

---

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Meeting | Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport |
| Date    | 20 February 2020                                  |
| Present | Councillors D'Agorne and Waller                   |

---

## **57. Declarations of Interest**

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 that he might have had in respect of business on the agenda.

The Executive Member declared a potential interest in Agenda item 6 'Consideration of Objections Received to the Proposed Residents' Priority Parking Area on Fulford Crossing' in that it had been pointed out to him that in his capacity as Ward Councillor, he was not impartial and would therefore not be able to determine this item. The Executive Member for Economy and Strategic Planning, Cllr Waller took the Chair for this item.

## **58. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session of the Executive Member for Transport and Planning held on 17 January 2020 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

## **59. Public Participation**

It was reported that there had been two registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. They both spoke on Agenda item 6 'Proposed Residents' Priority Parking Area on Fulford Cross' as set out below.

Mr Richard Iggulden, long term local resident, spoke in objection to the proposals. He considered that there was no benefit to the proposal and that most of the traffic problems in the area arose at key school drop off and pick up times of 08:30 -09:30 and 15:30 – 16:30 due to the two schools in the area which may discourage . parents from sending their children to either of these schools. He suggested that it would be beneficial if an up

to date travel plan were produced and called for an urgent review of traffic access to the City.

Ms Antje Ramming-Robinson, long term local resident spoke in support of the proposal which she considered was essential. She highlighted that during the day there was very little parking space available. Cars were parking on the verges or blocking drives. Residents had requested this Resident Parking Area and there had been two consultations undertaken since this request. The proposals in the report were in accordance with the wishes of residents.

#### **60. Consideration of Objection Received to Proposed Traffic Regulation Order at Longfield Terrace**

The Executive Member considered a report outlining the objection made to the proposal to include a small section of Longfield Terrace into the existing residents parking zone (R33). The report asks the Executive Member to consider the proposal with the objection received and to decide the way forward on this matter.

The options available were:

1. Option 1 – implement the proposed restrictions as advertised. This is the recommended option because it is in line with what local residents have requested.  
(Recommended Option)
2. Option 2 – drop the proposals and take no further action. This is not the recommended option because it would not deliver an improved parking provision for local residents.

The Executive Member considered the objection received from a visitor to York and advised that the Council has a Park and Ride scheme and provides city centre parking.

**Resolved:** That Option 1 be approved, to implement the proposed restrictions as advertised.

**Reason:** To provide the improved parking provision for residents in line with what the majority have indicated they would like.

## **61. Consideration of Objections Received to Proposed Traffic Regulation Order Changes at Piccadilly**

The Executive Member considered a report on the objections made to a proposal to create Blue badge holder and loading bay provision in Piccadilly. The report asks the Executive Member to consider the proposal with the objections received and decide the way forward on this matter.

The options available were:

1. Option 1 – implement the proposed restrictions as advertised. This is the recommended option because it helps to mitigate the changes made to the city centre pedestrian zone. (Recommended Option)
2. Option 2 – consider advertising a revised set of restrictions. This is not the recommended option because there is no practical way of providing improvements for blue badge holders without impacting on other users.
3. Option 3 – drop the proposals and take no further action. This is not the recommended option because it would not deliver the desired improvements for blue badge holder parking.

The Traffic Team Leader and the Traffic Project Officer, provided the following information in response to questions from the Executive Member:

- Regarding the under used taxi rank, observations had been that this was rarely used during the day.
- Officers confirmed that the taxi rank was restricted to licensed vehicles only.

**Resolved:** That Option 1 be approved and that the revised restrictions be introduced as advertised.

**Reason:** To provide the improved parking provision for residents in line with what the majority have indicated they would like.

## **62. Consideration of Objections Received to the Proposed Residents' Priority Parking Area on Fulford Cross**

The Executive Member for Economy and Strategic Planning, Cllr Waller, took the Chair for this item as the Executive Member for Transport had declared a potential interest in this item.

Cllr Waller considered a report on the representations received in response to an advertised proposal to introduce a Residents' Priority Parking Area on Fulford Cross. The report asked the Executive Member to consider the proposal with the objections received and decide the way forward on this matter.

The options available were:

1. Option (i): To over-rule the objections received and authorise implementation of the Residents' Priority Parking Area and additional restrictions as advertised and defined in Annex A. (Recommended Option)
2. Option (ii): Uphold the objections and take no further action on this matter. This is not a recommended option (see Analysis/16)

The Traffic Team Leader and the Traffic Project Officer, provided the following information in response to questions from Cllr Waller and the representations received:

- Resident Parking schemes are put forward by residents with a petition and are not schemes that Council officers suggest to communities. On receiving a petition officers work with residents to produce a scheme that is suitable.
- On page 26 of the Agenda pack it states that the School Travel Co-ordinator at City of York Council would work with any school to educate and encourage sustainable models of travel when asked.
- There were additional resources to support the Residential Parking Scheme if it was found to have had an impact further along the street at Danesmead Estate, and should they request a Residents Parking scheme, they would go to the top of the list.
- Officers confirmed that there were resources in place to accelerate Residential Parking Schemes. This had meant that these schemes were led by residents rather than a Council imposed whole area review.

Resolved: That Option – 1 be approved, to over-rule the objections received and authorise implementation of the Residents' Priority Parking Area and additional restrictions as advertised and defined in Annex A.

Reason: To improve residential parking amenity for the residents of Fulford Cross. On consultation, the majority of residents who responded supported the introduction of a Resident Parking Area.

Cllr A D'Agorne, Executive Member for Transport  
[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 2.30 pm].