

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	14 February 2022
Present	Councillors D'Agorne and Widdowson

#### **41. 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 D'Agorne noted that he had a personal interest in item 4. Consideration of Objections for ResPark for Broadway West, as he was a resident of Broadway West. Therefore it was confirmed that Councillor Widdowson was in attendance to consider that item.

#### **42. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Sessions of the Executive Member for Transport held on 16 November 2021 and 18 January 2022 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

#### **43. Public Participation**

##### Public Participation

It was reported that there had been 11 registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. However, two were unable to attend the meeting.

Tony May questioned the Council's current policy of pedestrian crossing signal technology. He spoke in favour of the far side crossing signals being used and asked if sufficient consideration was used when considering signals at junctions and those not at junctions.

Roger Pierce spoke on behalf of Walk York who he noted preferred far side crossing signal technology. He noted the results of a public consultation which showed a preference in York for far side signals. He also outlined concerns that some blind or partially sighted residents had noted that they found far side signals better to use.

David Skaith raised concern about the current layout of Blossom Gate Junction for pedestrians. He noted the long wait for pedestrians at the large junction and that the narrowness of areas to wait to cross meant it was difficult to see the near side crossing technology.

Cllr Melly expressed concern about the reduction in the Acomb Road Active Travel Scheme. She noted that when meetings with Ward Councillors had taken place they had not included the reduction of the scheme and raised concerns that the remainder of the scheme was being outlined for a different program which had no budget or timeline for when work would begin.

Rob Ainsley noted that York Cycle Campaign were disappointed in the reduction of the Acomb Road Active travel Scheme and noted that the Council should deliver long continuous schemes instead of broken up routes. He also noted that Active Travel England providing funding would expect full schemes that promoted cycling by delivering good cycle infrastructure.

Cllr Lomas stated that residents in Acomb Ward wanted to cycle on safe routes and noted her disappointment in the Acomb Road Active Travel Scheme being reduced. She noted that this would leave the most dangerous part of the route for cyclists outside of the scheme. She also suggested that the scheme shouldn't be reduced if complaints had been made by Westfield Ward Councillors to the scheme.

Cllr Waller outlined that Westfield Ward Councillors were not opposed to the Acomb Road Active Travel Scheme but noted that a public consultation was required on the scheme. He noted work the Ward Councillors had undertaken locally around cycling and a report provided to the Council in June 2020. He also raised concerns that York High School and Westfield Primary were not listed for consultation on the scheme.

Kristian Gregory noted their disappointment in the reduction to the Acomb Road Active Travel Scheme. He outlined that the benefit of these cycle schemes should be to deliver safe long interrupted routes, however, the reduction would leave areas of danger along the route that would discourage residents from cycling.

Cllr K Taylor noted his frustration about the York Road and Acomb Road Active travel Schemes. He stated that he felt Councillors in Westfield Ward had opposed the Acomb Road Active Travel Scheme and therefore the scheme had be reduced. He asked that the Executive Member reinstate the whole scheme.

### Written Comments

Written comments below were received regarding agenda item 7. Position on use of signalled controlled pedestrian crossing technology:

Diana Robinson noted support for far side pedestrian crossing signals and noted the challenges of visibility of busy crossings with near side signals.

Chris Webb outlined his support for the use of far side pedestrian crossing signals and noted that a majority of those consulted had also supported far side signals.

Written comments below were received regarding agenda item 8. Active Travel Programme – Project Scope:

Jim McGurn on behalf of Get Cycling wrote that he felt insufficient progress had been made on the A19 cycle scheme.

Cllr Craghill wrote in relation to the junction of Ogleforth, Goodramgate and Aldwark. She noted concerns of the use of terms such as 'out of scope' and asked that an holistic approach be used for potential schemes outside the Active Travel Programme bring together different potential funding pots.

Barry Treanor noted his disappointment that the length of the Acomb Road scheme had been reduced. He also noted on the A19 Bootham Cycle Scheme that he felt too much of the Active Travel budget was being spent on design work for this area and noted previous designs that had been rejected.

Dorinda Gear wrote in relation to a number of schemes. she noted disappointment in reduction of the length of Acomb Road scheme, as well as, concern that she felt insufficient progress had been made on Active Travel schemes.

John Mackle noted disappointment that the Acomb Road scheme had been reduced in length and noted dangerous parts of the route for cyclists which would be left out of the scheme.

Mark Roman asked that the Council go to design stage for the whole of the Acomb Road scheme and asked that progress be made on A19 Cycle Scheme rather than new planning and survey work being undertaken.

Neal Hawman noted disappointment in current progress of the Active Travel Programme and that he felt the ambition of the schemes were decreasing.

Tim Pheby also noted disappointment in the progress of the programme and requested that the progress of the schemes in annex 1 be colour coded to show those on schedule. He also made a number of other comments regarding the schemes.

#### **44. Consideration of Objections for ResPark for Broadway West**

Councillor D'Agorne left the room for this item and Councillor Widdowson considered the report and noted that the objections received had been addressed by officers and agreed to confirm the decision to make the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) needed to introduce the Residents Parking scheme.

Resolved:

- i. Confirmed the decision to make the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) needed to introduce the Residents Parking scheme set out in the report and annexes. The proposed restrictions affect Broadway West and include 296 Fulford Road. They would be added to an extended Residents' Priority Parking Zone R63.

Reason: To positively respond to original petitions and further comments received, supporting Residents Parking controls in Broadway West, which the Executive Member considered in 2021 and to implement a scheme that reflects the majority view gained from more recent consultation in the area.

- ii. Approved the removal of the section of street being the initial length Westfield Drive from the scheme.

Reason: To respond to the views expressed on the configuration preferred by some residents.

- iii. Approved the extension of the zone as drafted to include those properties on the west side of Fulford Road (even numbers) 298 to 314.

Reason: To respond to the views expressed on the configuration preferred by a local resident whose property fronts a section of Fulford Road that is subject to no waiting at any time.

#### **45. Update on E-scooter trials**

Councillor D'Agorne noted that the initial decision to participate in the Department for Transport (DfT) trial for micro-mobility had been made in consultation with Councillor Widdowson, and he confirmed that he would consider the item in consultation with Councillor Widdowson.

Officers introduced the report noting that the trial of E-Scooters and E-Bikes had peaked with usage of 20,000 commutes in a month. They confirmed that the trial had been extended again by the DfT, however, the Council would need to implement a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the scheme as the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (E-TRO) would expire on 6 April 2022 and could not be extended without being made permanent.

Members noted the success the trial had had in the city and noted their thanks to the provider Tier who had worked closely with the Council to roll out the scheme. It was noted that the Council would need to monitor cycle parking spots in the city to ensure sufficient spaces were available for cyclists.

Resolved:

- i. Approved the continuation with the micro-mobility trial, in line with the DfT extension and that the current operator (TIER) will remain the sole provider in York until the end of the trial period.

Reason: Continuation of the trial in York until the 30th November 2022 in line with the DfT's expectations provides important feedback to the creation of national guidelines. It allows the approx. 6,000 current users making 20,000 trips a month to continue using the sustainable methods of transport to get around the city.

- ii. Approved the generation of a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the scheme as the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (E-TRO) will expire on 6 April 2022.

Reason: The experimental Traffic Regulation Order that allows Escooters to the list of permitted vehicles allowed to travel wherever cycles are permitted expires on 5 April 2022 and cannot legally be extended.

- iii. Confirmed that e-bikes to use CYC cycle racks with capacity restrictions so that there is plenty of space for other cycles at all times.

Reason: Allowing e-bikes (not e-scooters) to use cycle racks around the city will encourage adoption of cycling by making journey start and end points convenient and accessible to more people. This will also make e-bikes accessible to residents living in York's outer villages such as Haxby & Poppleton where scooter parking has not been easy to identify.

**46. Consideration of results from the consultation with residents of Mount Vale Drive, Mount Vale Gardens and Towton Avenue**

The Executive Member considered the proposal for a 'No Waiting' at any time restrictions for Mount Vale Drive, Mount Vale Gardens and Towton Avenue. He noted the objection that had been received and that temporary measures had not resulted in increased speeds. Noting the report the Executive Member agreed to the implementation.

Resolved:

- i. Approved the implementation of the as proposed 'No Waiting' at any time restrictions for Mount Vale Drive, Mount Vale Gardens and Towton Avenue.

Reason: To introduce required restrictions to ensure that waste services vehicles can continue to access Mount Vale Gardens and Towton Avenue safely to undertake their statutory duties. This will also help reduce the risk of damage to the kerb line from vehicle over run.

**47. Position on use of signalled controlled pedestrian crossing technology**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the Council's current policy which favoured near side crossing technology, however, they confirmed that each crossing was a case by case consideration for technical officers. The Executive Member highlighted the benefits mentioned by public participants for far side signals and enquired as to whether the council could use near and far side crossing technology at certain junction. Officers confirmed that legislation prevented them from using both signals at one crossing.

The Executive Member agreed to note the report but highlighted that the Council would need to continue to monitor the impact of any crossing signals used. He also asked that in order to create a more accessible city that officers consider how to prevent near side signals from being blocked from view at busy junctions, as well as, addressing some of the long waiting times at inner ring road junctions.

Resolved:

- i. Noted the report.

Reason: To remain updated on the Council's policy for the installation of pedestrian controlled traffic signal crossings.

#### **48. Active Travel Programme – Project Scope**

The Executive Member considered the report and noted the need for the Council to get the scope correct for its list of Active Travel Programme. It was clarified that the report was looking at the scope for the different proposed programmes before design work was undertaken. It was therefore confirmed that schemes would still go out to public consultation when individual schemes were being advertised.

Several of the individual schemes were discussed by the Executive Member. He also noted the comments made during public participation and from the written representatives, and added that he had had discussion with Ward Councillors about schemes such as Acomb Road. Following discussions with officers he also recommended the changes outlined in the resolved below to the following schemes, amended additional text highlighted in yellow.

Resolved:

- i. Approved the project outlines including the extension of the Acomb Road scheme to include the section from Beckfield Lane to Hebden Rise, with a number of individual changes to the documents detailed below to the Active Travel Programme – Project Scope:

Annex 2 - A19 Cycle Scheme the objectives be revised to state: "Improve junctions for cyclists **(without detriment to pedestrians)** – Make changes to the junctions of Clifton Green / Water End and Rawcliffe Lane / Shipton Road to improve the amenity for cycling **(and where possible for walking)**". That the scope be revised to state "Consideration of solutions to enable safe



pedestrian access to, and use of, existing bus stops (including meeting needs of disabled passengers).”

Annex 3 – Acomb Road Cycle Scheme the geographical scope of the project be amended and now reaches “between Beckfield Lane and the Fox junction”. It was confirmed that design work for the scheme could commence on the entire geographical scope, however, construction work west of Hebden Rise may occur in a later phase than the other elements, dependent upon consultation outcome and interactions with the Acomb Regeneration scheme.

Annex 6 - A1237 Section over the River Ouse it was decided that a reduction in speed limit can be considered to achieve the project objectives. This can include consideration of a reduction in speed limits in the adjacent location of Great North Way. It was noted that the scoping document would not require changes to project outline required, consideration of speed limit reduction was already identified within the document.

Annex 7 - City Centre North South Cycle Route that the project description be revised to state: “Create a clear, legible, attractive alternative route for cyclists instead of the footstreets or the inner ring road.” Also that the scope be revised to: “Consideration of LTN 1/20. Green scoring solutions are preferred, however non green scoring solutions can be considered if they achieve the stated objectives. This includes the location of Ogleforth / Aldwalk junction”

Annex 8 – City Centre Bridges that the scope revised to state “Consideration of solutions that require changes to traffic regulation orders, including lower speed limits.” Also to revise the scope to state “Consideration of solutions that impact loading / bus stop arrangements, where relevant.”

Annex 15 – Fishergate Gyratory P&C Scheme that several addition be made to the scope:

- “Consideration of alterations to the pedestrian route crossing Cemetery Road junction on the East side of Fulford Road. This can include consideration of signalised solutions.”
- “Consideration of changes to the pedestrian route at the Western end of Kent St. This can include consideration signalised solutions.

- “Consideration of changes to speed limits, where required to achieve project objectives.”
- “Changes to existing traffic signals or introduction of new traffic signals, **except in those 2 locations defined above.**”

Annex 17 – St Georges Field Crossing that an additional be made to the scope: “Consideration of both single-stage and multi-stage pedestrian crossing solutions.”

Annex 18 – Rougier St Tanners Moat Gap that an additional be made to the scope: “Consideration of changes to kerbs and other civil constructions, where required to achieve the project objectives.”

Annex 19 – Skeldergate Cycle Improvements that an additional be made to the scope: “Consideration of adapted cycles / tricycles.”

- ii. To delegate to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning in consultation with the Executive Member further amendments to the outlines of the projects.

Reason: To enable officers to progress projects effectively within the Active Travel Programme.

- iii. Agreed to delegate to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning in consultation with Director of Governance and Chief Finance Officer the procurement of design resource for the ‘A19 Cycle Scheme’ and the A1237 section over the River Ouse’ scheme.

Reason: To support progress of the identified projects.

- iv. Confirmed and approved the proposed prioritisation of projects within the programme.

Reason: To support the creation of more accurate programme timescales and allow more effective assignment of resource.

- v. Confirmed and approved the budget allocation follows the above prioritisation in decision iii. This

approach being one that assigns funding to projects as and when the necessary feasibility information becomes available, rather than waiting for information on all projects within the programme.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate balance is reached between obtaining value for money and the expeditious delivery of schemes.

Cllr A D'Agorne, Executive Member for Transport  
[The meeting started at 3.01 pm and finished at 5.03 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank