MEETING	DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITY STRATEGY
DATE	6 APRIL 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR STEVE GALLOWAY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)

89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Merrett, declared a personal non prejudicial interest in respect of Agenda item 6 (Adoption of Highways on New Estates – Update Report) as he lived on a road that was unadopted.

90. MINUTES

The Executive Member stated that he had received a request from Cllr Merrett for the inclusion of additional information in the preamble to Minute 87 (City of York's Local Transport Plan 3 – Stage 1 Consultation Results and Preparations for Stage 2 (Options and Impacts) Consultation). Cllr Merrett felt that the minute did not adequately reflect the concerns he had raised. The Executive Member confirmed that he was happy for these to be incorporated into the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy, held on 2 March 2010 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record, subject to amendment of the preamble in paragraph 6 of Minute 87 as set out below:

Councillor Merrett referred to the concerns specified in the reasons for the call in of this report. He questioned how the results of the Traffic Congestion Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee would be taken into account as no acknowledgement was made of their work in the LTP3 strategy - *the committees short / medium term recommendations had been agreed two months ago so as they could be taken into account but hadn't been brought forward to the executive for some reason.* He also felt that residents would find Annex C confusing with the overlap in short and longer term options. He stated that earlier agreement had been reached that the Traffic Congestion and the LPT3 surveys would not overlap and that there would be clear distinctions between the two. Finally he stated that he felt this questionnaire was seriously flawed in relation to the four options *whose components were then subject to a separate yes or no* multiple choice. *He was concerned on* the effects *of this* on *the overall validity of* each *main option - knocking out key components would make the assessment of the effects of that option completely wrong.*

91. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - DECISION SESSION

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Details of the speaker are set out under the individual agenda items.

92. PETITIONS FOR 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS ON RESIDENTIAL ROADS IN YORK

The Executive Member considered a report, which advised him on progress towards prioritisation of a number of petitions and requests for 20 mph speed limits.

Officers updated that since the report had been compiled there had been changes to the LTP3 consultation process, which meant that, rather than consultation on 20mph speed limits on residential streets being undertaken in April this would now take place in the summer. She also confirmed that whilst a number of paths had not been included at this time this was only the first stage towards the production of a Definitive Map and these paths could be picked up for further investigation at a later stage.

Cllr Merrett welcomed the report and the inclusion of the South Bank area for implementation of a 20mph scheme. He did however express concern at the requirement for a response rate of 50% but stated that he was pleased to learn that the 50% household support rate was in relation to prioritisation of the requests and petitions and that schemes would be progressed on a lower percentage return provided that at least 50% of the returns were in favour.

The Executive Member confirmed that Annex A to the report set out the latest prioritised position based on current information and that this would effectively become a work programme, the highest priority being given to those records with a record of accidents. He referred to Officers reference to accident levels on a number of roads where an unenforced 20mph limit could not be introduced and that he was proposing that these should be investigated under the Council's existing speed management and accident reduction policies.

The Executive Members also confirmed that, in view of the delay in polling residents on the introduction of a citywide 20mph zone, he felt it advisable not to authorise any physical works on 20mph limits pending receipt of the results of the consultation.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option one – Agree the latest prioritised position and agree to progress the schemes in paragraph 11 through the 2010/11 capital programme.

Option two – Agree the prioritisation but do not proceed with further delivery until the results of the LTP3 survey are known.

Option three – Do not agree the current prioritisation or implementation of further 20mph schemes.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees:

i) The prioritised list of petitions and requests as shown at (revised) Annex A;

ii) To progress the next four schemes on the list through the 2010/11 capital programme, which are: Holly Bank area, Westminster Road, Low Poppleton Road and Millfield Lane.

iii) To note that the next LTP3 consultation will contain a question on 20mph speed limits and that no expenditure on physical works, on additional 20 mph limits, be incurred until the results of that survey are known.

iv) That the Key Route roads shown on the Annex be considered as part of the Councils on going accident reduction processes. [1.]

REASON: To enable a response to petitions to be progressed and a number of 20mph speed limit schemes to be developed for implementation during 2010/11 as part of the capital programme.

Action Required
1. Commence work on schemes and ensure key route roads are considered as part of the accident reduction process. RS

93. PROPOSED NARROW CYCLE LANE TRIALS - MUSEUM STREET/LENDAL BRIDGE AND GILLYGATE

The Executive Member considered a report, which advised him of feedback from consultation on proposals to introduce narrow cycle lanes on Museum Street/Lendal Bridge and Gillygate. The proposals were intended to improve facilities for cyclists on these narrow roads, where queuing traffic often obstructed the progress of cyclists riding on their nearside. It was intended to introduce proposals on a trial basis in order to evaluate their effectiveness.

Cllr Merrett stated that he welcomed the trialling of the narrow cycle lanes and that he hoped this would be closely monitored, as it would have significant benefits for cyclists. He referred to the proposals for Gillygate where there was room for a narrow cycle way inbound but he felt there was insufficient room in the central section of this route. He also referred to the proposals for an advanced stop line box at St Leonard's Place, which did not appear very large and he suggested maximising its length.

Officers confirmed that they would certainly examine the issues Cllr Merrett had raised when implementing the scheme.

The Executive Member confirmed that he was happy for Officers to examine the points raised and for them to have delegated powers to implement whatever was safe and practical in relation to these schemes. [1.]

He went onto refer to the fact that no consensus had been reached on how cycling speed and safety could be improved on the Museum Street/Lendal Bridge corridor and therefore he felt it advisable to defer further consideration of this pending a review of the trials on Gillygate.

Consideration was also given to the following options:
Option 1 – implement the proposals as shown in Annexes A (for Lendal Bridge/Museum Street) and B (for Gillygate), as consulted upon;

Option 2 – implement the revised proposals resulting from consultation feedback, as shown in Annex D for Museum Street/Lendal Bridge, and the original proposal for Gillygate as shown in Annex B;

Option 3 – implement a variation of the proposals to incorporate any changes that may be deemed necessary.

Option 4 – make no alterations to the current situation

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member agrees:

i) On a trial basis, to implement the proposal for Gillygate shown at Annex B of the report;

ii) To provide direction signage on the Advanced Stop Line (ASLs) boxes on St Leonard's Place and Museum Street;

iii) To defer consideration of any other changes to road markings on the Lendal Bridge corridor until the results of the trial of the use of narrow cycle lanes on Gillygate have been evaluated;

iv) That cycle margin carriageway maintenance work, for this corridor, be given a high priority. [2.]

REASON: Officers consider that these proposals will benefit cyclists, as they will improve the passage for cyclists on the nearside of queuing vehicles. The proposed measures would also contribute towards the aims of the Council as a Cycling City.

Action Required

1/2. Implement Gillygate scheme on a trial basis. JP

94. ADOPTION OF HIGHWAYS ON NEW ESTATES - UPDATE REPORT

The Executive Member considered a report, which provided an interim progress report on highway adoptions, completed, together with the current work programme and general development activity.

Cllr Merrett raised concerns at the unsatisfactory length of time taken in relation to the adoption of highways. He questioned the possibility of making representations to the relevant agencies to accelerate the process.

Officers confirmed that they had pressed for discussions with Yorkshire Water regarding sewer adoptions and that they supported the making of additional representations as this was also a significant issue for Officers.

The Executive Member confirmed that many of the issues appeared to be out of the control of the authority. He confirmed that he supported Officers drafting a letter of representation to the local MP to request them to examine if there were any legislative changes that could be implemented in an effort to expedite these issues. [1.]

Consideration was given to the following options:
Option A - Note the content of the update report and request that officers prepare the subsequent Annual report in the autumn.

Option B - With reference to Paragraph 14, there is an opportunity to consider revising the Fee rate percentage, in the range of 1% – 3%, for the auditing of technical submissions and supervision of works.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member notes the progress being made with many adoption schemes in the City and agrees that a raked percentage fee linked to the commencement of road building be investigated as detailed under Option B. [2.]

REASON: It will provide the most informative analysis, including an ongoing review of work programme and service performance, together with engagement with developers to provide improved understanding of their commercial processes, and identify opportunities for improvement, for the overall benefit of residents

Action Required

1. Officers prepare letter as outlined.	RB
2. Officers to investigate the revision of fees.	RB

95. PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY - WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981, PREPARATION OF DEFINITIVE MAP FORMER COUNTY BOROUGH OF YORK (FISHERGATE, GUILDHALL AND MICKLEGATE WARDS)

Consideration was given to a report, which sought to assist the Executive Member in determining whether or not to make a number of Definitive Map Modification Orders to record public rights of way on the Definitive Map for

the former County Borough of York within Fishergate, Guildhall and Micklegate Wards.

The Definitive Map Officer updated and circulated details of Officers comments in respect of a number of issues recently raised by Councillors D'Agorne and Merrett and from David Nunns, on behalf of the Ramblers Association. She stated that a number of the points raised by David Nunns still required further examination. She also confirmed that a number of paths had not been identified for further investigation and that although this was only the first stage these paths could be picked up at a later stage.

Cllr Merrett confirmed that he was still unclear in relation to the process involved in recording the existence of these paths and to the consultation being undertaken. He requested clarification and reassurances in respect of the processes. He referred to the large number of paths, which were listed for no further action and to a number of paths being cut off on the plans attached to the report. He stated that he had found it difficult to interpret the maps particularly in relation to the coloured paths.

David Nunns, made representations on behalf of the Ramblers Association and he confirmed that he was pleased with progress on the Definitive Map Modification Order's. He hoped that the publicity surrounding this work would promote the use of these paths for residents, giving health benefits and resulting in less car use and pollution. He asked for clarification of the term 'no further action at this time' and asked for confirmation that these paths would be included at a later stage. He went onto suggest that an annual inspection of these paths should be undertaken by volunteers to reduce costs.

Officers confirmed that a list of the routes proposed for examination in the future would be prepared and that Officers would re-examine the processes and consider the use of Ward Newsletters to gain publicity.

The Executive Member stated that as a number of issues had only recently be raised and to enable these to be publicised and given appropriate consideration he proposed to defer further consideration of this report until the next meeting. He confirmed that this would enable all the points raised to be listed in the report and for Officers to set out their comments on each.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member defers a decision on the proposals until the next meeting in order to allow officers time to prepare a tabular response to each of the representations which have been made in writing by Councillors Merrett, D'Agorne and the Ramblers Association. [1.]

REASON: To enable the Executive Member to be fully informed when making decisions on the addition of these footpaths to a Definitive Map and in making Definitive Map Modification Orders to register the existence of public rights of way in that area.

Action Required

1. Include on Forward Plan for May Decision Session. SS

Cllr Steve Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy

[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 4.55 pm].