City of York Council	Committee Minutes
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport and Planning
Date	22 June 2017
Present	Councillor Gillies (Executive Member)
In Attendance	Councillors Cannon, Craghill, D'Agorne, Looker and Mason

1. 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.

Councillor Gillies declared a personal non prejudicial interest in agenda item 7 (Fossgate Traffic Management Consultation) as a Member of the Merchant Adventurers Guild. He confirmed that he had not been involved in any consultation which had taken place.

Councillor Cannon declared a personal non prejudicial interest, having registered to speak as Ward Councillor with regard to agenda item 8 (Consideration of the results of the consultation process reference Residents' Priority Parking in Holgate Central), as a resident of the local area.

Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal non prejudicial interest having registered to speak as Ward Councillor with regard to agenda item 10 (Danesmead Estate Residents' Parking Petitions) as a resident of Broadway West which was on the fringe of the area in question.

2. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the last decision session held on 11 May 2017 be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Executive Member.

3. Public Participation - Decision Session

It was reported that there had been a number of registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. The Executive Member advised that he would take registered speakers during consideration of each agenda item rather than at this point in the meeting for purposes of clarity.

4. Traffic Signal Asset Renewal (TSAR) - Junction Alterations

The Executive Member considered a report which proposed alterations to the Tadcaster Road/St Helens Road, Heworth Road/Melrosegate and Rougier Street/Tanner Row junctions to allow replacement of life-expired signalling assets.

He considered a written representation which had been received from Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward Councillors in relation to the Tadcaster Road/St Helens Road junction which stated that residents and councillors were supportive of the proposals. It put forward the following points: removing the island on the southern arm would remove the need to replace damaged railings at regular interval; adding a crossing on the northern arm would be most helpful for pedestrians; and that residents would welcome further consultation on the exact location of the control box in relation to potential noise from beepers.

The Executive Member considered the following options detailed in the report:

<u>Tadcaster Road/St Helens Road</u>
Option 1 – to approve the recommended design for these junctions
Option 2 – not to approve the proposed junction design

<u>Heworth Road/Melrosegate</u>
Option 1 – to approve the recommended design for these junctions
Option 2 – not to approve the proposed junction design

<u>Rougier Street/Tanner Row</u>
Option 1 – to approve design option A junction design
Option 2 – to approve design option B junction design
Option 3 – not to approve either proposed junction design

The Executive Member accepted the reasoning behind recommended option A for the Rougier Street/Tanner Row junction which included a change in road alignment and the introduction of a ‘no left turn’ out of Tanner Row.

Resolved:

i) That the proposed design for Tadcaster Road/St Helens Road junction be approved.

Reason: The recommended design offers the best solution to allow replacement of the asset in line with current design standards, whilst improving pedestrian facilities without significantly impacting vehicular traffic. It includes a minor improvement to safety.

ii) That the proposed design for Heworth Road/Melrosegate junction be approved.

Reason: The recommended design offers the best solution to allow replacement of the asset in line with current design standards, whilst minimising the impact on pedestrians and vehicular traffic. It includes a minor improvement to safety.

iii) That Design Option A be approved for Rougier Street/Tanner Row junction.

Reason: Design Option A offers the best solution to allow replacement of the asset in line with current design standards, whilst minimising the impact on pedestrians, vehicular traffic and air quality. It includes a minor improvement to safety.

5. Thanet Road Local Safety Scheme

The Executive Member considered a report which sought approval of a scheme to extend an existing 20mph zone on Gale Lane to include a section of Thanet Road past the Lidl supermarket to just beyond St James Place.

He took into account written representations which had been received from Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward Councillors, Councillor Andrew Waller and local resident Mr Steve Galloway.

Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward Councillors expressed general support for the revised scheme stating that they were pleased to see that proposals to fill in the south bound bus lay-by had been removed as this would have reduced visibility for cyclists crossing from Kingsway West and would have caused tailbacks across the roundabout if traffic had to wait behind a bus. They expressed the view that filling in the northbound lay-by at the present time would be premature as buses stopping on the carriageway would also reduce visibility for those using the crossing and if buses were waiting at both bus stops, traffic would be halted in both directions. They confirmed that their preference would be to retain both lay-bys and for the situation to be monitored.

Councillor Waller's submission stated that he was glad that officers had recognised the problems that cyclists would face coming from Kingsway West if the southbound layby was removed and noted that issues relating to traffic exiting Acorn Ruby Club would occur if the northbound lay-by was removed. He stated that there were already issues with cable boxes obscuring cars coming from the Chaloners Road junction on Thanet Road which would be complicated further by buses stopping on the highway.

Mr Galloway's submission presented the view that the proposed changes represented an "over engineered" solution to what he felt was a poorly defined problem and questioned whether traffic speed was in fact a principle cause of reported accidents as current traffic speed figures were not included in report, noting that three junctions, roundabouts and pedestrian crossings along Thanet Road, along with congestion, tended to reduce speeds. He expressed concerns that the proposals had only been advertised by lamppost notices and had not been accessible on the council's website, nor circulated to local residents' associations. He reiterated points already made with regard to the infilling of the bus laybys and suggested that a solution to accidents caused by pedestrians randomly crossing road would be to provide guard rails with intention of directing pedestrians to safest crossing point and a lower speed limit of 20mph may be appropriate where there was a particular accident risk such as by the Lidl store.

Mrs Sue Galloway addressed the Executive Member, under the public participation scheme, on behalf of the Foxwood Residents' Association in relation to the proposals. She urged the Executive Member not to agree to filling in the layby, advised that she would prefer no speed bumps but noting that a

20mph limit would be acceptable. She asked that barriers be considered first, then a 20mph speed limit as well as looking at sight lines. She expressed dismay that the advertisement notices had only been attached to lampposts as drivers would not have stopped to read these, and that residents associations had not been consulted on the proposals.

The Executive Member considered three options as detailed in the report:

- Option 1, to approve the proposed scheme as shown in Annex C of the report for implementation
- Option 2, as option 1, but with revisions as the Executive Member deems appropriate
- Option 3, to do nothing, and reallocate the funding to another local safety scheme.

In response to the comments submitted regarding the need to fill in the layby, officers noted that there was only a fairly remote chance of vehicle drivers using the layby to bypass the speed cushions, and recommended that the speed cushions be aligned slightly and the layby left open and speed monitoring be undertaken. Officers circulated an amended plan (TP/150019/THRD/GA/01C) showing the option without layby filling.

Officers responded to the issues and suggestions raised in the written representations and by the public speaker. They confirmed that consultation had involved a large number of bodies but acknowledged that residents associations had not been included and gave assurances that they would be consulted in future. The Executive Member requested that sight lines be looked at before implementation of the scheme.

Resolved: That the proposed scheme, shown in Annex C of the report, be approved for implementation **with the following amendment:**

- The bus lay-by will not be in-filled, but a slight change will be made to the positioning of the speed cushions plus some hatch road markings added (as shown on drawing TP/150019/THRD/GA/01C)

- Visibility from side accesses will be reviewed prior to implementation.
- Post-implementation monitoring will take place to assess the effectiveness of the scheme.

Reason: To address a road safety concern identified on Thanet Road.

6. Consideration of results from the consultations in various areas following petitions received requesting Residents' Priority Parking

The Executive Member considered a report which provided the consultation results for the possible introduction of residents parking in South Bank Avenue; St Aubyn's Place; Beresford Terrace area; and St Peter's Quarter, Martins Court and Carleton Street. Consultation had been undertaken in all four areas between February and April 2017 to determine what action was appropriate.

Six people had registered to speak under public participation with regard to the results of the consultation.

Laura Kent spoke in support of the introduction of residents parking in response to parking issues in South Bank. As a resident of Bishopthorpe Road, she requested that house numbers 151 and 153 be included as she lived in a row of 3 houses and 149 had been included in the consultation but 151 and 153 had not.

Mike Bainbridge also spoke as a resident of Bishopthorpe Road in relation to residents parking. He expressed his support for the introduction of residents parking giving examples of abuse of on street parking which had occurred to date.

Mrs Walker spoke in objection to the proposed changes on St Aubyn's Place. As an elderly resident, she expressed concerns that, if a residents parking scheme was introduced, she would have to pay for people to be able to park to come and visit and provide her with help.

Peter O'Reilly spoke in support of the proposals for St Martin's Court, St Peter's Quarter. He stated that there had been several near accidents as a result of children playing out and although there were currently signs stating it was residents parking only, cars were frequently observed being left there by those working in the city centre.

Peter Emsley spoke in relation to Phoenix Boulevard in St Peter’s Quarter. He stated that there continued to be a safety issue and asked that this be kept under review and requested that speed restriction signs be considered.

Councillor Mary Cannon spoke as Holgate Ward Councillor. She expressed her support for residents’ approach to the introduction of residents parking. She thanked officers for their hard work in relation to the proposals and gave her support for the implementation of 24 hour restrictions.

The Executive Member considered options as follows for each of the four areas:

<u>South Bank Avenue</u>

- Option 1, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the existing R57 residents priority parking scheme to include No’s 1 – 108 South Bank Avenue, 64 Nunthorpe Grove and 147 – 153 Bishopthorpe Road, to create a new larger zone boundary as per plan in Annex A1(A) in addition convert the whole zone to Community – R57C, this enables businesses to purchase permits for the zone.
- Option 2, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the existing R57 residents priority parking scheme to include consulted properties up to Trafalgar Street only, the section of street that the petition represented. In addition convert the zone to Community – R57C, this enables included businesses to purchase permits for the zone.
- Option 3, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a new Community Residents Priority Parking Scheme for South bank Avenue only.
- Option 4, to take no further action at this time

St Aubyn's Place

- Option 1, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a Residents' Priority Parking Area for St Aubyn's Place to operate between 9am and 5pm, 7 days a week.
- Option 2, to take no further action at this time.

Beresford Terrace Area

- Option 1, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the existing R58C residents parking zone to include the whole consultation area. This would create one large zone as per plan in Annex C1(A).
- Option 2, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a new Residents Parking Zone which would include the consulted area, south of Butcher Terrace, only.
- Option 3, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic regulation Order to include a Residents Priority Parking zone, either separate zone or an extension to R58C, which would exclude Butcher Terrace and Finsbury Street leaving both streets unrestricted.
- Option 4, to take no further action at this time

Phoenix Boulevard

- Option 1, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a Residents Priority Parking Area for the St Peter's Quarter development only.

  Martins Court and Carleton Street; No further action at this time. If residents of these streets raise a petition requesting resident parking within 12 months of any implementation of a scheme on St Peter's Quarter we request authorisation to undertake additional consultation at that time with a view to adding them to the same scheme.

  Advertise a proposal to include No Waiting at any Time restrictions (double yellow lines) at the entrance to the development and in the fountain turning area as shown on the plan at Annex D4.

- Option 2, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order for the full consultation area including Martins Court and Carlisle Street to include the waiting restrictions as detailed in Annex D4
- Option 3 -   No further action at this time

Officers clarified that this was the first stage of consultation to obtain a broad view of what residents wanted and noted that there was a high level of support in most areas. In relation to the Phoenix Boulevard Scheme, the Executive Member noted that this would include only the St Peter's Quarter development at the current time and not Martin's Court and Carleton Street. Officers agreed that the time allowed for residents in Martins Court and Carleton Street to raise a petition requesting residents parking themselves should be extended from 12 to 18 months of any implementation of a scheme on St Peter's Quarter to ensure consistency.

The Executive Member noted the contents of the report and confirmed that the views and objections expressed by public speakers would be taken into account. He acknowledged the request to include house numbers 151 and 153 Bishopthorpe Road in the proposed scheme. He confirmed his agreement to move to the next stage of the process which would allow detail on the traffic regulation orders to be agreed.

Resolved:

That an amendment to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order, to introduce Residents' Priority Parking Areas for the following, be advertised for the following areas:

South Bank Avenue – Option 1 be agreed, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the existing R57 residents priority parking scheme to include No's 1 – 108 South Bank Avenue, 64 Nunthorpe Grove and **147 – 153 Bishopthorpe Road,** to create a new larger zone boundary as per plan in Annex A1(A), in addition convert the whole zone to Community – R57C, this enables businesses to purchase permits for the zone.

Reason: This reflects the majority view of all residents consulted as a whole and removes the likelihood of problems relocating further up South Bank Avenue.

St Aubyn’s Place – Option 1 be agreed, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a Residents’ Priority Parking Area for St Aubyn’s Place to operate between 9am and 5pm, 7 days a week.

Reason: This reflects the majority opinion.

Beresford Terrace area – Option 1be agreed, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the existing R58C residents parking zone to include the whole consultation area. This would create one large zone as per plan in Annex C1(A).

Reason: This reflects the majority view of all residents consulted as a whole. By introducing one large zone this increases the on street parking available to residents.

St Peter’s Quarter, Martins Court and Carleton Street – Option 1 be agreed, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a Residents Priority Parking Area for the St Peter’s Quarter development only.

Martins Court and Carleton Street; No further action at this time. If residents of these streets raise a petition requesting resident parking **within 18 months of any implementation** of a scheme on St Peter’s Quarter we request authorisation to undertake additional consultation at that time with a view to adding them to the same scheme.

Advertise a proposal to include No Waiting at any Time restrictions (double yellow lines) at the entrance to the development and in the fountain turning area as shown on the plan at Annex D4.

Reason: This reflects the majority view of residents from the streets consulted.

7. Fossgate Traffic Management Consultation

The Executive Member considered a report which detailed the outcome of consultation carried out with residents and businesses in and off Fossgate in relation to potential traffic management changes including making the street a pedestrian zone, reversing the one way traffic flow and re-allocating road space for street cafes.

The Executive Member considered two written representations which had been received from Councillor Andrew Waller and Mr Paul Hepworth on behalf of Cycling UK.

Councillor Waller's written statement expressed concern that the reversal of traffic flow without an improvement to the safety of turning right from Coppergate into Piccadilly would lead to safety issues for cyclists. It stressed the importance of having a comprehensive cycling and pedestrian strategy for the city in order that a holistic approach could be considered whenever traffic flows on individual roads were being considered.

Mr Hepworth's written statement welcomed the proposal to retain daytime access for cyclists in Fossgate and advised that the proposals would provide a useful test bed for the current DfT guidance on sharing space in Vehicle Restricted Areas and suggested looking at the streetscape design included in guidance. He advised caution in regard to the need to be realistic and accept that some cyclists may continue to misuse Fossgate by riding the wrong way along it. He asked that the extent to which this occurred should be monitored during the trial, with a view to considering legalising two way cycling in the future, both in Fossgate and Merchantgate.

Two people had registered to speak under the public participation scheme.

Mr John Pybus addressed the meeting on behalf of the Fossgate Association and as landlord of the Blue Bell pub in support of the proposals. He advised the Executive Member that the Fossgate Association had organised festivals in the street which had helped the street to become a better place and increased footfall had helped retailers. He felt that proposals would enable Fossgate to become a more vibrant and pedestrian friendly place to be but expressed some concerns about how the new rules would be enforced.

Councillor Denise Craghill spoke as Ward Councillor. She expressed her support for the proposals and felt that the recommended options represented a good balance of the consultation responses and that an experimental period would allow any concerns arising to be responded to. With regard to enforcement, she asked for assurances that the council would work with the police from an early stage. With reference to capital investment being announced, she questioned how it was intended to take forward the physical improvements needed (consultation and timescales) and how this would link with traffic management.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

<u>A pedestrian zone except for access and pedal cycles, plus reversal of the one way traffic flow.</u>

- Option 1, take no further action.
- Option 2, to approve taking forward a permanent TRO to create a pedestrian zone except for access and pedal cycles.
- Option 3, to approve taking forward a permanent TRO as option 2 but also include the reversal of the one way traffic flow.
- Option 4, to approve taking forward an Experimental TRO for up to 18 months to create a pedestrian zone except for access and pedal cycles and to reverse the direction of the one way traffic flow.

<u>Highway cafes</u>

- Option 5, take no action.
- Option 6, progress formal Planning Applications for individual premises.
- Option 7, if the Experimental TRO is approved, give delegated authority to officers to determine where street cafes can be positioned between the hours of 11am and 5pm in the area identified in Annex F and as indicated in the example in Annex G. These cafes would be licensed obstructions for the duration of the experiment.

In response to the questions raised by Councillor Craghill, officers confirmed that the hope was to make improvements to the street as soon as possible and confirmed that after 6 months of the experimental period of the scheme, consultation could begin on the physical changes to the street.

The Executive Member acknowledged that Fossgate was narrower at the Pavement end of the street and suggested that a no loading restriction be implemented at the top end in order to prevent parking at any time in this area. It was agreed that delegated authority be given to officers to advertise a proposal to amend the York Parking Stopping and Waiting Traffic Order 2014 to include a no loading restriction for 10-15 metres at the Pavement end of Fossgate.

Resolved:

(i) That Option 4 be approved, to take forward an Experimental traffic regulation order for up to 18 months to create a pedestrian zone except for access and pedal cycles 8am to 6pm, 7 days a week and to reverse the direction of the one way traffic flow.

Reason: Because there is a good level of support indicated from the consultation and an Experimental scheme enables the council to respond rapidly to any unexpected issues that might arise during the experiment period; and

(ii) That Option 7 be approved, to give delegated authority to officers to determine where street cafes can be positioned between the hours of 11am and 5pm.

Reason: To further enhances the pedestrian priority in the street and provide good flexibility within the experimental period.

(iii) That delegated authority be given to officers advertise a proposal to amend the York Parking Stopping and Waiting Traffic Order 2014 to include a no loading restriction for 10-15 metres at the Pavement end of Fossgate.

Reason: To prevent obstructive parking close to the junction area.

8. Consideration of the results of the consultation process reference Residents' Priority Parking in Holgate Central

The Executive Member considered a report which provided details of the consultation results for Holgate Central undertaken in February 2017 and sought to determine what action was appropriate.

The Executive Member considered written representations from Councillor Sonja Crisp and Richard Knowles, Headteacher of St Paul's C of E Primary School.

Councillor Sonja Crisp's written representation expressed concerns regarding the issue of altering the current practice regarding eligibly for ResPark permits to include teachers and employees of schools such as St Paul's Primary. While acknowledging sympathy for them, she noted the difficulties faced by residents in finding parking in streets near their own homes in this area. She expressed concerns that providing permits to as many as 25 school staff would push residents over into neighbouring streets which had no ResPark (despite having paid for ResPark themselves) and therefore causing problems elsewhere. She requested that if the decision was taken to allow school staff passes, that these be restricted to working hours so that staff were not able leave their cars there during evenings and weekends when parking spaces should be available for residents.

Richard Knowles, Headteacher of St Paul's, advised that the school would support option 1, allowing the school to purchase a number of commercial permits which would allow the school's staff and visitors to be able to park vehicles in the vicinity of the school. However he expressed concern that the proposed cost for a commercial permit, which was higher than what they had been lead to believe, was excessive for St Paul's to bear and asked that this be reviewed in light of their unique situation. On the understanding that these permits were not for a particular vehicle registration but for use by any staff member or visitor needing to park in the vicinity of the school, he advised that the school would require up to 20 transferable commercial permits.

Six people addressed the meeting under public participation with regard to the consultation process:

Philip Hunter spoke on behalf of St Paul's Church with regard to the effect the proposals would have on the church, located off St Paul's Terrace. He advised the Executive Member that the area suffered from commuter parking by those who travelled from the rail station or who worked in town. He advised that there were only 3-4 spaces available for church users who were encouraged to car share or walk to the church. He expressed a preference for the restrictions to be time limited to allow those attending church services to park on street when needed.

Jenny Hartland, a resident of St Paul’s Terrace, spoke in support of the proposals. She advised that the streets were now used as a free car park for those using the city centre, rail station and those visiting the National Railway Museum with some using the streets for long term parking for up to a week at a time. She also noted an increase in the regularity of parcel deliveries which had led to a constant stream of delivery vehicles. She expressed sympathy with St Pauls Primary School and expressed a preference for a 24hrs/7 days per week restriction.

Malcolm Senne, spoke on behalf of York Spiritual Centre on Wilton Rise. He expressed a preference for a less restrictive scheme which would prevent city centre workers parking there (suggesting that 4am to 12 noon restriction would be sufficient to deter them) but which would allow residents to benefit from flexibility for themselves, their visitors and tradesmen. He advised that visitors to York Spiritual Centre were not able to use Park & Ride for the majority of events as Park and Ride closed early in the evening and the rail bridge, secluded access and steep steps prevented many from using the nearby pay car park.

David Nunns, a resident of Acomb, advised that the proposed scheme failed the 50% test in most parts of the area and should therefore not proceed as currently proposed. He stated that the recent Holgate Road scheme, with 90 minutes restriction, had removed some all-day parking in the street and made it easier to park for people visiting nearby businesses in Watson Street however he would not wish for Holgate Hill to be included in the Holgate Road Zone, due to its likely effect on the visitor parking. He applauded the creation of a few 2 hour spaces in Watson Street but advised that visitors to the two schools had similar problems to the school staff and suggested that the waiting time in Watson Street could increased to 60-90 minutes which would be more appropriate than the current 10 minutes. With regard to problems on Wilton Rise and the first part of Enfield Terrace he stated that the proposed signage would be misleading.

Nicholas Payne spoke in objection to the timings listed in the report. He confirmed that the main issue was one of commuter and shoppers parking, which could be removed with the introduction of daytime restrictions. He questioned the justification for a 24 hour scheme, advising that there were regularly a minimum of 25 available spaces in the evening. He requested that more attention be given to Wilton Rise and Enfield Crescent, acknowledging that there was already a problem on Wilton Rise which would be exacerbated with the introduction of the proposed restrictions, and asked the Executive Member to consider the incorporation of these streets in the scheme.

Councillor Mary Cannon, spoke as Ward Councillor in support of local residents. She advised that some residents felt that 24 hrs restrictions were not required although others had expressed problems parking in the evening. She asked that clarification be given around the use of blue badges in a residents parking zone. She requested a Sunday break in parking restrictions in order to allow for users of Holgate Community Gardens, St Paul's Church and the Spiritual Centre and for community activities to take place. She expressed support for the 18 month trial period but asked the Executive Member to think seriously about the needs of the two schools.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

- Option 1
  Advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the R60 Residents' Priority Parking Area to operate Monday to Saturday as outlined on the plan at Annex F (excluding private streets and St Paul's Mews). St Paul's Mews to be reconsidered for inclusion in the scheme if further representations are made within a 18 month period from implementation of any neighbouring scheme.
  The bays on Watson Street to be marked and signed individually to allow 2 hour parking for non-permit holders.
  Advertise an amendment to the eligibility requirements of Commercial Permits to allow staff from St Paul's Nursery School and St Paul's CE Primary School to purchase permits to park. Current Eligibility: "A person who, in the course of that person's business or calling, is required to visit residential or business premises within a zone."
  These are issued for use away from the normal place of

work. Recommended Addition: “Any staff member of an education establishment for 0 to 18 year olds that doesn’t have off street parking provision at the time the residents parking zone is implemented.”
Replace and add street name plates for Enfield Crescent and Wilton Rise to include wording “Private Street, Resident Parking Only”

- Option 2, advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order as outlined in Option 1, a to e, but as a separate scheme.

- Option 3, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order as outlined in Option 1, a, b, d & e; omitting part c (not providing for school staff).

- Option 4, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order as outlined at Option One, a to e, with operational times of 24 hours, 7 days a week.

- Option 5, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order as outlined at Option One, a to e, to operate 9am to 5pm, 7 days a week.
- Option 6, to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order as outlined at Option One, a to e, for the following streets only: Watson Street Railway Terrace St Paul’s Terrace St Paul’s Square
- Option 7, to take No Further Action at this time.

Officers confirmed that in the same way that a special case had been made for parking by school staff through the allocation of commercial permits, and in response to concerns raised in relation to access to churches, the proposal had been modified to apply to Mondays to Saturdays only. As 24 hours had been expressed as a preference by most people, this would be stated in the formal advert period, but this could be reduced. They confirmed that blue badge holders could park for free without a permit.

The Executive Member expressed the view that the proposals provided a fair balance and were based on the responses of a wide network of consultees. He endorsed the relaxation of hours on Sundays to help churches and the decision to allow school staff to purchase permits.

Resolved:

That approval be given to advertise an amendment to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order, to introduce a Residents' Priority Parking Area, as outlined in Option 1 of the report as detailed below:

(a) Advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the R60 Residents' Priority Parking Area to operate Monday to Saturday as outlined on the plan at Annex F of the report (excluding private streets and St Paul's Mews).

(b) St Paul's Mews to be reconsidered for inclusion in the scheme if further representations are made within a 18 month period from implementation of any neighbouring scheme.

(c) The bays on Watson Street to be marked and signed individually to allow 2 hour parking for non-permit holders.

(d) Advertise an amendment to the eligibility requirements of Commercial Permits to allow staff from St Paul's Nursery School and St Paul's CE Primary School to purchase permits to park.

Current Eligibility: "*A person who, in the course of that person's business or calling, is required to visit residential or business premises within a zone*." These are issued for use away from the normal place of work. Recommended Addition: "*Any staff member of an education establishment for 0 to 18 year olds that doesn't have off street parking provision at the time the residents parking zone is implemented*."

(e) Replace and add street name plates for Enfield Crescent and Wilton Rise to include wording "Private Street, Resident Parking Only"

Reason: To progress the majority views of the residents consulted and to take into consideration the needs of the schools and churches in the area.

9. Highway Condition Petitions – The Horseshoe and Muncastergate

The Executive Member considered a report which provided an update in relation to two petitions which had been received calling for works to be carried out to the highway at The Horseshoe in Dringhouses and Muncastergate.

Councillor Mason addressed the meeting as Ward Councillor for Dringhouses and Woodthorpe in relation to The Horseshoe petition. He advised that residents had been concerned about the safety in the Horseshoe for some time but were concerned that it would take some time to get to the top of the list and requested that action be taken as soon as possible.

The Executive Member considered the outputs of the inspections shown at Annex 1 and detailed in paragraphs 9 to 12 of the report. He noted that a further review would take place following the 2017 inspection and any identified schemes would be considered for the 2018/19 highways programme. He acknowledged that routine highway safety inspections would identify any actionable defects that required repairs and routine maintenance funding would address these defects but that no further work was scheduled in the 2017/18 highways programme at both locations and no further options were available at this time.

Officers explained that inspections in respect of next year's programme would take place over the next few months. The Horseshoe and the adopted section of Muncastergate would be looked at again as part of consideration of the results of the annual conditions surveys.

The Executive Member acknowledged that all roads in the city were assessed and prioritised on a regular basis to ensure that required work was carried out in a fair manner.

Resolved:

(i) That the petitions detailed in paragraph 5 of the report be noted.

(ii) That the detail of the report and the conclusions drawn in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the report be noted.

Reason: To ensure the effective delivery of funding to address key priorities across the cities highway network

10. Danesmead Estate Residents' Parking Petitions

The Executive Member considered a report which informed him of the receipt of a petition which requested that “dangerous and inconsiderate parking on the estate by tackled by double yellow lines and residents parking”

Officers advised that they had received another petition from the Fulford Cross area which was adjacent to the Danesmead Estate. This had been anticipated in the preparation of the Danesmead petition report with option 3 putting forward the possibility of widening the consultation area depending on circumstances at the time. They therefore recommended that consultation on a single residents parking scheme covering both petition areas be carried out in due course.

Councillor D’Agorne addressed the meeting as Ward Councillor for Fishergate. He advised that the current proposals would have an effect on the Steiner School which was why Fulford Cross Area needed to be considered at the same time. He advised that there was evidence of commuter parking in the area with commuters then walking or cycling into town to work and welcomed the inclusion of Fulford Cross in the consultation. He expressed concern that delaying the Beresford Terrace scheme would have a knock on effect and could exacerbate problems on the Danesmead Estate and Fulford Cross, noting that some displacement would occur. He expressed the opinion that a scheme covering Monday to Friday 9am – 5pm would gain most support.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

- Option 1, to note the petition but take no action.
- Option 2, to approve the initial consultation.
- Option 3, to give approval to progress an investigation when the area reaches the top of the waiting list along with the option of widening the consultation depending on circumstances at the time.

Resolved:

(i) That Option 3 be approved and that the Danesmead Estate and Fulford Cross Area be added to the Residents parking waiting list and an investigation carried out when it reaches the top of the list.

Reason: Because this will respond to residents concerns in the order they are raised and can be progressed depending on funding available each year.

(ii) That a strategic review of the Residents Parking policy be undertaken

Reason: To provide a more strategic and effective response to residents parking concerns in the city.

11. Barbican Mews Residents' Parking Petitions

The Executive Member considered a report which informed him of the receipt of a petition which asked the City of York Council to “address inconsiderate parking in Barbican Mews” and put forward two proposals to alleviate the problem

a) Yellow lines at the entrance to the Mews
b) The implementation of a residents’ only parking scheme to be extended along the full length of Barbican Mews.

Councillor D’Agorne spoke as Ward Member acknowledging residents’ concerns in relation to parking problems on Barbican Mews.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

- Option 1, to note the petition and add the information to the annual review but take no further action at this time.
- Option 2, to approve the investigation and consultation to be carried out as a one off item.

Officers advised that concerns about parking at the entrance to the Mews had already been brought to their attention and confirmed that the Mews was already included in the Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests list for investigation.

Resolved:

(i) That the petition, requesting that consideration is given to yellow lines at the entrance to the Mews and the implementation of a resident only parking scheme, be noted

(ii) That the information be added to the Annual Review but that no further action be taken at this time.

Reason: Because the issue is already on the Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests list for investigation.

12. Rosedale Street Residents' Parking Petition

The Executive Member considered a report which informed him of the receipt of a petition requesting that “the City of York Council Parking Enforcement include Rosedale Street in the R20 Residents Parking Scheme”

Two people had registered to speak at the meeting under public participation.

Councillor D’Agorne addressed the meeting as Ward Member for Fishergate. While he acknowledged that the normal process was to consult with every resident of the street, he asked if there was an opportunity in this case to speed up the process as every resident of the street had already indicated via the petition that they wanted a ResPark scheme.

Officers noted his comments but advised that residents would still need to be consulted formally as they would need to be made aware of the financial implications of the scheme before confirming their views.

Michael Conboy, a resident of Rosedale Street, addressed the meeting in support of residents parking in Rosedale Street as a continuation of R20. He explained that parking congestion in Rosedale Street was exacerbated by double yellow lines on the corners of junctions as well as by the introduction of permit parking in Grange Street, which now had several empty spaces, with some Grange Street residents choosing to park for free in Rosedale Street instead of paying for a permit to park in their own street. He advised that he had spoken to fellow residents of Rosedale Street, all of whom were in favour of a permit scheme.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

- Option 1, to note the petition but take no action.
- Option 2, to approve the initial consultation.
- Option 3, to give approval to progress an investigation when the area reaches the top of the waiting list along with the option of widening the consultation depending on circumstances at the time.

Resolved:

(i) That Option 3 be approved and Rosedale Street be added to the Residents parking waiting list and an investigation carried out when it reaches the top of the list.

Reason: Because this will respond to residents concerns in the order they are raised and can be progressed depending on funding available each year.

(ii) That a strategic review of the Residents Parking policy be undertaken.

Reason: To provide a more strategic and effective response to residents parking concerns in the city.

13. Traffic Signals Asset Renewals, Procurement of Engineering Support

The Executive Member considered a report which sought permission to undertake a tendering exercise for the provision of specialist traffic signal engineering design services to support internal resources in the Transport Team, noting that this was the retendering of an ongoing provision and was required to support the continued successful delivery of the Traffic Signals Asset Renewal (TSAR) Programme.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

- the appointment of an external provider as proposed above, or
- Create and fill additional posts on the Council staffing structure to deliver the required services.

Officers confirmed that the best option was to buy in services from a consultant as they were not needed on a continual basis The Executive Member noted that this arrangement would allow the council to renew and improve traffic signals and, in turn, improve traffic flow in the city.

Resolved: That the tendering and subsequent award of engineering design support services, to support the delivery of the Traffic Signals Asset Renewals (TSAR) Programme up to a value of £300,000 over four years, be approved.

Reason: To provide specialist traffic signal engineering design services to support CYC staff in the ongoing delivery of the remaining four years of the TSAR Programme. This service is required to provide capability in the design and implementation of traffic signals schemes in addition to the general highways and civil engineering design and construction support provided internally by the Highways and Projects Teams.

Cllr I Gillies, Executive Member
[The meeting started at 2.00pm and finished at 3.30pm].