
MEETING	DECISION SESSION - CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY
DATE	27 SEPTEMBER 2012
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR MERRETT (CABINET MEMBER)
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLOR REID

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting, the Cabinet Member was asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests that he might have had in the business on the agenda.

The Cabinet Member declared two personal and non prejudicial interests in both items on the agenda.

In relation to Agenda Item 4 (Open Space at Mayfield Grove York) the Cabinet Member declared an interest, in that he lived close to the land under consideration.

Regarding Agenda Item 5a (A59 Phase 2 and Phase 3 Bus Priorities-Highway Proposals Consultation and A59 Phase 1 and 3 TRO Consultation) he declared an interest as he worked in an adjoining building to the areas under consideration.

No other interests were declared.

10. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on 2 August 2012 be approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - DECISION SESSION

It was reported that there had been five registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Details of the registrations are included under the relevant minute.

12. OPEN SPACE LAND AT MAYFIELD GROVE YORK

The Cabinet Member considered a report which asked him to confirm the progress made and actions taken on Open Space Land at Mayfield Grove following a decision made at the Cabinet Member Decision Session held on 8 March 2012 where the matter was considered previously.

David Munley spoke on behalf of the Mayfield Community Trust, who rejected the Officer's recommendation to approve Option 1, to hand over responsibility of the long term management of the land to York Natural Environment Trust (YNET). He felt that the track record of YNET was not credible given that they had failed to secure ownership and maintain the land in the past, when they had the responsibility to do this. He also added that he felt that YNET had little public support.

Louise Cresser, the secretary of the Chase Residents Association (CRA) spoke about how the organisation did not know that YNET had been previously managing the land. She also stated that the Officer's report did not mention the Mayfield Community Trust, which would be taking over the management, if the CRA bid was successful. She also felt that the successful bidder should be handed responsibility in perpetuity. This would then seek to avoid the successful applicant from ceding their responsibilities to the site.

Bob Dick, from YNET spoke about YNET's involvement in the site over many years and felt that they had the advantage of being an established trust with a track record in relation to the Mayfield Community Trust, which had been established recently. He informed the Cabinet Member although YNET had reported difficulties with a group of residents over the past couple of years, that he felt that this was not insurmountable and should not be used to portray YNET as not being engaged with the community.

Gordon Campbell Thomas, a representative of the John Lally Foundation, who wished for the management of the land to be given over to the CRA, spoke. He reported that he had been the Chair of YNET in the 1990s, and outlined some history of their involvement in the site during that decade. He felt that as the CRA and Mayfield Community Trust had greater links to the local community that they should be entrusted with the site.

Councillor Reid spoke about how she felt that the CRA should manage the site. She felt that as the open space had principally been set aside for development that the residents should be managing the land. She added that YNET had not shown plans of how they would manage the land, and that their bid wanted to restrict access on to the land. Additionally, she commented that YNET had not shown their plans for the site with all interested groups. Finally, she suggested that if the Cabinet Member did not decide on Option 2 that he should postpone making a decision to a later date.

Officers told the Cabinet Member that a significant amount of time had been put in by both organisations in the preparation of their two bids.

Further points were made by Officers on the scoring of the bids which included;

- That the MCT bid was stronger than YNET on the levels of community engagement, in particular that YNET had only suggested two community meetings a year.
- That on management proposals YNET had achieved a higher score, as it was very clear on how they would manage the site.
- The MCT bid said that they had a 10 year restoration plan, but their management plan did not outline how they would carry this out.
- That the final scores between the bids were less than 10% apart.

The Cabinet Member stated that he felt that both organisations were appointable to manage the land at Mayfield Grove, but that he had concerns in regards to YNET's levels of community engagement. He also added in relation to the MCT bid, that uncertainties in their management plan had left him unsatisfied. He felt that further discussions needed to take place with both groups in order to address these concerns. He said it was preferable if both organisations could make a deal, as both could bring different expertise to the land management.

The Cabinet Member decided to defer making a decision and urged to all those who were involved to allow for the space to be kept special.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That the report be noted.
 - (ii) That the comments raised by the public, Councillors and interested organisations be noted.
 - (iii) That the decision on securing future management arrangements for the land at Mayfield Grove be deferred.

REASON: In order for further discussions to take place with the two bidding parties to clarify levels of community involvement and management plans.

13. URGENT BUSINESS: A59 PHASE 2 AND PHASE 3 BUS PRIORITIES- HIGHWAY PROPOSALS CONSULTATION AND A59 PHASE 1 AND 3 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO) CONSULTATION

The Cabinet Member received a report which requested him to consider the designs and approve proposals for immediate construction of bus priority works on Phase 2 and 3 of the A59 bus corridor scheme as highlighted in an annex to the Officer's report.

Officers updated the Cabinet Member on an issue raised in the consultation period for the Phase 3 works in relation to a right hand turn into Tisbury Road.

They added that they had amended the layout and markings to avoid making the use of the turn more difficult following the works.

The Cabinet Member suggested a few amendments to the bus priority works under consideration that he felt needed to be added to the designs and proposals including;

- That the use of anti pedestrian paving between the bus stop and the proposed crossing on Phase 3 of the A59 bus corridor scheme be deleted, following concerns raised by the Police.
- That there was a lack of facilities for cyclists and suggested that the pedestrian crossing refuge across the mouth of Holgate Park Drive be widened. Following a concern that this would make the inbound carriage narrower, he suggested that changes be made to the triangular island junction.
- That a traffic survey be carried out before and after construction works to review the situation of commuter parking in nearby residential streets.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That the comments raised by the public, Councillors and interested organisations be noted.
 - (ii) That the Officer's response to the comments and proposed amendments to the design be noted.
 - (iii) That the implementation of the schemes of Phase 2 (as set out in the drawing in Annex 4 of the report) and Phase 3 (as set out in the drawing to Annex 5 of the report) be agreed in line with the recommended improvements and the following amendments;

- That Officers look again at the layout of the Acomb Road/Holgate Road/Poppleton Road junction to provide more space for cyclists if possible.
 - That Officers carry out a traffic survey before and after the construction of bus priority works to review the situation of commuters parking on residential streets in the area.
- (iv) That the addition of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders to the city-wide order be approved.

REASON:

To inform the Cabinet Member of the consultation responses and to enable the works to proceed prior to inclement weather and the moratorium on highway works.

CLLR D MERRETT, Cabinet Member
[The meeting started at 4.35 pm and finished at 5.25 pm].