

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p><b>A) Recommendations to be implemented in the <u>short term</u> i.e. included as part of the preparatory and ongoing work for LTP3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2010/11 Capital Programme approved at DSEMCS on 02 March 2010</li> <li>• the ad hoc scrutiny report forms part of the LTP3 evidence base and will be considered and developed as part of the LTP3 process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short term is defined as <u>2010/11</u> in the report. It should be noted that there is little scope for change during the present year as the budgets have already been set</li> </ul>
<p>(i). Strengthen the place of transport policy in future versions of York's Sustainable Community Strategy to recognise its importance in the life of the city and the importance of tackling congestion to its' residents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WoW Board is a stakeholder for LTP3, which is intended to harmonise with a refreshed Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support as a generalised comment. The Sustainable Community Strategy is updated periodically (but not "owned" by Council). The LSP will continue to be consulted on LTP3.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) Commission a detailed study involving stakeholders, of a future long term Transport Strategy to 2025 and beyond based around the scenarios emerging from the consultation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long Term Strategy, already drafted, will be reviewed / updated, as appropriate, as part of the LTP3 'dialogue' in summer 2010 and as part of the work to understand LDF requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be further consultation on the LTP3 in late summer. Regular reviews are built into the timetable for implementing LTPs</li> </ul>
<p>(iii). Adopt an on-going public engagement strategy in terms of the future transport strategy and solutions for the City</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LTP has no fixed end date as yet. The review periods and engagement for reviewing / updating LTP3 could be set out in the first edition of LTP3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See ii</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p>(iv) Adopt the transport hierarchy detailed in paragraph 19 of the Final Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the measures will be examined in the ‘dialogue’ and as part of the development for LTP3.</li> <li>• No mention has been specifically made about making better use of (all forms of) public transport, financial stimuli or other demand management measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed hierarchy seems somewhat naive and assumes, for example, technology progress (5<sup>th</sup> priority) which may not happen for many years</li> <li>• Priority 7 is actually a short term reality as "stop start" technology is already with us and being fitted to an growing number of vehicles.</li> </ul>
<p>(v) Fund the development of a comprehensive ‘Smart Choice’ package including personalised journey planning to maximise modal shift together with a re-invigoration of ‘Travel Plans’, ensuring they are implemented, monitored and periodically updated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct terminology is ‘smarter choices’</li> <li>• Almost a totally revenue funding dependent activity. Additional staff resource would also be required.</li> <li>• Work on travel plans with businesses is underway through the cycling city programme and work is being undertaken on the CYC TP.</li> <li>• Assume this is referring to workplace rather than school travel plans (or both?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget amendment, to provide more funding in 10/11 for smarter choices ,was defeated at February Council meeting, but there is already capacity available to continue work on cycling, home to school travel planning etc.</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p>(vi) Re-acknowledge the role of city centre car park availability and fee levels relative to bus fares in influencing modal choice, whilst taking account of the short term economic situation and recognising the importance of both imperatives. Remove car park charges from the budget process entirely and set them as part of a longer term policy approach to both transport and the city centre economy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking availability and price is a useful demand management tool and it would be possible to maintain a closer link but it would have revenue implications</li> <li>• City centre car parking charges should be considered in parallel with Park &amp; Ride fares. This, rather than 'bus fares' per se, is the key issue if traffic congestion in York is to be reduced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opaque recommendation. Use of municipal car parks in central York has reduced since the economic recession started and prior to that levels were stable. The introduction of new electronic ticket machines – now working in the Piccadilly car park - offers the opportunity to make differential charges at less busy times of day.</li> <li>• It is simply not possible to detach car parking income (worth £7 million a year to the Council) from the budget setting process</li> </ul>
<p>(vii) Ensure the current local development control policies on limiting city centre car parks are enforced and further tightened up within the new Local Development Framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitations of powers available to CoYC in preventing some car parks opening and operating.</li> <li>• Resource implications of identifying car parks operating without consent and subsequent granting of consent or enforcement (closing down)</li> <li>• NYP are represented on the Quality Bus Partnership and provide advice/assistance where resources permit to address the concerns presented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed but enforcement may not be straight forward</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p>(viii) Seek an agreed traffic enforcement strategy with North Yorkshire Police for the York area and establish an on-going delivery partnership arrangement to address issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus priorities</li> <li>• Road safety</li> <li>• On-street parking</li> <li>• School no parking zones</li> <li>• Considerate road user campaigns across all modes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be affected by the future transference of 'policing' moving traffic offences from the Police to CoYC which will be considered by Network Mgt once appropriate regulations have been made (will check further on this)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was NYP reaction to this suggestion? Presumably they were invited to comment by the congestion committee? It is unfortunate that this is not detailed in the report.</li> <li>• If the Police have not been consulted then officers are requested to do so.</li> <li>• There does seem to be potential scope for more enforcement of minor traffic offences using PCSO and civil enforcement (parking warden) resources.</li> </ul>
<p>(ix) Make representations to Government in relation to the roll out powers to non London authorities on enforcement issues possibly through the Sustainable Communities Act</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure what enforcement issues are referred to, if it is moving traffic offences then awaiting appropriate regulations to be implemented? Would involve purchase of camera equipment, poss additional resourcing to process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remains to be seen what happens to the SCA.</li> <li>• Need to understand what enforcement issues we talking about?</li> <li>• What are the cost implications?</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
(x) Undertake an early comprehensive review of the current bus network in terms of appropriate changes to match changing development patterns and gaps etc, since the 2002 review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Group, in partnership with the Council reviewed and radically reformed their bus network in 2001/2.</li> <li>• CoYC is currently in discussion with First Group concerning a review of their bus operations.</li> <li>• York's tendered bus services were reviewed as part of a bus study in January 2009. A further review will be undertaken to inform the procurement of bus services (2011)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed: This is already underway and there are plans to relaunch the partnership agreements with local bus service providers later in the year</li> </ul>
(xi) Undertake an urgent review of the Council's bus strategy, taking into account the new powers in the recent transport act, so as to move towards a bus network that is completely integrated from the bus users point of view, including integrated ticketing and day round services, to include:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although no longer a requirement to produce a separate Bus Strategy, LTP3 is likely to reference a fully updated Bus Strategy.</li> <li>• A trial 'Quality Contract' will be considered in the procurement of services for the new Park &amp; Ride services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans exist for a trial Statutory Quality Contract (SQC) although a Statutory Quality Partnership (SQP) might be a cheaper and quicker option to implement.</li> <li>• Discussions are ongoing re cross ticketing but there are cost and practical issues. First are pressing ahead on the development of a smart card payment option for their fleet in Yorkshire.</li> </ul>
(xi) a) Examining how the current stagnation in overall bus usage, decline in non-concessionary usage, and in the conventional bus network can be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity is one of the fundamental principles in LTP3, so it will examine how best to connect people from home to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some users have transferred from being paying passengers to concession holders but overall bus passenger numbers are stable.</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
reversed	<p>work and will examine the role of buses in the commute</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoYC currently developing bilateral partnership agreements with all York bus operators</li> </ul>	<p>Recently there has been a minor decline in volumes – as there has been on all modes of transport – because of the recession; but less than in other Cities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is already discussing the possible introduction improvements with operators including “express” services to cater for specific travel needs (e.g. to serve the University expansion)</li> <li>• We have already agreed to refresh partnership arrangements with bus operators</li> </ul>
(xi) b) Ensuring positive promotion of bus network and bus usage including passenger information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better information for passengers was one of the proposed actions in the (abandoned) LTP3 stage 2 city-wide consultation</li> <li>• The marketing sub-group of the Quality Bus Partnership is currently working on a strategy to deliver improved web based and at-stop bus information pooling the resources of both CoYC and the bus operators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
(xi) c) Improving the quality of interchange points between public transport modes and between routes with designated interchange stops, and coordinate bus timings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although improved interchange(s) has been an aspiration since before LTP1 there is no quantitative evidence yet to support the need.</li> <li>• A comprehensive survey of bus users is planned to better understand what interchange journeys are currently being made and what latent demand exists for interchange journeys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlikely to be solved entirely in a short term (12 month) project but is a worthy longer term objective</li> </ul>
(xi) d) Prioritising the provision of timetable displays and bus shelters at all bus stops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The marketing sub-group of the Quality Bus Partnership is currently working on a strategy to deliver improved web based and at-stop bus information pooling the resources of both CoYC and the bus operators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Scrutiny Committee should be more specific in identifying which bus stops do not have timetables. (Providing timetable information is a responsibility of the bus operator)</li> </ul>
(xi) e) Requesting that local bus companies continue to revise bus timetables to provide more accurate and credible timings, and work to them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VQP/SQP/SQC issue</li> <li>• Current government consultation out for bus operators to engage with local government before registering bus timetables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any changes to bus timetables need to be coordinated to avoid confusion for passengers.</li> </ul>
(xi) f) Improving access to York District Hospital from all parts of the city, which may involve route revisions and through ticketing. Demand for parking at and around the Hospital as well as improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• York Hospital aiming to become a 'Secondary Care Plus' centre? The implications of this will need to be examined with the York Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While direct services to hospital are desirable for many, the road network means that buses from the WEST of the City would have to be routed through St Leonards</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p>access can be achieved by ensuring the extension of Park &amp; Ride services to include the Hospital</p>	<p>as part of the LTP3 'dialogue'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved bus stop facilities (closer to main entrance) planned as part of the hospital's internal road layout &amp; parking changes</li> </ul>	<p>Place rather than the, more popular with most passengers, Pavement area. Any change needs to be subject to full consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have already agreed to route the new Wigginton Road Park and Ride service via the hospital (but not before 2011).</li> <li>• Cross bus ticketing still being discussed with bus operators who now seem to see some advantages in finding a system that works for them all</li> </ul>
<p>(xii) Introduce a Bus Champion for the City to support City Strategy and bus operators in re-invigorating the Quality Bus Partnership, and use them to:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better delivered through VQP/SQP/SQC</li> <li>• The Quality Bus Partnership has an independent chairperson. Would the 'Champion' be a Cllr, member of Bus Users UK, or something else?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The champion role is one that could be taken over by the independent Chair of the QBP</li> </ul>
<p>(xii) a) Examine and implement ways of improving bus boarding times, whilst avoiding penalising occasional and less well off bus users</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing discussions with bus operators concerning the possible introduction of off bus ticketing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumed to a coded message re off bus ticket sales. Off bus ticket sales have the advantage of reducing boarding times and hence the speed of the service. However, previous trials of a (mainly) off bus sales strategy on a service in 2006 were disappointing. Will be easier</li> </ul>



Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
		when a smartcard product is universally available
(xii) b) Identify underused bus services and undertake those measures that would most effectively stop the current decline in bus usage i.e. ticketing and marketing measures for all services, holding down bus fare levels, increased non-concessionary bus priorities, influencing public attitudes and tackling outstanding issues from the 2001 Steer Davies review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus services are being reviewed in relation to the changing shape and demands of the city.</li> <li>• Changes to services are currently limited by operators willingness change them as part of their business model</li> <li>• Current DfT consultation is reviewing Local Government powers to set maximum fares on a subsidised basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear what is meant by “increased non-concessionary bus priorities”</li> <li>• The Council currently does not have powers to control bus ticket pricing (in 2010)</li> </ul>
(xii) c) Review the operation and delivery of the BLISS real time bus information display system and agree a comprehensive programme for its early roll out across the whole network, with local bus operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic approach to rolling-out BLISS / RTPi is required</li> <li>• 100% of First York, Coastliner, Transdev York &amp; EYMS buses operating in York area are fitted with RTPi. York Pullman to be fitted in 2010/11.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be significant cost implications in rolling out Real Time displays at every bus stop? Does the Congestion committee really mean that? Certainly couldn't be done during 2010?</li> <li>• The vast majority of buses operating in York already are equiped to provide RTPi</li> </ul>
(xii) d) Review loading and parking restrictions and their enforcement on bus routes with bus operators and the Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An activity to be undertaken by the QBP performance sub-group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed although it is unlikely to be completed by the end of 2010/11</li> </ul>
(xii) e) Work with partners in the wider York area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering York in the wider area is an important factor in LTP3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
(xiii) Drive through early implementation of full DDA compliance for all Council vehicles used by Social Services and council procured bus services, and CCTV in taxis and private hire vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local bus services procured in 2011 will require full DDA compliance. Current contracts are comply with DPTAC regulations</li> <li>• The vast majority of buses in York are DDA compliant</li> <li>• Might be considered within the 'York Taxi Accreditation Scheme' (refer to Dick Haswell)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vast majority of buses in York are DDA compliant. New Dial and Ride buses meet high accessibility standards.</li> <li>• Unclear who will pay for CCTV in Taxis and Private hire and what the cost of so doing would be?</li> </ul>
(xiv) Ensure better pedestrian priority at traffic signals and in road & junction layouts to simplify and speed up pedestrian crossing times whilst minimising the knock on consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Puffin technology used in all new installations and on upgrades which also has safety benefits.</li> <li>• Signal timings are currently looked at on a case by case basis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is being done as the capital works programme rolls around City, but won't be completed in 2010 other than at sites which are already programmed (e.g. Blossom Street)</li> </ul>
(xv) Tackle road safety issues and help to make roads more attractive to green modes by undertaking 'Considerate Road User' campaigns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agreed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. Already being done through cycling City</li> </ul>
(xvi) Reinvigorate cycling in York using the 'Cycling City' initiative and funding by:		
(xvi) a) tackling key gaps in the network and difficult locations i.e. bridges, key radials and junctions, as identified by the 2003/4 cycling scrutiny review but as yet not implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires commitment from all parties to difficult decisions and implications.</li> <li>• Cycling scrutiny review was some time ago would be useful for electronic report to be made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is being done this year (see capital programme). Did the congestion committee have something else in mind?</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
	available (not available on intranet)	
(improving planning processes to ensure adequate consideration is given in new designs to cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>officers with responsibility for walking and cycling facilities are involved in the response to pre-planning and planning applications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“new designs to cycling” If this means layouts on new developments to accommodate optimised cycle routes then that is being done.</li> </ul>
(xvi) b) relaunching Cycling Forum to give stakeholders the opportunity to shape future cycling policies and proposals, and to encourage partnership work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second meeting will be in May/June 2010</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relaunched about a year ago</li> </ul>
(xvii)The Cycling Champion for York to:		
(xvii) a) ensure cycling measures are focused around what will make a difference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Officers would welcome any further in put the cycle champion is able to provide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is what he is already doing</li> </ul>
(xvii) b) promote considerate road user behaviour by cyclists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ditto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is what he is already doing</li> </ul>
(xvii) c) engage the business community to encourage the provision of cycling facilities for both employees and visitors/customers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ditto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is what he is already doing</li> </ul>
(xviii) Undertake an urgent review of the Air Quality Management Plan with a view to taking more radical action to eliminate the health risks associated with York’s NO2 hotspots, by the EU deadline of 2010. This should include:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully updated AQMA to be an integral part of LTP3</li> </ul>	

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
(xviii) a) examining the progression of low emission zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Emission Strategy currently in preparation which will consider where and how a LEZ might be introduced if appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If this means the extension of low emission zones then this process has started</li> </ul>
(xviii) b) queue relocations using ITS/UTMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May become more essential as part of the LES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being done in Fulford Road</li> </ul>
(xviii) c) further tightening of the Euro-emission vehicle requirements on the Council's own and its partner's vehicle fleets, tendered transport services and licensed vehicle services, given that buses account for 42% of road traffic emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is possibility of considering low emission vehicles as part of any new contract for the P&amp;R.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latest spec First vehicles are to Euro 5+ (EEV) standard</li> <li>• Ditto internal fleet purchase</li> <li>• Problems generally relate to older private bus fleets</li> <li>• Consideration is being given to the introduction of a quality standard scheme where buses would only qualify if they met (say) minimum Euro 4 specification.</li> <li>• New Park and Ride contracts will set an even better emissions target</li> </ul>
(xviii) c) promoting electric vehicles and the servicing infrastructure to support their roll out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Plugged in Places' Expression of Interest currently in preparation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Included in Park and Ride site spec.</li> <li>• "Plugged in places" included in this years capital programme</li> <li>• Will be included in LTP3 but little is likely to be seen in 2010 (nor will there be many plug in hybrids on the streets this year, even fewer pure electric vehicles).</li> <li>• Committee might usefully have</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
		<p>looked at the role of battery powered cycles and mopeds.</p>
<p>(xviii) d) consideration of a new city centre servicing plan, particular where traffic flows are frequently interrupted, and the introduction a local freight transhipment centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to be considered in ‘City Centre Accessibility Framework’ to support the LDF City Centre Area Action Plan</li> <li>• Forms part of the Footstreets review, in relation to freight delivery and access routes.</li> <li>• Transhipment will be considered as part of the development of the LTP but will be long term project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not a short term (2010) option.</li> <li>• Transhipment is highly expensive and, if practical at all in a City of York’s size, then it is a longer term option</li> </ul>
<p>(xviii) e) working with the PCT to increase understanding of the associated health issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also to part of LTP3 ‘dialogue’</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed (LSP to lead)</li> </ul>
<p>(xix) Undertake short term project to measure the levels of most harmful PM2.5 carcinogen carrying particles, to understand if there is a problem in York</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently monitoring PM10 which is not showing a breach of objective levels. PM2.5 is not currently a priority. Not currently advised by DEFRA that it needs to be monitored in York.</li> <li>• Monitoring equipment would have to be purchased and cannot be set up in the same place as PM 10 monitoring equipment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will rely on central government professional advice on this.</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p><b>Recommendations in strategic response to tackling congestion from LTP3 onwards</b></p>		
<p>The Council and Local Strategic Partnership to adopt and work consistently towards the implementation of the following long-term vision for transport in the City, (complementing the city’s Sustainable Community Strategy, and giving a clear direction to what the city’s transport will look like in the future):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A draft vision was included in LTP3 consultation and could be revised to take account of scrutiny version.</li> <li>• Draft vision is built on SCS</li> <li>• Stage 1 Consultation on LTP3 showed strong support for a Draft</li> </ul>	

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p><i>‘A city which has transformed itself in traffic terms and reasserted its human scale and environmental credentials, through its residents being able and positively choosing to travel less by car and more by foot, bicycle and public transport with little delay, so as to be individually healthier and collectively to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve local air quality, noise levels and quality of life, and where business, leisure and other activity is thriving because of good affordable quality and easy access by a choice of travel modes’</i></p>	<p>Vision of: To enable everyone to undertake their activities in the most sustainable way</p> <p>and to have a transport system that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is less dominated by motorised transport Makes York easier to get around with better links to surrounding areas and other cities</li> <li>• Enables people to travel in safety, comfort and security, whatever form of transport they use</li> <li>• Provides equal access to opportunities for employment, education, training, good health and leisure for all</li> <li>• Has the widest choice of transport available, with minimal impact on climate change and air quality.</li> </ul>	<p>To be regarded as a contribution towards the development of a vision wording for LTP3</p>
<p><i>Given the key importance of public transport within the above, the following subsidiary vision for public transport to be adopted, ensuring the Council and its</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too specific as a public transport vision as it only considers buses, what about rail?</li> <li>• Many of these issues are</li> </ul>	<p>To be regarded as a contribution towards the development of a vision wording for LTP3</p>

Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<p><i>partners work consistently towards its implementation: 'By 2026 York is benefiting from one of the best and most popular local bus services in the country outside London, offering a seamless passenger experience, with a single competitively priced ticketing system, high frequency daytime services to all key destinations in the city, recognised interchange points with well timetabled connections where bus transfer is required, non carbon fuelled fully disabled accessible vehicles, friendly and welcoming staff who drive considerately of passengers and other road users, good bus stop facilities and reliable interactive timetable information.'</i></p>	<p>currently being considered e.g through ticketing, quality contract, setting emission standards in contracts.</p>	
<p>In regard to buses, the Council to ensure further comprehensive 5-yearly reviews of the bus network are carried out to optimise the network and service frequency, taking into account new housing and other developments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, with smaller reviews in between. Needs the full buy in of all local bus operators to be achieved.</li> <li>• Review period may be set within LTP3</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>In regard to freight, the Council to:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to keep the issue of providing a freight transshipment centre for the City under review if a suitable site and funding mechanisms come forward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• will be considered as part of the evidence base for the development of LTP3</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed</p>



Recommendations	Additional officer information	Executive comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lobby government (national and EU) to improve standards for HGV engine efficiency and emissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could form part of the actions within a Low Emissions Strategy</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure council and partners vehicle fleets, and tendered delivery vehicles move rapidly towards the most up to date emission and efficiency standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Low Emissions Strategy is being drafted and will consider fleet vehicles.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed</p>