

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport and Planning
Date	12 November 2015
Present	Councillors Gillies
In attendance	Councillors Brooks, Craghill, D'Agorne and Warters

---

## **21. Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, the Executive Member was asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or pecuniary interests he may have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

## **22. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the last Decision Session held on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

## **23. Public Participation - Decision Session**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

There were a number of registered speakers on the agenda items as follows:

Roy Haddon had registered to speak on agenda item 4 in relation to the Public Right of Way issue. He felt that free movement should not be restricted and that the public spaces protection orders were not justified. The crime statistics only highlighted 6 recorded crimes between January 2014 and December 2014 and the area could not be considered a crime hotspot.

Stuart Kay spoke as Chairman of Dunnington Parish Council in relation to agenda item 5, Part 2, Annex J, Site 12 Common Lane Dunnington. He was pleased that the Council had acknowledged the speeding problem at the entrance to the

village from the A166 via Common Road but was concerned that the solution being put forward in the officers report would make the situation worse around the sports club.

Councillor Brooks spoke as Ward Member also in relation to agenda item 5, Part 2, Annex J, Site 12 Common Lane Dunnington. She raised concerns about moving the 30mph speed limit closer to the sports club entrance and asked that the proposal be deferred to enable further consultation.

Lawrence Mattinson spoke as Parish Councillor for Strensall and Towthorpe. In relation to in relation to agenda item 5, Part 2, Annex G, York Road, Strensall he advised that the Parish Council did not support the proposal and in light of a lack of comment from North Yorkshire Police and the opposition to the scheme from the Parish Council and Ward Member he was concerned that it is to go ahead. He asked that the Council listens to residents and referred to the fact that 75% of traffic enters the village from Sheriff Hutton Road and the lack of a crossing at that point makes it difficult for elderly residents and children to cross the road safely.

Councillor Waller spoke in relation to agenda item 5, Part 2, Annex N, Wetherby Road. He advised that he had asked residents for their views on the proposal and the key issue is speed. The majority did not support changing the road layout. He felt that a 40mph buffer was required and asked that this be incorporated into any ongoing consultations.

Councillor D'Agorne spoke in relation to agenda item 5. He referred to the speed review process and advised it should be a speed monitoring process. He felt that the Council was failing to achieve a safe environment for all road users and more needs to be done to make sustainable travel safe and attractive. He advised that the Council should consult on the whole speed management process rather than just individual engineering schemes. He supported the replacement of Vehicle Activated Signs but felt that they needed to be deployed for a maximum of 6 months and combined with enforcement action to make them effective.

Councillor Warters spoke in relation to agenda item 5, Part 2, Annex Q, Murton Way. He felt that improving the signage would be a waste of money as in his opinion, signs are ineffective. In reference to the white lines, he felt they should not of been

painted in the first place but it was not an appropriate use of funds to now attempt to remove them. He supported the installation of a granite rumble strip and verge widening in Murton Lane.

Nick Kay spoke on behalf of the St Andrew Place Residents Association. He advised that the entrance to Spen Lane is access for residents, visitors, utilities and deliveries only. He referred to paragraph 16 of the report and advised that Spen Lane, St Andrew Gate and St Andrew Place should of been included in the list as being covered by regulations. He advised that residents suffer from pollution and noise. He asked that the Spen Lane area be included within the review as the restrictions aren't currently being enforced and residents are concerned that if more restrictions are introduced around the city centre then more people will use Spen Lane.

Councillor Craghill spoke on agenda item 7 City Centre Strategy. She advised that she welcomed the report and its recommendations as she was concerned about vehicles spoiling access in the city centre. She supported as much of the city centre being closed to vehicles as possible and supported option 9 as outlined in the report, to look at a wide range of solutions. She supported the comments made by the previous speaker in relation to Spen Lane and also had some concerns about Fossgate and the lack of enforcement in that area and welcomed further work in that area but didn't want to see Fossgate removed from plans to bring it into the footstreet area.

**24. Public Rights of Way - Proposal to restrict public rights over the alleyways between Barbican Road/Willis Street, Willis Street/Gordon Street and Gordon Street/Wolsley Street, Fishergate Ward, using Public Spaces Protection Order legislation**

The Executive Member considered a report which outlined a proposal to restrict public rights over the alleyways between Barbican Road/Willis Street, Willis Street/Gordon Street and Gordon Street/Wolsley Street, Fishergate Ward, using Public Spaces Protection Order legislation.

The Executive Member commented that he didn't feel there was enough evidence to act on the proposals to alleygate the streets, he also took into consideration the comments made by

residents about waste collection with only a small majority stating they would be happy with presenting waste to the front of their properties.

Resolved: That the Executive Member:  
Agreed to abandon the schemes.

Reason: Though the majority of respondents are in favour of the Alleygating scheme, the results of the waste collection consultation have shown that changing collections could be problematic.

**25. Partnership Speed Review Update. Including Proposed engineering speed reduction schemes. Related Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) Review.**

The Executive Member considered a report which gave a Speed Management Update and which had been split into 3 elements.

Part 1 Speed Review Process Update

The report provided the Executive Member with an update on the collaborative Speed Review Process set up under the 95 Alive Partnership and provided an overview of the locations from 2013, 2014 & 2015 where concerns about traffic speeds had been raised, and provided an update on progress towards assessing these against the agreed prioritisation framework.

The Executive Member noted the report and approved option 1.

Part 2 Review of the Speed Management Engineering Programme

The report provided the Executive Member with details of the speed management schemes which had been referred for an engineering solution and sought approval for the detailed 2015/16 speed management programme.

In relation to the comments made by the Public Speakers and Ward Members, Officers advised as follows:

- In relation to the Dunnington Scheme, Officers were aware that there were still concerns about the proposals

and were happy to look at the scheme again. As such, the scheme would be taken out of the programme at present to allow for further investigation.

- Officers felt that the Strensall Road scheme should remain in the programme to enable consultation to continue. In relation to the Sheriff Hutton Road scheme, this was already being dealt with and would be brought back to the Executive Member at a later date.
- In relation to the Wetherby Road scheme, Officers were already aware of the issues raised by Councillor Waller. The comments about a 40mph buffer were noted and would be incorporated into the ongoing consultation. Receipt of a 42 signature petition at the end of the Decision Session was also acknowledged.
- For all of the schemes above, if strong representations were received then a further report would be brought back to an Executive Member Decision Session.

The Executive Member was happy to approve the speed management programme with the suggested amendments.

### Part 3 Vehicle Activated Signs Review

The report sought approval for an updated Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) policy to include:

- The criteria that a site would have to meet before a VAS can be considered.
- Monitoring of existing and new sites and;
- The future maintenance of VAS

The Executive Member queried whether it would be possible to research the cost of different types of VAS so that the Council has cost information available upon request as a number of Parish Council's have queried costs in the past. Officers confirmed they could look into this.

Resolved: That the executive Member agreed to the following:

#### Part 1 – Speed Review Process Update

That the Executive Member approved Option 1, and agreed with the findings and

recommendations of the report as a cost effective, and evidence led solution to provide the appropriate level of investigation to community speed concerns.

Reason: So that all locations identified, from past reports as well as this current report, are considered for appropriate speed reduction measures on clear and equal guidelines.

### Part 2 – Review of Speed Management Engineering Programme.

i) Approve the proposed programme of schemes (Annex A-P sites) and authorise officers to undertake further consultation and advertisement of speed limit orders as necessary, and to implement the measures if no objections are received. Any measures which receive objections should be reported back to the Executive Member for a decision. With the following amendments:

- Removal of the Common Lane, Dunnington Scheme from the programme to allow for further investigation of speeds between it's junction with the A1079 and the village entrance.
- To include in the Consultation for Wetherby Road the 60mph limit on Wetherby Road (Acomb) to the A1237 be reduced to 40mph in a similar way to neighbouring junctions.
- York Road, Strensall to remain in the programme with a view to bringing back the matter to an Executive Member Decision Session if the consultation proves the scheme to be controversial amongst residents.

ii) Authorise officers to carry out additional speed surveys (Annex Q and R sites) and to

carry forward these sites for further assessment in the 2016/17 programme.

iii) Approve the inclusion of further feasibility work for the three sites with speed limit issues (Annex S) in the ongoing programme of speed management schemes.

Reason: To deliver measures to address speed complaints raised by local residents.

### Part 3 – Vehicle Activated Sign Review

Approved Option 2 and:

i. To retain the existing criteria for speed limit VAS, which is:

a) That Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding will only be used where the 85%ile speed equals or exceeds the signed limit by 10%+2mph (i.e. 35mph in a 30mph limit, and 46mph in a 40mph limit). This would be consistent with the speed enforcement thresholds employed by the police (ACPO guidelines).

b) Where this funding criteria is not quite met, a Ward Committee or Parish Council may still wish to fund the installation of a VAS. In this situation, a threshold of 85%ile speeds being 10% above the speed limit should be adopted (i.e. 33mph in a 30mph limit and 44mph in a 40mph limit).

Reason: To ensure a consistent approach and targeted use of LTP resources. In the case of Ward Committee and Parish Council funding this allows the use of VAS where there are real concerns about the speed of traffic but where the stricter criteria for LTP funding is not met.

ii. To establish criteria for the provision of hazard warning VAS based on at least one recorded injury accident in the previous three

years, with reports of inappropriate speed (which may be within the posted speed limit) .

Reason: To make sure hazard warning VAS are used appropriately.

iii. The existing system of monitoring should be replaced by collection and analysis of speed data before installation and three months after.

Reason: To focus future monitoring and review, where it is most needed.

iv. VAS to be reviewed as and when they develop faults applying the criteria in i. and ii. above. If the site meets the criteria, it is recommended that the VAS is repaired or replaced. If they do not, the sign and post should be removed and the site disbanded.

Reason: To address the issue of maintenance, longer term monitoring, and review the site objectively when the sign is not present.

v. To consider the need for future allocations for the review and aftercare of LTP funded signs. Ward committee or Parish Councils are expected to fund any maintenance (if they so wish) if they originally purchased the signs.

Reason: To address the current maintenance funding shortfall and ensure the VAS stock is maintained at sites where the signs are warranted.

## **26. Stockton Lane - Speed Management Scheme**

The Executive Member considered a report which sought approval for the implementation of cycle lanes on Stockton Lane between its junction with Lime Avenue and Greenfield Park Drive to reduce speeds following the receipt of speed complaints from local residents.



Officers outlined the report and advised that following a consultation, 6 objections to the scheme were received out of 116 responses. The scheme would be the first attempt to tackle speeding in the area and once implemented it would be monitored and the speed survey repeated to measure effectiveness.

The Executive Member was happy to approve the scheme with the understanding that if it did not have the required impact then officers would look at an alternative intervention.

Resolved:            That the Executive Member:  
  
                                 Approved the scheme as proposed in Annex B for implementation.

Reason:              To introduce measures to reduce speeds on Stockton Lane following the receipt of a speed complaint from local residents.

## **27. City Centre Strategy**

The Executive Member considered a report which outlined options for further investigation regarding the regulation of vehicles and other operational issues in the central retail area of the city.

Officers outlined the report and in response to the comments made by a registered speaker, confirmed that Spen Lane should of been included in the map at Annex A of the report.

The Executive Member commented that he supported the comments made about the enforcement of restrictions in the City Centre and the difficulties surrounding what Council Officers are able to enforce. He acknowledged that the Council can help with measures such as bollards and signage but officers would need to consult with all organisations in the City Centre to find solutions. He also asked that cycle parking facilities be reviewed.

Resolved:            That the Executive Member:

- (i) Approved the further investigation into the regulation of the City Centre as identified in Options 2,4,6 and 11 to include Spen Lane.
- (ii) Requested that consideration be given to the practicality of enforcement of the regulations.
- (iii) Requested that Officers review cycle parking facilities in the City Centre.

Reason: To enable a comprehensive and coherent review of the operation of the public highway in the city centre to be undertaken with the aim of minimising the impact of vehicular traffic whilst maintaining access for visitors, residents and businesses where appropriate.

## **28. Traffic Systems Asset Renewal Plan**

The Executive Member considered a report which presented a plan for structured renewals of traffic signals across the city, which a recent asset condition assessment had shown are in need of significant investment.

Officers outlined the report and advised that there was a significant backlog in the maintenance of traffic signal equipment in the city and that extra funds required to complete the work would be drawn from the Council's Local Transport Plan Integrated Block Capital allocation.

The Executive Member was pleased to note the work to be undertaken on the Traffic Signal Detector Equipment and the benefits this would bring towards improving traffic congestion in the city.

Resolved: That the Executive Member:

- (i) Approved the commencement of the Traffic Asset Renewal Programme as outlined in the report.

Reason: To ensure the City traffic signals equipment is up to date and the costs and risks to the Council of maintaining an increasingly aged asset are mitigated.

(ii) Approved the continuation of the current programme of provision of new detector equipment.

Reason: To ensure effective and reliable detection equipment is provided at traffic signal junctions in York for the benefit of road users.

## **29. City and Environmental Services Capital Programme - 2015/16 Monitor 1 Report**

The Executive Member considered a report which set out the progress to date on schemes in the 2015/16 City and Environmental Services Capital Programme, including budget spend to the end of September 2015. The report also proposed adjustments to scheme allocations to align with the latest cost estimates and delivery projections.

The Executive Member noted the report and asked that thanks be recorded to the Highways staff who had completed the A19 Pinch Point Scheme under budget.

That the Executive Member:

- i. Approved the virement of funds within the Highways and Transport Budgets.
- ii. Approved the amendments to the 2015/16 CES Capital Programme set out in Annexes 1 and 2.

Reason: To enable the effective management and monitoring of the council's capital programme.

Councillor Gillies, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 6.10 pm].