
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	21 October 2025
Present	Councillor Ravilious – Executive Member
Officers in Attendance	Garry Taylor – Director of City Development Dave Atkinson – Director of Environmental and Regulatory Services Helene Vergereau – Head of Highways Access and Development Siavosh Mahmoodshahi – Highways Asset Manager Geoff Holmes – Traffic Projects Officer

13. Apologies for Absence (10:01am)

There were no apologies.

14. Declarations of Interest (10:01am)

The Executive Member was asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any disclosable pecuniary interests, or other registerable interests she might have in respect of business on the agenda, if she had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. None were declared.

15. Minutes (10:01am)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on 16 September 2025 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

16. Public Participation (10:01am)

It was reported that there had been two registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Mrs Wathsala Kuruppu Mudiyanseelage spoke on item 8, as a resident of the R67 zone. She discussed non-resident parking in her area causing

great inconvenience for her and her family and advised that residents regularly faced a dilemma of whether to drive and not be able to park on their return, or to take public transport or taxis to avoid stress. She felt that the report's recommendation of permit parking, along with limited parking for non-residents was therefore essential.

Cllr Fenton spoke on item 6, welcoming the review of the Res Park consultation and ballot arrangements. He expressed regret that this item had not come to predecision scrutiny but hoped that the scrutiny committee would have input going forwards. He noted that the phrase "detailed plan and timeline for expanding Res Park" in the report could be interpreted as indicating an intention on the council's part to expand to a citywide rollout of Res Park.

He referred to the current strategy for the implementation of off-street parking, with a proposed 2km radius of the city centre, and said wider discussions would be needed if Res Park were to be expanded into this zone. He suggested that while many residents would welcome this, consultation was needed to ensure residents' voices were heard.

17. Lendal Bridge Major Refurbishment (10:08am)

The Director of Environmental and Regulatory Services presented the report, supported by the Highways Asset Manager. They discussed the two phases of works – the first being maintenance and the second being painting. Officers explained that the paintwork was not just cosmetic but would also extend the lifespan of the works.

Officers advised there would be a planned 8-week closure period of the bridge to motor traffic. The bridge would remain open to walkers and wheelers, though the strategy for exactly how cyclists would be dealt with would remain open.

Officers noted that phase two would require approval from the Council Executive and that funding for the project was anticipated from the Highways Capital Programme.

The Executive Member acknowledged that this was both a 150-year-old bridge and also an essential part of York's transport infrastructure; that the bridge was last repaired 20 years ago and to not repair it now would likely result in a future closure at a time not of the council's choosing.

The Executive Member clarified that the work on Lendal Bridge had been planned so as not to coincide with the works outside York railway station, and therefore the proposed time of these works was easter 2026.

The Executive Member then

Resolved:

- i. To note that a procurement process for the award of a contract for all of the works is currently underway, and the works programme is to be delivered as laid out in the report.
- ii. To delegate authority to the Director of Environmental and Regulatory Services, in consultation with the Director of Governance and the Head of Procurement, to take such steps as are necessary to award and conclude the Contract for the works and to determine the provisions of any subsequent modifications and/or extensions thereto post award and to seek Executive approval for the re-prioritisation of Highways and Transportation funding to deliver the Additional Works programme.

Reason: Without completion of the works the risk of the biennial bridge inspection process identifying further deterioration is heightened considerably, this could lead to weight restrictions being enforced causing considerable impact on movement in the city centre.

18. Resident Parking Review (10:15am)

The Head of Highway Management presented the report, explaining that it was written in response to a motion presented to council in September 2024, and focused on the process by which Resident Parking (ResPark) was introduced and implemented. She explained that the report aimed to streamline this process, looking at different options to make the process as efficient as possible.

She explained that the recommended option introduced more officer decisions in advance of the statutory consultation process; widened consideration of other users of the highway when consulting residents and removed the guideline whereby officers have hitherto required a 50% response and 50% support threshold, instead looking at how the proposed strategy would align with local circumstances and the wider transport strategy. It also proposed increased use of digital tools for consultation to increase efficiency when analysing responses.

The Executive Member thanked officers for the work undertaken on the report and Cllr Whitcroft for introducing the motion. She acknowledged that this was a legal process, and there was ultimately a limit to how much it could be streamlined.

She recognised that there was currently a backlog of 2-4 years for ResPark requests to reach implementation and that under the current rules, given the number of rental properties and holiday lets in the city, it was virtually impossible for a 50% response rate to be achieved and for officers to thereby recommend Res Park options.

She noted that though the transport strategy had been approved last summer, the current system still did not allow opportunities to enhance neighbourhoods and use curbside space in ways beneficial to the community (e.g. cycle storage, bus lanes, pavement cafés).

She stated that this proposal allowed a broadening of possibilities for what can be done with ResPark; emphasising the need to increase accessibility, reduce car dependency and create healthy spaces.

She asserted that in approving this scheme, the council would still involve full consultation with the community, residents would still have their say, but the implementation process would be streamlined and frustration reduced in allowing residents to shape their neighbourhood.

Resolved: To approve

- a) The following changes to the process for the ResPark waiting list and of the decision to proceed to statutory consultation:
 - i. ResPark requests which are not submitted through a petition will be added to the waiting list by officers. An Executive Member decision will only be required where ward members and/or officers are opposed to the request being added to the waiting list. Once a proposal reaches the top of the waiting list, the first informal consultation will be undertaken without the need for a public decision; and
 - ii. Once the informal consultation has concluded, the decision to initiate the statutory consultation stage will be made by a senior officer (published Officer

Decision). This will apply unless ward members and/or officers are opposed to the scheme progressing to statutory consultation. In these cases, the decision will be made by the Executive Member at a decision session.

- b) Changes to the informal consultation process so that it can be linked to the implementation of the wider Council's Transport Strategy by consulting residents and businesses on options for alternative uses of kerbside space in their area/street if a ResPark scheme is implemented, to provide alternative kerbside uses and activities (such as car club cars, cycle hangers, providing more space pedestrians, cyclists, or buses, or planting trees, or retrofitting sustainable urban drainage solutions).
- c) Changes to the way officers consider the responses to the informal consultation to inform their recommendations, by removing the current officer guidelines (where 50% response rate and 50% of responses received in support are usually required for officers to recommend that the proposed scheme progresses to the statutory consultation stage).

Officers' recommendations on whether to proceed with a proposed scheme will be based on the applicable legal framework (see below), the Council's adopted policies and strategies, and a qualitative review of the feedback and objections received through the consultation process.

The Executive Member also noted that officers would aim to implement and encourage the use of digital tools for engagement and consultation, retaining the options of letters and emails to ensure that the process remains inclusive.

Reason: To respond to the motion presented by Cllr Whitcroft at the 19 September 2024 Council meeting, *entitled "Reforming Residents' Priority parking in York"*, streamline the ResPark process where possible, and support the implementation of the Council's Transport Strategy.

19. Decision Report: Informal Consultation of Annual Review of Traffic Regulation Order Requests (10:26am)

The Traffic Projects Officer presented the report, noting that it had been previously agreed to remove the requirement to present requests at a decision session, leaving approval to advertise statutory consultation to the director, if impacted ward councillors agreed. He went on to discuss the recommended options (A-D) and the objection to the proposed received from Cllr Warters.

Addressing the non-recommended options, he noted that the option of an urban clearway would not allow for exemptions (such as weddings and funerals) in the way that double yellow lines did, and that while bollards would restrict parking in the bollarded area, this would merely lead to displacement of parking to other areas.

The Executive Member thanked officers, and recognised the frustrations raised by Cllr Warters and Osbaldwick Parish Council. She acknowledged that while the suggested urban clearway was more discreet than double yellow lines, there was a need to also recognise needs of bus traffic and legal parkers, blue badge holders, and people needing to access schools and churches, including for weddings and funerals. Parking restrictions would address problems of bus access, footway access and legitimate parking across all times of the day. She conceded that any solution would ultimately push parking further down the road.

The Executive Member asked officers whether the proposed Tranby Avenue Traffic Regulation Order was intended to be implemented at the same time as these changes. The Traffic Projects Officer responded that he believed so. The Executive Member suggested that if this was the case, the two sets of restrictions should be implemented at a similar time.

The Executive Member stated that enforcement would be key here; she emphasised that it was more straightforward to ensure successful enforcement of parking on double yellow lines. She stressed that this was not a decision intended to force residents to adopt ResPark, but to find a balance which ensured prioritised parking for blue badge holders, prioritised access for walkers and wheelers and access for public transport. She also suggested the decision would dissuade parking on verges.

Resolved: To approve the advertisement of the proposed restrictions set out in the report.

Each of the areas and reasons are detailed below.

1. Osbaldwick Link Road:

Previously there were double yellow lines on Osbaldwick Link Road, these were removed, as it was considered they were no longer required due to the nature of the businesses and the available parking at each site. Following the redevelopment of some businesses off Osbaldwick Link Road and an increase in vehicle access to the sites, the issue of footpath parking started.

The proposed restriction will remove parking to the whole length of Osbaldwick Link Road.

2. Murton Way in the direction of Murton Village:

The parking in this location is occurring on the verge and footpath and removing access to the footpath for pedestrians. There is footpath to only one side of the carriageway.

The proposed Clearway restriction from the end of the existing No Waiting restriction to the village of Murton will remove all parking, including on the footpath and verge (with additional text signage).

3. Murton Way in the direction of Osbaldwick village:

During the previous consultation we received representations in support of the proposed restriction from residents, who also requested we extend the proposed No Waiting restriction (Double yellow lines) as the proposal would lead to vehicles parking close to the tactile crossing points and restrict visibility when exiting their driveways.

The proposed extension to the existing restriction will provide access to the tactile crossing points and improve visibility for pedestrians and vehicles using the Beckett Drive junction.

4. Osbaldwick Village/Osbaldwick Lane:

Our Sustainable Transport team have reported bus access issues in the area of the junction of Osbaldwick Village and

Osboldwick Lane, including the straight section and round the bend of Osboldwick Lane. They report the issues can be at all times of the day due to funerals/weddings at the church and parking opposite the church on Osboldwick Lane.

The proposed No Waiting restriction (double yellow lines) will remove parking close to the junction and along Osboldwick Lane. The Sustainable Transport team support the proposed restriction and have not reported access issues in any other location of the village.

20. Decision Report: Consideration of representations received during the Statutory Consultation for the proposed R67 Huntington Road Resident's Priority Parking Scheme (10:36am)

The Traffic Projects Officer presented the report, outlining the proposed scheme, the R67 zone covered and the proposed times of operation (24 hours Monday to Sunday).

He explained that officers had consulted 288 properties within the proposed zone and had during the consultation received 13 representations in objection to the proposal including staff at local businesses requiring staff parking. He noted that there was unrestricted parking outside the zone on Dorchester Avenue or Fossway and that a clear majority of respondents favoured the proposed 24:7 enforcement. The decision to take the scheme forward was based on 60% response rate.

The Executive Member thanked officers for their efforts. She noted the importance of buses and cycles having free passage unobstructed by parked cars. She stressed that a number of parking bays for 1-2 hours free parking would be retained on Hayleys Terrace under these proposals, with additional spaces on Foss Way and Dodsworth Avenue, outside the affected zone.

Addressing feedback from traders regarding poor bus services to the area, she suggested the bus service would improve when parked cars were no longer obstructing them. She emphasised the importance of assessing how best to use the space – expressing satisfaction that bus and cyclist access was being prioritised while still providing plenty of parking spaces.

Resolved: To approve the variation of the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Order 2014 to implement the proposed R67 Huntington Road Resident's Priority Parking scheme as advertised.

Reason: This will remove commuter parking, increase accessibility for residents and during two public consultations has been the preferred option by the majority of respondents.

Cllr K Ravilious, Executive Member
[The meeting started at 10.01 am and finished at 10.46 am].