

---

MEETING	DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITY STRATEGY
DATE	1 JUNE 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR STEVE GALLOWAY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS D'AGORNE, HORTON AND SIMPSON-LAING

## 1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting Members present were invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

## 2. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy, held on 11 May 2010 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

- i) Inclusion of Cllr Merrett as 'In Attendance' at the Session.
- ii) Minute 99, in the seventh line of the third paragraph the amendment of the word 'path' to 'paths'.
- iii) Minute 101, in the sixth paragraph, following the words 'He went onto' the following additional wording *'say that Cllr Gunnell, had also been present at the last briefing with officers, when they had seen an earlier version of the current proposal, but they had not been given the detailed traffic figures, only a verbal summary. He said that at the briefing they had raised 9 issues of concern on the then plan, and the majority of these had not been reported in the Officers report. He hoped the smaller ones could be picked up in the promised further local consultation. In terms of the proposals overall, he felt the traffic studies highlighted the short-comings of the piecemeal approach to tackling problems at single locations in the city centre, where the traffic consequences of doing the right thing at that location, like here at Blossom Street of providing separate cycle lanes, gave unacceptable traffic consequences. A comprehensive approach to*

*reducing traffic in and around the city centre was required to free up space for alternative measures, and was going to be the only way of improving safety for cyclists.’ and the deletion of the following ‘raise a number of concerns including that no separate cycle lanes were proposed on the Blossom Street approach and that a comprehensive traffic solution was the only means of improving safety for cyclists.’*

- iv) Minute 102, the addition of the words ‘ Wigginton Road Park and Ride’ prior to the words ‘ bus service’ in the fourth paragraph.

### **3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - DECISION SESSION**

It was reported that there had been five registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council’s Public Participation Scheme. Details of the speakers are set out under the individual agenda items.

### **4. A19 FULFORD ROAD AND FISHERGATE GYRATORY IMPROVEMENTS STUDIES**

The Executive Member considered a report, which identified the transport issues to be addressed, and potential improvement measures in the following areas on the A19 Fulford Road corridor:

- Cemetery Road junction
- Cemetery Road to Fishergate School
- Fishergate Gyratory
- Piccadilly junction

Details of the various options for these areas were set out in the Officers report.

The Executive Member reported receipt of two additional representations from a resident whose child attended Fishergate Primary School and from a Parent Governor in support of a 20mph in the vicinity of the school.

Officers updated that additional points had also been received by email from Councillor Merrett in relation to the northern section of the A19 Fulford Road Corridor and the Fishergate Gyratory. The Executive Member confirmed that he would ask Officers to examine these issues at the next stage of the process.

Representations were received from a member of the Cycling Touring Club (CTC) who confirmed that they were broadly in favour of the scheme and welcomed further opportunity to comment on the proposals at the detailed design stage. He also raised a number of points in relation to possible options for light controlled crossings at Blue Bridge Lane/Melbourne Street, liaison with Cycling England re timescales, a new right turn facility linked to an advisory southbound route through St Georges Field car park and recommended widths for traffic islands.

Representations were also received from a Fishergate resident who was also the parent of a child who attended Fishergate School. He highlighted the benefits of lower vehicle speeds in relation to pedestrian accidents and to the speed of traffic in the vicinity of both Fishergate and St George's Primary Schools. He pointed out that a petition signed by nearly 300 residents had been collected in support of a 20mph limit outside these schools and that it would be better to carry out this work during the present improvements rather than delay.

Councillor D'Agorne, as Ward Member for Fishergate, confirmed that he welcomed the proposals for the gyratory system including the widening of the footway in front of Fishergate School. However he strongly urged that consultation should include the options for a 20mph limit from Grange Street/Howard Street to Fishergate School as both schools were working hard to promote walking and cycling to school. He confirmed that there was clear public support for a 20mph limit and that he felt the proposed alterations without the lower speed limit would fail to meet the objectives of the strategy and in some cases make it worse for the safety of cyclists.

Officers responded to the comments and confirmed that the ultimate aim of the scheme was to reduce traffic speeds. They pointed out that they were aiming to carry out speed surveys prior to public consultation to gain support for the proposals from both the Police and consultees.

The Executive Member confirmed that generally the officer proposals had been well received with the exception of the treatment of the speed limit outside Fishergate School. He acknowledged that there appeared to be an anomaly at this point, as most schools now had a 20mph zone outside their entrances, and confirmed that he would be amending the recommendation to allow for public consultation on a proposal to establish this.

The Executive Member also confirmed that Officers would examine the detailed issues raised by those who had made written and verbal representations as they developed the details of the scheme.

- RESOLVED:
- i) That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:
    - ii) Note the contents of the report and its annexes.
    - iii) Note that proposals to improve the safety of the Cemetery Road junction are still being developed and to agree to receive a further report in due course.
    - iv) The proposals as shown in Annex A, including option 1A, should form the basis for the proposed improvements between Cemetery Road and Fishergate School.
    - v) The proposals shown in Annex B should form the basis of the proposed improvements to Fishergate Gyratory.

- v) Note that it is not proposed to amend the junction with Piccadilly at the current time and to agree to further investigations into a staggered crossing in the vicinity of this junction.
- vi) Carry out public consultation on the proposed improvements.
- vii) Advertise any Traffic Orders associated with the proposed improvements.<sup>1</sup>
- viii) Commence detailed design on the basis of the proposals shown in Annexes A, including option 1A, and B to review the proposals to take due account of any issues raised during the consultation process and to address any outstanding written and verbal representations, made to this meeting as part of that exercise.<sup>2</sup>
- ix) Implement the proposed reduction in carriageway width and associated changes in lane use at the southern end of the Fishergate gyratory on a trial basis and monitor its implications pending implementation of the permanent scheme.

REASON: To improve conditions at these key locations and sections of the corridor and to give the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed improvements.

Action Required

- 1. Commence public consultation and advertise traffic orders on the agreed scheme DW
- 2. Commence detailed design on agreed scheme. DW

**5. WATER END CYCLE SCHEME EVALUATION**

The Executive Member considered a report, which advised him of the outcome of monitoring of the Water End cycle scheme and the effectiveness of the scheme in encouraging increases in cycling levels. The report also considered the purpose of the scheme, traffic and cycling data and the impacts of the scheme on other parts of the highway network, specifically Westminster Road and The Avenue. He also considered details of the option contained in a previous report to implement a road closure with reference to the draft recommendations from the Councillor Call for Action Task Group.

Representations were received from the Cyclists Touring Club who confirmed that it was not possible for York to build its way out of congestion and that the Water End scheme showed the need to consider other transport options, without which they felt future gridlock would

become a certainty. They also pointed out the Scrutiny Committee's findings revealed some useful learning points for future schemes.

Representations were also made by a resident of Westminster Road who confirmed that there had been a 97% increase in through traffic volume in Westminster Road/The Avenue. He stated that this increase was as a result of the changes made to the Water End junction. He referred to the table of Comparative Traffic Volumes in the Officers report and pointed out that these were not due to the action of the Council elsewhere. He pointed out that some anecdotal information had been omitted from the notes of the CCfA Task Group meetings. He pointed out that nothing had been proposed to assist the problems that residents were encountering in the area.

Officers pointed out that the report had not been intended as a response to the recommendations of the Task Groups report and that all the Groups findings would be examined by the Executive at their meeting on 6 July.

The Executive Member confirmed that he could not ignore the Scrutiny Committees deliberations and while it would be inappropriate to agree implementation of their proposals before the Executive had discussed the issue to aid clarity he would be endorsing the recommendations in relation to future capital programme modelling work and the timescales etc for review of future schemes. He referred to the "new, comprehensive proposals for the Water End junction" as referred to by the Scrutiny Committee and questioned the type of options the Committee had in mind.

The Scrutiny Officer confirmed that the Task Group had now held its last meeting but that it had intended that all possible options should be considered to gain improvements at the junction and reduce traffic flows in Westminster Road/The Avenue.

The Executive Member confirmed that improvements in the area had proved to be controversial and that when agreed members had appreciated that there would be some negative implications. However, the scheme had been successful in increasing the number of cyclists using the corridor and any increase in the number of people cycling was an advantage to all road users. He did point out that the volume of vehicles now using Westminster Road was less than on many other streets where residents complained of "rat running". He stated that it was now clear that, after a settling down period, the length of time taken to get through the Water End junction was broadly comparable to the situation before the cycle lane was established although some queue lengths had changed.

The Executive Member then went on to express his appreciation to Officers for the work they had put into addressing the problems at this junction .

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the success of the scheme in achieving its main objective of delivering increased levels of cycling.

- ii) Note that a road closure in the Westminster Road area would generate increases in traffic queues, and delay, at the Clifton Green junction would potentially significantly impact on the operation of the junction and other parts of the network.
- iii) Instruct officers to give further consideration to altering the signal timings during the AM peak and weekend operation <sup>1</sup>.
- iv) Instruct officers to give further consideration to linking the crossing points to optimise traffic flow heading towards the Clifton Green junction. <sup>2</sup>.
- v) Note the recommendations of the Scrutiny CCfA review to the Executive on 6 July and
  - Suggests to the individual members of the Scrutiny Committee that, in light of officer concerns about the limited options available to them, they should make clear precisely what changes they would expect to see covered by their recommendation for “new, comprehensive proposals for the Water End junctions to improve the current junction and reduce greatly traffic flows in Westminster Road/The Avenue”? and <sup>3</sup>.
  - Endorses the following scrutiny recommendations:
    - a. That the Council should, in future, use traffic models which incorporate side streets when assessing and designing junction improvements
    - b. That the present policy of reviewing new highway schemes only after a period of twelve months should be modified to enable a review after three months when unforeseen consequences have arisen and when Ward Members request it.

REASON: To retain the benefits of the cycle scheme without causing additional delay to the network and to alter the signal timings in order to improve traffic flow travelling towards and through the junction, which is intended to reduce the amount of traffic diverting through Westminster Road and The Avenue.

Action Required

- 1/2. Examine suggested changes in resolutions iii) and iv) RS
- 3. Request Scrutiny Committee members for further details TW

**6. 20MPH SPEED LIMIT PETITIONS FOR SOVEREIGN PARK AND DODSWORTH AVENUE**

Consideration was given to a report, which advised the Executive Member of the proposed response to the receipt of two petitions requesting 20mph speed limits at Sovereign Park and Dodsworth Avenue. Both petitions had been considered under the criteria set out and agreed

at the December 2009 Decision Session and the report included an updated prioritisation table which included the data for both these petitions.

Representations in support of the 20mph speed limit at Sovereign Park were received from a representative of the Sovereign Park Residents Association. He confirmed that a petition supporting the reduction in speed limit had been signed by 223 residents, which represented 87.1% of the households in the area. He referred to the prioritisation table and to the factors affecting prioritisation many of which he felt the area met. He stated that the estate had a lot of young families with children and that there had already been two vehicle collisions involving a child on the estate roads as vehicles often drove too fast for the conditions. He pointed out that the signage required would be minimal and requested the Executive Member to support local residents and prioritise a 20mph speed limit at Sovereign Park.

Councillor Simpson Laing referred to the large amount of local support for the Sovereign Park petition. She stated that the estate design was flawed with blind bends, no footpaths and a central play area with no barriers to prevent children wandering onto the roads, which aggravated the dangers of speeding traffic.

Councillor Horton went through the prioritisation criteria explaining how the request for a 20mph speed limit at Sovereign Park met all the criteria. He confirmed that residents had witnessed two accidents on the estate but as the estate roads had only recently been adopted these accidents had not been recorded which affected prioritisation of the scheme. He also referred to errors in the report and to unnecessary delays relating to the LTP3 consultation and requested the Executive Member to progress this scheme without delay.

Officers confirmed that they would have to examine Police records to ascertain whether details of accidents were collected in respect of unadopted roads. She stated that it had not been suggested that Sovereign Park did not meet the criteria but that, together with other requests across the city, it had not been allocated a higher priority than some other schemes.

The Executive Member pointed out that the priority list had been agreed in December without any disagreement. He stated that Sovereign Park had traffic speeds of 14mph which was the lowest of any street or group of streets suggested for a limit change and that it was unlikely that the provision of signs would result in further speed reductions. He referred to the residents survey as part of LTP3 to be undertaken later in the year, which meant that no additional 20mph speed limits would be implemented prior to receipt of these results. He confirmed that the request from Sovereign Park residents had been added to the priority list and that it would be progressed as resources became available.

The following options were considered:

Option one – Agree the prioritisation for both petitions and await the outcome of the LTP3 consultation before undertaking any further

implementation in relation to Sovereign Park and await the outcome of the Speed Review Process in relation to Dodsworth Avenue.

Option two – Do not agree the current prioritisation but still await the outcome of the LTP3 consultation process.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the relative priority of the petitions set out in the table (annex A) in relation to other petitions and requests received.
- ii) No further action being taken at the current time in relation to Sovereign Park but that it is retained on the list for possible implementation when higher priorities have been addressed and resources become available. <sup>1</sup>.
- iii) Note that Dodsworth Avenue is currently being considered through the speed review process, requests officers to provide an update on progress at a future Executive Member Decision Session meeting and to update residents on the progress being made by including a briefing note in the next Heworth Ward Committee newsletter. <sup>2</sup>.

REASON: To progress requests and petitions against the agreed criteria and in priority order and to enable those requests that do not comply with key elements of the criteria to be considered through other processes.

Action Required

1. Inform lead petitioner of decision. RS
2. Provide update on progress to future meeting and include details in Ward newsletter. RS

**7. CITY STRATEGY CAPITAL PROGRAMME - 2009/10 OUTTURN REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report which informed the Executive Member of the outturn position for schemes in the 2009/10 capital programme, including budget spend to 31 March 2010 together with details of progress of schemes in the year. Information was also provided of any variations between the outturn and budget and the report sought the Executive Members approval for funding to be carried forward to 2010/11 subject to Executive approval.

The report confirmed that changes had resulted in a current approved capital programme for 2009/10 of £5,233k with an outturn of £4,737k. In relation to carry over of funding, it was proposed to carry over £92k for the continued repair of the city walls together with the £13k underspend on the Regional Funding Allocation.



The Executive Member reported receipt of a request from Councillor Potter in relation to the possible option of using compulsory purchase powers for the joining up of the James Street Link Road owing to traffic problems in the area.

Officers confirmed that there were a number of issues to solve with the developer in relation the Link Road including contaminated land.

The Executive Member recorded his thanks to officers for the work they had undertaken in implementing the agreed capital investment programme over the year.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member agrees to:

- i) Note the progress achieved delivering schemes in the Capital Programme as indicated in the Annexes to the report.
- ii) Approve the proposed carryovers as outlined in paragraphs 21 to 23 of the report, subject to the approval of the Executive. <sup>1</sup>.
- iii) Request an officer update on the options available for progressing the James Street link road scheme. <sup>2</sup>.

REASON: To enable the effective management and monitoring of the Council's Capital Programme.

Action Required

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Refer to Executive.                  | TC |
| 2. Provide update for a future meeting. | TC |

Cllr Steve Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy  
[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 5.05 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank