
Meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel

26 March 2007

Report of the Director of City Strategy

POLICY FOR DEALING WITH ACCESS AND PARKING ISSUES IN NARROW STREETS

Summary

1. Members will recall at their 15 January 2007 meeting they considered a report from the residents in Langholme Drive, Acomb where they were calling for highway improvement works in the street to make access and egress of the street easier for vehicular traffic.
2. Members resolved to review access and parking issues in narrow streets across the city and formulate a coherent policy to deal with them.
3. Members are asked to consider the options outlined in this report and approve the recommendation.

Background

4. For the purpose of this report and for Members clarification the definition of a narrow road is equal to or less than five metres of carriageway width.
5. A copy of the Council's highway design guide policy with regards to the minimum carriageway width for new builds is shown as Annex 1.
6. Clearly many of the roads and streets in York were built well before any coherent policy with regards to highway design was ever implemented. Members will note that the current Highway Design Guide only allows two categories of roads to be built to an adoptable standard where the carriageway width can be equal to or less than 5 metres. These are informal shared surfaces where the road serves 25 or less properties or a minor access way, in effect a private drive which serves less than five properties.
7. The City of York Council network consists of 750 kilometres of carriageway. Of these, when you discard rural roads where there is no parking or access problems we have approximately 147 kilometres of residential roads or 20% of the network where the carriageway width is 5 metres or less. Approximately 23 kilometres of these roads are back lanes, 50.5 kilometres are roads where there is a verge or verges as well as a footway, and the rest approximately 73.5 kilometres are streets with just a footway or footways both sides, typically

a terraced street. Annex 2 is a plan showing the location of all the Council's narrow roads, which because of its size will be circulated at the meeting.

8. Narrow residential roads, often suffer from extensive resident parking and this can create a number of difficulties such as access problems and damage to grass verges and footways where vehicles park on them.
9. A policy to deal with damage to grass verges was approved at an officer in consultation planning and transport meeting of the 7 December 2000. A copy of this report will be available at the meeting or should Members want to see it before the meeting a copy can be had from the writer of this report.
10. The policy framework approved in the damage to grass verge policy unequivocally stated that any highway improvement works should be funded by a third party and the highway maintenance budgets should only be used to maintain the existing network.
11. Given the current financial position of the highway maintenance budget I see no reason to change this approach.

Consultation

12. Consultation has taken place with the emergency services and with Neighbourhood Services. Contact details of the consultees can be provided by the writer of this report should Members wish to request them.

13. **Police**

They only require sufficient space to take a car through, and are not experiencing difficulties like the other emergency services.

14. **Fire Service**

They experience difficulties with narrow terraced streets where cars are parked both sides. The problem is increasing, but still only occurs once or twice a year. Standard appliances are usually okay to get through, but the aerial platforms are wider. If they are responding to an emergency and a parked car is blocking the route they will try to move it (eg by bouncing), then proceed slowly and move through.

15. **Neighbourhood Services**

They are not experiencing difficulties with gaining access.

16. **Ambulance**

They have a lot of problems with narrow terraced streets where cars park both sides, particularly Leeman Road and Bishophill areas. The contact person emphasised it happens a lot, but didn't give a frequency. As they only have a 2 person crew they can't move vehicles. They approach as near as possible then offload all their gear and wheel a stretcher down the street.

Options

17. Option 1: Seek residents support to park in a more resident friendly, controlled manner to improve access and egress and reduce damage to grass verges and footways.

Option 2: Introduce a traffic regulation order to limit waiting to sections or the whole of the street and thereby improve access and egress for all.

Option 3: Where there is a grass verge convert it to a hard landscaped area using block paving, eco-blocks, bituminous macadam or similar, to widen the street to at least 5.5 m.

Option 4: Widen the road, on one or both sides depending on the severity and nature of the problem to 5.5 m in residential areas and 7.2 m where there is regular use by HGV's or buses.

Analysis

Option 1

18. This option is in line with the Council's established grass verge policy. In addition to the letters which the Highway Infrastructure team already sends in an attempt to control this matter, Officers could look at ways of utilising parking attendants and street scene officers who apart from being additional eyes on the ground could give useful help and assistance in controlling and managing the manner in which residents park.

Option 2

19. This may prove to be the most unpopular option, but would achieve resident's aspirations by ensuring the street is kept clear. Members should be aware it would be very difficult to enforce, particularly at periods through the night.
20. For any TRO to be effective Members would have to consider extending the Parking Attendants hours, possibly up to midnight. Members would have to balance the additional costs of this against the benefits, which may include a small increase in income from fines, although the main benefit would be more accessible roads.

Option 3

21. Again this is in line with the current damage to grass verge policy but the cost, plus any statutory undertakers diversionary works costs, would have to be found from third parties such as Ward Committees.

Option 4

22. This is the best engineering solution to the problem but is also the most expensive. As with Option 3 and again in line with the current damage to grass verge policy the cost of the works plus any statutory undertaker diversion

works would need to be found from other sources such as ward committee budgets, residents associations etc.

Corporate Priorities

Maintenance of the public highway has a direct impact on several of the Council's corporate aims and priorities:

23. Corporate Aim 1: (Environment)

Take pride in the City by improving quality and sustainability, creating a clean and safe environment.

Specific priorities:

- 1.1 Increase resident satisfaction and pride with their local neighbourhoods.
- 1.2 Protect and enhance the built and green environment that makes York unique.
- 1.3 Make getting around York easier, more reliable and less damaging to the environment.

24. Corporate Aim 3: (Economy)

Strengthen and diversify York's economy and improve employment opportunities for residents.

Not directly relevant to any of the specific priorities, but good quality highway infrastructure is vital to the local economy.

25. Corporate Aim 4: (Safer City)

Create a safe City through transparent partnership working with other agencies and the local community.

Specific priority:

- 4.7 Make York's roads safer for all types of user.

26. Corporate Aim 8: (Corporate Health)

Transform City of York Council into an excellent customer-focused "can do" authority.

Specific priority:

- 8.9 Manage the Council's property, IT and other assets on behalf of York residents.

Implications

Financial

27. The cost to carry out Option 1 would be met from the Council's current Staffing Budget.
28. The cost to carry out Option 2 would be dependent on the length of yellow line needed in respect of the Traffic Regulation Order but typically would be between £1,000 and £2,000 per street, plus any additional staffing costs.
29. Members should note that to properly enforce Option 2 may cost up to an additional £200,000 per annum depending on how many waiting restriction are introduced and the extra cost of employing parking attendants.
30. The cost to harden the grass verge would be dependent on the materials used and the cost of any statutory undertaker diversionary works. Typically the physical works would cost between £60 per square metre and £80 per square metre plus the cost of the statutory undertaker works.
31. Option 4. The cost to reconstruct a grass verge or footway to a carriageway construction depth would be £135 per square metre plus the cost of all the statutory undertaker diversionary works.
32. Option 2 would have to be considered as part of the annual highway maintenance report in order that funding could be made available for the physical works or alternatively could be funded by the ward committee if they considered it worthy of promoting.
33. Options 3 and 4 would have to be funded by a third party such as a Ward Committee or a residents association, or residents themselves.

Human Resources

34. There may be a need to increase staffing levels in the parking section should it be felt necessary to lengthen the enforcement hours of Traffic Regulation Orders around the City.

Equalities

35. There are no equalities implications.

Legal

36. City of York Council in its capacity as the Highway Authority as a statutory duty under Section 41 of the 1980 Highways Act to maintain the public highway.

Crime and Disorder

37. There are no significant Crime and Disorder implications, although parking on footways and grass verges, or obstructing the free flow of traffic or pedestrians by way of anti social parking could well lead to disorder.

Information Technology (IT)

38. There are no information technology implications.

Property

39. There are no property implications.

Other

40. There are no other implications.

Risk Management

41. In compliance with the Council's Risk Management strategy the main risks have been identified in this report are risks arising from hazards to assets and people (physical), those which could lead to financial loss (financial), and none compliance with legislation (Legal and regulatory). Measured in terms of impact and likelihood the risk score for all of the above has been assessed at less than 16. This means that at this point the risks need only to be monitored as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report.

Recommendations

42. (1). Note the content of the report.
- (2) Approve the decision making process, as outlined in Annex 3 of this report.

Reason: to comply with current Council policy and ensure that the Highway Maintenance Budgets are expended in the most cost effective way whilst at the same time freeing access for vehicular traffic to the road network where streets are equal to or less than 5 metres wide.

Contact Details

Author:
Fred Isles
Maintenance Manager
Highway Infrastructure
Tel 01904 551444

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Damon Copperthwaite
Assistant Director
(City Development & Transport)

Specialist Implications Officers:
Wards Affected: All

Report Approved **Date** 13/3/07
Patrick Looker, Finance Manager, City Strategy

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Damage to Grass Verge Policy 7 December 2000.

Annexes

- Annex 1 Extract from Highway Design Guide
- Annex 2 Plan of the Council's narrow roads – to be presented at the meeting – available for inspection on request at reception at 9 St Leonard's Place
- Annex 3 Decision making process as set out in the approved Damage to Grass Verge Policy in December 2000.

FI/LT

5 March 2007

[comm/emap-citystrategy/260307](#) Policy for dealing with access and parking issues in narrow streets

Extract from Highway Design Guide

Road Type	Minimum Carriageway width*	Minimum Centreline radius	Minimum footway width	Minimum verge width	Design Speeds for visibility etc	Max Gradient	Junction Alignment	Minimum Spacing junction (m)	
								Same side	Opp side
	(m)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(mph)	(%)	(°)		
Local Distributor	6.5 ¹	60	2 x 2.0	2 x 2.0 ²	30	6	90°	60	35
Transition Road	6.0	60	2 x 2.0		30	6	90°	60	35
Residential Access Roads:									
Major	5.5	20 ³	2 x 2.0	N/A	20/30	7	90°	30	15
Minor	5.5	20	2 x 2.0	N/A	20	7	90°±10°	N/A	N/A
Shared surface roads									
Informal shared surfaces	4.5 - 6.5	10	N/A	2 x 2.0	<20	10	90°±10°	N/A	N/A
Access courts	6.5 ⁴	10	N/A		<20	10	90°±10°	N/A	N/A
Minor Accessway	4.5 ⁵	10	N/A	1 x 2.0	<20	10	90°±10°	N/A	N/A

NARROW STREET POLICY - DECISION MAKING PROCESS



