	35,662

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
Public Transport				
PT05/22	Bus Priority - Radial Routes	1,250	1,481	Feasibility/ Delivery
PT06/22	City Centre Bus Priority	750	410	
PT07/22	P&R Interchanges	1,750		
PT07/22a	P&R Interchanges – Askham Bar		100	
PT07/22b	P&R Interchanges – Grimston Bar		326	
PT07/22c	P&R Interchanges – Monks Cross		29	
PT07/22d	P&R Interchanges – Poppleton Bar		34	
PT07/22e	P&R Interchanges – Rawcliffe Bar		186	
PT08/22	Bus Stop Upgrades	150	142	
PT09/22	Real Time Information Screens	490	1,290	
PT10/22	Small Scale Bus Priority	50	46	
Public Transport - Carryover Schemes				
PT03/22	Bus 'Tap Off' Readers		105	Delivery
PR01/20	P&R Token Barriers		40	Delivery
Total Public Transport		4,440	4,189	

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
	Traffic Management			
TM01/23	TSAR Programme	1,050	1,002	
	Malton Road/ New Lane Jct			Delivery
	Tadcaster Road/ Sim Balk Lane Jct			Delivery
	Heworth Green/ Dodsworth Ave Crossing			Feasibility
	Fossbank/ Layerthorpe Jct			Feasibility
	Pavement/ Piccadilly Jct			Feasibility
	Previous Years Costs			Previous Years
TM02/23	Air Quality Monitoring	20	20	Delivery
TM03/23	Signing & Lining - New Schemes	20	20	Delivery
TM04/23	Car Park Counters	5	5	Feasibility
	Traffic Management - Carryover Schemes			
TM04/22	ANPR Bus Lane Enforcement	185	230	Delivery
TM14/19	The Groves Traffic Restrictions (LTN)	10	23	Delivery
TM05/21	Piccadilly Transport Improvements	10		N/A
TM07/18	Hungate CCTV		38	Delivery
Total Traffic Management		1,300	1,338	

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
	Pedestrian & Cycling Schemes			
CY01/21	Access Barrier Review	146	173	Delivery
PE01/23	Pedestrian Crossing Review	60	60	
	Heworth Green (near Malton Ave)			Future Years
	Kent Street/ Fawcett Street			Future Years
	Folk Hall, New Earswick			Future Years
	Water Lane near Rawcliffe Drive			Future Years
	New Lane near Anthea Drive			Feasibility
	Peasholme Green/ St Saviour's Place (Hiscox)			Feasibility
	Boroughbridge Road (Langley Gates development)			Feasibility
	Fulford Road Crossing (Germany Beck)			Feasibility
PE02/23	LCWIP Infrastructure Schemes	65		N/A
PE03/23	Pedestrian Minor Schemes	30	30	Delivery
CY01/23	Cycle Minor Schemes	40	40	Delivery
PE04/23	Dropped Crossings	55	55	Delivery

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
PE05/23	City Centre Dropped Kerbs	50	110	Delivery
PE06/23	Dropped Kerbs & Access Improvements	200	250	Delivery
	Pedestrian & Cycling - Carryover Schemes			
PE04/22	PROW Structural Upgrades	60	91	Delivery
CY05/22	NCN 65 Improvements	348	356	
	Millennium Bridge Approaches			Feasibility
	Other NCN 65 Schemes			Delivery
CY04/22	Solar System Cycle Route Improvements (Tadcaster Road to Playing Fields)		148	Delivery
Total Pedestrian & Cycling Schemes		1,054	1,313	

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
	Safety Schemes			
New	2024/25 Programme Development			Feasibility
SR02/21	Osbalwick Primary School			Feasibility
SR01/20	St Mary's Primary, Askham Richard			Feasibility
SR02/20	OLQM / Hamilton Drive			Feasibility
SR02/22	Millfield Lane (Manor CoE)			Feasibility
	Local Safety Schemes			
New	Programme Development / Cluster Site Review			Feasibility
New	RSA4 Reviews			Feasibility
LS01/19 b	Fawcett St / Paragon St LSS			Delivery
LS02/20	Monkgate Roundabout LSS			Feasibility
LS04/22	Front Street / Askham Lane LSS			N/A
LS05/22	Wetherby Road / Ridgeway LSS			Feasibility
LS06/22	Heworth Green / Eboracum Way LSS			Feasibility
LS07/22	A166/ Bore Tree Baulk LSS			N/A
New	Bradley Lane Rufforth LSS			Delivery
New	Heworth Green/ Malton Rd/ Stockton Lane Roundabout LSS			Feasibility
New	York Rd/ Carr Lane/ Front Street/ Beech Grove LSS			Feasibility
New	The Mount/ Blossom Street/ Holgate Road LSS			Feasibility
New	Eastfield Avenue / York Road Haxby LSS			Feasibility
New	Foxwood Lane/ Thanet Road LSS			Feasibility
New	Maple Grove / Fulford Road LSS			Feasibility
New	Burdyke Avenue/ Kingsway North LSS			Feasibility
	Danger Reduction			
New	2024/25 Programme Development			Feasibility
DR02/22 a	Reactive DR – Heslington Road	205	205	Delivery
DR02/22 b	Reactive DR - Union Terrace			N/A
DR03/21 a	Askham Lane / Ridgeway Roundabout DR			Delivery
DR03/21 c	Jockey Lane / Monks Cross Link DR			Feasibility
DR03/21 d	Wheldrake Lane / Elvington Road DR			Delivery
DR03/22	Black Dike Lane DR			Feasibility
New	Huntington Road DR			Feasibility
New	Danebury Drive/ Rosedale Ave DR			Future Years
	Speed Management			
New	2024/25 Programme Development			Feasibility
SM01/18	Alness Drive SM			Feasibility
SM01/21 a	Heslington Lane 20mph Zone Review			Delivery

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
SM01/21 b	Howard Link Rawcliffe SM			Delivery
SM01/21 c	New Lane Acomb SM			Delivery
SM01/21 d	Rawcliffe Drive SM			Feasibility
SM02/22	Irwin Avenue SM			Feasibility
SM03/22	Grassholme SM			Feasibility

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
New	Elvington Lane 20mph Zone Review			Feasibility
New	New Lane Huntington SM			Feasibility
New	Vehicle Activated Signs Review			Delivery
	Safety Schemes - Carryover Schemes			
LS01/19 a	Foss Islands/ Navigation Road Local Safety Sc	165	165	Delivery
Total Safety Schemes		370	370	

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	

Other Costs				
-	Previous Years Costs	30	30	Previous Years
STEP	STEP (Maintenance Costs)	668	300	Previous Years

Total Other Costs	698	330
--------------------------	------------	------------

Total Integrated Transport	7,862	7,540
-----------------------------------	--------------	--------------

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
	Active Travel Programme			
CY01/20	Cycle Schemes	1,039	1,519	Feasibility/ Delivery
	Hospital Fields Road Cycle Route			
	Skeldergate - Cycle Improvements at Build-o			
	Manor Lane/ Shipton Road Improvements			
	City Centre North-South Cycle Route			
	University East-West Campus Link			
	Active Travel Fund - Tranche 2			
AT02/21	A19 Shipton Road Cycle Route - Phase 1 Inter			
AT03/21	City Centre Accessibility: St George's Field Cro			
	Active Travel Fund - Tranche 3			
AT01/22	Cycle Parking Improvements - City Centre			
AT02/22 a	People Streets: Clifton Green Primary			
AT02/22 b	People Streets: Badger Hill Primary			
	Active Travel Fund - Tranche 4			
CY03/22	Riverside Cycle Path Improvements (York Central)		1,531	Delivery
	Active Travel Programme - Phase 2 Schemes			
	A1237 Ouse Bridge Scheme			On Hold
	Orbital Cycle Route at Lawrence St / James St			
	Wheldrake / Heslington Path			
	Acomb Road Scheme			
	Fishergate Gyratory Ped and Cycle Scheme			
	Fulford Road / Frederick House			
	Rougier St / Tanners Moat Gap			
	Chocolate Works Riverside Path			
	Tang Hall Lane / Foss Islands Path			
	A19 Shipton Road (Corridor Improvements)			
Total Active Travel Programme		1,039	3,050	

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
Maintenance Schemes				
SM01/21	Flood Sign Renewal	180	195	Delivery
Total Maintenance Schemes		180	195	

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme Ref	2023/24 Transport Capital Programme	23/24 Budget	Proposed 23/24 Budget	Scheme Status
		£1,000s	£1,000s	
Major Schemes				
OR01/17 OR02/17	Outer Ring Road Dualling	24,205	1,100	Feasibility
YC01/17	York Station Gateway	12,420	9,151	Delivery
TM07/18	City Centre Access & Security (HVM)	2,522	2,417	Delivery
HS01/21	Haxby Station	15,065	157	Feasibility
TR01/21	Tadcaster Road Transport Enhancements		922	Delivery
CG01/21	Castle Gateway Transport Development	3,527	565	Feasibility
EV01/22	EV Fleet Infrastructure		38	Delivery
TM07/16	Union Terrace Hyper Hub		201	Feasibility
TM04/20	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure		131	Delivery
CY04/15	Scarborough Bridge Cycle Routes: St Mary's R	135	330	Delivery
ZE01/22	ZEBRA Grant	5,000	10,258	Delivery

Total Major Schemes	62,874	25,269
----------------------------	---------------	---------------

Total Programme	71,955	36,055
------------------------	---------------	---------------

Overprogramming	260	393
------------------------	------------	------------

Total Budget	71,695	35,662
---------------------	---------------	---------------

This page is intentionally left blank