

---

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	28 May 2024
Present	Councillor Ravilious (Executive Member)
Officers in Attendance	James Gilchrist – Director of Environment, Transport and Planning Helene Vergereau – Head of Highway Access and Development

---

## **52. Declarations of Interest (11:05am)**

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 they might have in respect of the business on the agenda. None were declared.

## **53. Minutes (11:05am)**

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on 16 April 2024 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

## **54. Public Participation (11:06am)**

It was reported that there had been 9 registrations to speak at the session and 3 written representations under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Cllr Waller spoke regarding Item 4, Annex Q. He welcomed the officer recommendations for Annexes Q1 and Q2. Regarding Q3 residents had requested he make representation that the initial issue had now been resolved. He also requested a review of the TRO process to ensure swifter resolution going forwards.

Cllr Nelson spoke regarding Item 4, Annex Q3. She stated that ward councillors had worked with residents to resolve the initial signage issue and that the outstanding issue concerned one particular resident's pavement parking, which had also been dealt with informally by residents,

therefore a TRO was not necessary here. She suggested that small issues could be resolved by working with people not using the council's resources.

Christopher Tregellis spoke regarding Item 4, Annex C3. He advised that the officer recommendation was universally supported among residents. He suggested residents may be minded to ask for further review but conceded that the TRO application had already taken a long time.

Susan Ayres spoke regarding Item 4, Annex J2. She provided the Executive Member and officers with photographs to illustrate her point that there were not two road spaces outside each house in the area being considered. She advised that both she and her husband were in their 60s and relied on their daughter for support. She asked the member to reconsider this proposal.

Judith Pinder spoke regarding Item 4, Annex K4. She asserted that the proposed double yellow lines would have a detrimental effect on her as a cancer patient with mobility issues. She explained that she required her support team to be able to park outside her house, and noted that the TRO had been instigated by one prior resident who felt inconvenienced, and this person had since passed away.

Wayne Glaister spoke regarding Item 4, Annex J3. He expressed concern that further enforcement action would mean residents and their relatives would be unable to park outside their own houses.

Christina Chelin spoke regarding Item 4, Annex M2. She expressed frustration that her past complaint and petition had not been actioned due to a conflict with the council's blue badge policy, but she felt this proposal addressed her earlier concerns and supported the recommendation. She encouraged the member and officers to consider further review of this TRO in the future.

Rachel Gilbert-Cornish spoke regarding Item 5, in support of Option 2. She represented a group of residents who opposed the R23 zone on Govt House Road/Water End slipway. She said that council parking spaces on Government House Road had not been determined and that this nullified the point of the report. She felt that the recommended option sought to revert the cul de sac into a private road which seemed wrong to her. She also pointed out concerns over parking on the slip road and dangers to pedestrians and cyclists.

Andrew Beattie spoke regarding Item 5, in support of Option 1. He stated that the vast majority of residents of Government House Road were in favour of the report's recommendations and felt the council's analysis of the

problem was very sensible. He cited further examples of access issues on the road which would be mitigated by approving the recommended option.

The Executive Member read the following written representation from Cllr Stephen Fenton on Item 4, Annex E;

I'm not able to attend the Transport Executive Member Decision Session on 28<sup>th</sup> May, but would like to put in writing my support for the officer recommendations in relation to the proposals relating to Dringhouses & Woodthorpe ward.

The Executive Member read the following written representation from Cllr Mark Warters on Item 4, Annex N1;

I wish to submit under public participation the following to be read out by the chair and included in the papers for the meeting on the 28th May;

The officer proposals to introduce double yellow line parking restrictions as detailed are a direct response to parking problems expressly created by previous failures of Highway Development Control to listen to local representations and apply common sense when commenting on recent planning applications in the area.

This failure to listen and apply common sense will, if these restrictions are passed simply be repeated again resulting in a parking problem created by the activities of one business being moved further along Murton Way to the detriment of residents and just moving the unnecessary road hazard further along for motorists to contend with.

Highways officers have been offered a solution to all the parking issues in the immediate area which was double yellow line parking restrictions on Outgang Lane and Urban Clearway restrictions extended both ways on Murton Way and along Osbaldwick Link Rd.

Restrictions that would deal with the problems CYC Highways and Planning have created in the area, which had the support of residents living on Murton Way and could be carried out in a more aesthetically appropriate manner.

So why have Highways Officers pressed ahead with their proposals and ignored local representations?

I can only conclude, coupled with the complete absence in this agenda of any 'fast tracked' proposals to deal with the other CYC

created parking fiasco on Tranby Avenue that CYC are working with the aim of creating as much parking chaos as possible in Osbaldwick and Murton in furtherance of the imposition of revenue raising Respark schemes.

I would of course be pleased to be proved wrong if the Executive Member was to instruct Highways Officers to pursue the local solution to the issues in N1.

The Executive Member read the following written representation from Cllr Lucy Steels-Walshaw on Item 4, Annex K1;

I would like to raise the following objections to the proposed TRO on Brunel Court on Holgate on behalf of residents who live in the proposed area.

The residents are aware that the person who originally raised the concerns has now moved from the area and residents believe that the full proposal as advertised was probably not as they originally requested.

There are 4 residents who have raised objections, and these are the 4 residents out of 5 who would be directly impacted by the proposed changes. Residents have cited reasons for the TRO not to go ahead including restricting their ability to have guests visit, deliveries being unable to attend the address, tradespeople not being able to attend in order to carry out maintenance and probably mainly their objection is that there have not been any previous issues with parking in the small cul-de-sac that they are aware of.

The residents have advised that if there has ever been any discussion about parking disagreements which have been extremely rare, then this has been amicably sorted out amongst residents and indeed if there were any new issues to arise, I would work with the community of this street to resolve this at a local level.

I have discussed the lesser restriction as shown in the documents that are recommended and supported by some of the residents, but the question still remains whether these are necessary for a street of residents none of whom supported the initial application and have previously not reported any issues.

## **55. Consideration of representations received for Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests (11:37am)**

Officers introduced the item, explaining that the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) detailed in the agenda have now been advertised and it was the Executive Member's responsibility to consider each one, including officer recommendations and public representations, before making a decision on each proposal. Her decisions were as follows:

### **Annex A1 – Princess Drive:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The restrictions will provide clear sight lines for pedestrians and particularly children who may use the tactile crossing to access the children's play area. Properties affected by these restrictions have private off-street parking amenity for one vehicle. Loading or unloading deliveries and collecting passengers is permitted from double yellow lines and access to Applefields school would not be restricted as long as drivers have a blue badge.

### **Annex B1 – Acaster Lane:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The proposed restrictions will reduce but not remove parking amenity on Acaster Lane. This prioritises bus travel and pedestrian/cyclist safety with provision for further review after implementation.

### **Annex C1 – Cromer Street, Lady Road, Wilberforce Avenue and Surtees Street:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: Vehicles parking very close to the junctions lead to drivers being unable to see vehicles proceeding along Cromer Street or access Surtees Street. The proposed restrictions will provide increased sightlines when exiting the junctions. They will also provide better access to Surtees Street. The dropping off and collecting of passengers is also permitted from double yellow lines. Blue badge holders can still park, and there is a need to prioritise refuse lorries and cyclists.

### **Annex C2 – Little Avenue:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: This will provide full access to residents off-street parking and use of the turning head. Parked vehicles in this location prevent access to residents off-street parking and cause vehicles to have to reverse the 55m back to Sutton Way if they are unable to use the turning head.

### **Annex C3 – Rawcliffe Lane:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The proposed restrictions would contribute to free flow of traffic through the junction, vehicles being able to approach the junction in their lane and less queuing further along Rawcliffe Lane when approaching the junction.

### **Annex D1- Horseman Lane:**

Resolved: To take no further action; to be reviewed when further development is considered and tactile crossing is introduced.

Reason: This TRO was initially proposed by the Parish Council, who have since reconsidered their request. The proposed restrictions to the junction would help to protect the crossing points when they are installed, although there is currently no date for these works to begin.

### **Annex E1 – Gower Road:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: Vehicles parking close to the junction leads to vehicles having to approach the junction in the centre of the carriageway.

### **Annex E2 – Highmoor Road/ Highmoor Close:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised;

Reason: To continue with junction protection on the junction of Highmoor Road and Highmoor Close but not to implement double yellow lines on the opposing roadside. To monitor area and consider

review at a later date. Vehicles parking close to the junction of Highmoor Close are leading to restricted visibility and manoeuvrability when entering or exiting the junction. Removing the proposed restriction on the north side of Highmoor Road will provide parking amenity for residents.

### **Annex E3 – Chalfonts:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: Shortening the proposed double yellow lines to leave approximately six metres near the garages will allow residents to park in front of their own garage. Reducing the restrictions on the south side by 6m will provide space for the garage owner to park their vehicle in front of their garage when required and would still provide enough space for the refuse wagon to manoeuvre and reverse into the cul-de-sac end of Chalfonts.

### **Annex F1 – Farndale Street:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: To not impose double yellow lines but to continue with the other restrictions. This allows for waste vehicle and emergency vehicle access. The extension of the no waiting 8am to 4pm on the south side will provide the required carriageway clearance for the refuse truck to safely enter and exit the street.

### **Annex G1 – Connaught Square:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised;

Reason: To retain double yellow lines from original plan, but allow one side of Connaught Court for parking and leave some space on Connaught Gardens. This avoids danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any road and prevent the likelihood of any such danger arising, it also improves visibility for pedestrians using the pedestrian tactile crossing point and vehicles proceeding in opposite directions when travelling through the bends of the carriageway and deters footpath parking.

### **Annex H1 – Marygate:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: This will provide additional parking to all permit holders in the R12 zone, and the small number of Guest House permits purchased in the zone should not have any negative impact on Household Permit holders. St Mary's Car Park is also nearby as a pay and display alternative and Blue Badge owners can still park in the area.

### **Annex H2 – St John's Street:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: This will reduce collisions on St John Street; parked vehicles have been leading to vehicles travelling in the centre of the carriageway and are unsighted to vehicles exiting the car park junction.

### **Annex I1 – Kirkcroft and Minster Close:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: Placing restrictions in this area will also remove vehicles parking close to junctions which are currently restricting visibility for exiting drivers. These restrictions should also help facilitate bus movement through the junctions.

### **Annex I2 – The Village, Haxby:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: To not put double yellow lines in front of the dropped curbs/driveways but to implement other proposals; the location of the dropped kerbs will effectively provide the same restriction of parking without the need for double yellow lines in front of them.

### **Annex J1 – Darnbrook Walk:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised; but to consider representations made regarding after school clubs, cycling access and other factors, and review at a later date if required.



Reason: These restrictions address the parking issues at school peak times. The requests to extend timed restrictions were considered and the authority will continue to monitor the situation outside of the peak hours.

### **Annex J2 – Stockton Lane and Seymour Grove:**

Resolved: To take no further action; deferring a decision at this time, in order to reach out to the speaker who objected to this proposal.

Reason: If the resident speaking against this TRO wishes to apply for a blue badge space this will be considered by officers and a blue badge bay can be installed, which would require the proposed plan to be altered.

### **Annex J3 – Turner Close:**

Resolved: To take no further action; parking in the area will remain as it is presently.

Reason: Two site visits after 4pm have witnessed vehicles being able to exit their driveways with vehicles parked on the single yellow line.

### **Annex K1 – Brunel Court:**

Resolved: To take no further action; deferring a decision for review in in six months time.

Reason: Given the objections raised and proposed resolution by ward councillor without the need for restrictions.

### **Annex K2 – Livingstone Street:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: Reducing the proposed restriction to the southern boundary line of number 7 Livingstone Street will increase the sightlines when exiting the junction and provide more parking amenity than originally proposed.

### **Annex K3 – Northcote Avenue:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: Delivery vehicles are able to park on double yellow lines in order to load and unload goods providing the activity is continuous. An objector commented that vehicles could be moved if requested but if this is not possible at the time of request it leads to vehicles having to reverse the full length of a narrow street in order to exit.

### **Annex K4 – Parkside Close:**

Resolved: To take no further action.

Reason: The Executive Member would like to review the wider area with officers, with regard to parking and access to Acomb Primary School, rather than just focusing specifically on Parkside Close.

### **Annex K5 – Rosebery Street:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The carriageway width at the end of Rosebery Street and Carnot Street is 6m. The proposed restriction will provide space for vehicles to turn at the end of each street and prevent vehicles having to reverse the full length of the street to exit. We have contacted the resident to advise on the process of applying for a disabled parking bay

### **Annex L1 – Geldof Road:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The issue of vehicles having to round the bend in the centre of the carriageway and into the path of vehicles travelling in the opposite direction due to vehicles parking on the bend still remains. This restriction will facilitate the free flow of traffic in their lanes when rounding the bend. The resident who objected would still be able to park outside their own house (albeit for three hours) with a blue badge.

### **Annex M1 – Count De Burgh Terrace/ Sutherland Street:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: Vehicles parked close to the junction are leading to vehicles being unable to access or exit the junction. Vehicles are also approaching the junction in the centre of the carriageway and unable to move when faced with a vehicle attempting to enter the junction. The proposed restrictions will provide a small space for vehicles to pull into before exiting the junction or when faced with a vehicle entering the street.

### **Annex M2 – Nunthorpe Road:**

Resolved: Implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: A revised respark plan has been proposed; in the short term there will be a revocation of part of the bay on the northern side that will facilitate the access for refuse truck access. Officers have also requested permission to advertise a 17m extension to the 5m of bay outside 50 Nunthorpe Road, which will increase the available parking when installed.

### **Annex N1 – Outgang Lane/ Murton Way and Osbaldwick Link Road:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The alternative proposal by the Parish Council would create more negative impact on residents and business in the area, we will continue to monitor the area through the next annual review. The ward councillor's proposal was also considered unsuitable by officers as this is an industrial estate. Double yellow lines still allow residents with a blue badge to load and unload. Need to look at area as a whole, and the member confirmed that the neighbouring Tranby Avenue proposals would be coming to the next decision session.

### **Annex O1 – Mitchell Way:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The issue of the footpaths being inaccessible still remains due to footpath parking on both sides of the carriageway.

### **Annex O2 – Shipton Road:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: The requested extension of the restrictions and further restrictions on the south side of the carriageway will be considered as part of the next annual review of traffic restrictions project.

### **Annex P1 – Ebor Way:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: To retain more parking on the street while protecting 35m from junction. Two site visits have been completed since the statutory consultation and have witnessed vehicles still parking close to the junction. It was also observed that the volume of vehicles was significantly less than had been previously.

### **Annex P2 – Brackenhill:**

Resolved: To take no further action.

Reason: Implementing restrictions for what has been reported to be a very rare occurrence in a rural location is not supported by residents or the Parish Council. Ward councillor is also working with residents to resolve this matter without taking action.

### **Annex Q1 – Croftway:**

Resolved: To implement as advertised.

Reason: Supported by ward councillor. The proposed restrictions are largely supported by the residents of Croftway and will restrict vehicles from parking close to the junction. Should residents agree to installing a 'Private Road' street name plate they are able to do so if the name plate is placed on the private land and is funded by the residents.

### **Annex Q2 – St Stephens Mews:**

Resolved: To take no further action.

Reason: The action is not supported by any of the residents; all the properties that would be affected by the proposed restrictions have objected to this proposal.

### **Annex Q3 – Stirrup Close/Houndsway:**

Resolved: To take no further action.

Reason: Ward councillors have offered to work with this case to resolve locally without implementing restrictions, so Executive Member would prefer to defer for review in six months.

### **Annex Q4 – St Stephen's Road/ Thoresby Road:**

Resolved: To implement a lesser restriction than advertised.

Reason: To remove the proposed restrictions in front of the flats. The proposed restrictions on the junction will provide for vehicles approaching the junction in their lane and improve visibility. Vehicles parking too close to the junction on Thoresby Road currently cause vehicles approaching the junction to proceed in the centre of the carriageway and have restricted visibility at the junction.

### **56. Consideration of results received from the consultation to extend R23 Residents Parking Zone to include Government House Road and a decision to be made on placing limited waiting restrictions on Water End slip road (12:21pm)**

Officers introduced the item, a joint consideration of resident parking and parking on the slip road. They explained that the proposal addressed both issues together since addressing parking on just the slip road would displace parking onto Government House Road. This decision was simply whether or not to advertise these changes.

The Executive Member expressed concern regarding pavement parking on the slip road restricting access from Water Lane to the Riverside path/Orbital route, citing Google maps data and information submitted via public participation.

She stated that any parking being provided must guarantee access for pedestrians and cyclists, and expressed her desire to defer the decision in order to revisit parking/traffic on the Water Lane slip road to ensure pedestrian safety and consistency with other equivalent roads throughout the city, before bringing the item back to a future decision session to determine the residents parking issue within the full wider context.

Resolved: That this decision be deferred.

Reason: In order for the proposal to be revised and brought back to a future decision session.

Cllr K Ravilious, Chair

[The meeting started at 11.05 am and finished at 12.26 pm].