

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	18 November 2025
Present	Councillor Ravilious, Executive Member
Officers in Attendance	Garry Taylor – Director of City Development Joshua Singer – Head of Projects, City Development Annemarie Howarth – Traffic Projects Officer Molly Kay – Assistant Rights of Way Officer Darren Hobson – Highway Regulation Manager

---

## **21. Apologies for Absence (10:01am)**

There were no apologies.

## **22. Declarations of Interest (10:00am)**

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.

## **23. Minutes (10:00am)**

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on Tuesday, 21 October 2025 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

## **24. Public Participation (10:02am)**

It was reported that there had been 5 registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Cllr Whitcroft spoke on item 6 strongly supporting the R66 residents parking scheme that he had helped formulate. He urged the Executive Member to put an end to the current arrangement, noting that in addition to

commuters taking advantage of free parking, cars from outside York drove around the area looking for a parking space, causing pollution and blocking spaces. He stressed that residents parking must be prioritised in the interests of putting Fishergate residents first.

Michael Kearney spoke on item 6 in support of the R66 residents parking scheme stating it cost shoppers nothing to park there for free, but cost residents everything when they couldn't park. He advised that idling parking traffic went against the principle of the council's climate policy.

Peter Lindsay spoke on item 8, supporting the scheme as resident of Wheldrake, whose property had been hit by vehicles. His car port structure had twice been clipped by oncoming traffic in the lane. The structure was most recently hit in 2023 and on this occasion he needed to pay for repairs. He supported the proposal, saying Walker Lane was unsuited for 2-way traffic and endorsed the one-way scheme in the interests of safety.

Hayley McCaie spoke on item 8, opposing the scheme as a Wheldrake resident and on behalf of her mother who was a local business owner. She stated that the collision with the carport in 2023 had been a minor incident involving a delivery driver reversing (not a serious traffic collision) and accidents were not common in this area. She felt that this proposal had been conceived to suit one individual and that other residents of Walker Lane did not support it and had not been consulted by the council in 2024. She presented diagrams which the Executive Member agreed to accept and study. She noted that the deed for her mother's hairdressing business showed a parking space outside the shop which the council had not acknowledged.

Colin Woods spoke on item 8, opposing the scheme as a resident of Wheldrake. He stated that moving to a one-way system would impact the business of the hairdressers previously mentioned by another speaker, and that this business and older residents would be negatively impacted by a change to one-way. He suggested local residents had not been consulted on this scheme. He asked whether the council had considered the Equality Act with regard to the impact on older and disabled pedestrians and whether other options had been considered, such as double yellow lines at either end of the junction with the lane or a speed bump next to the impacted property.

## **25. Residents Parking Bay and 'No Waiting at any time' Restrictions – Queen Street (10:22am)**

The report was presented by the Head of Projects – City Development. He explained that this proposal related to a resident's parking bay, with no waiting any time restrictions, on Queen Street as a mitigation for the Station Gateway scheme, which had previously removed some residents parking. It also realigned bays in front of the Fleetways taxi area in line with the local transport strategy.

The Executive Member thanked officers for their work on this report, acknowledging that residents on Queen Street had lost parking amenity due to the Station Gateway project and that this proposal would go some way to restoring this.

She also acknowledged that the existing taxi rank only impacted hackney carriages, whose rank had been relocated, and the changes would not impact the nearby Fleetways cars business. Officers confirmed this.

The Executive member was thereby happy to approve officers recommendations and

**Resolved:** To implement the TRO and associated road marking & signage changes to include 2 additional parking spaces within the existing residents parking provision.

**Reason:** This meets the purposes in sections 1(1) (a) (c) (d) and (f) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 – namely:

- (a) avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such arising;
- (c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians);
- (d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property; and
- (f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

This also meets the Council's duty under section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, namely:

- a. Support the “convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway” (RTRA 1984, Section 122(1)). The changes proposed will provide parking amenity for the local residents in the layby, which will leave sufficient carriageway width, to not obstruct vehicular traffic in both directions.
- b. “Consider the effect on the amenities of any locality affected” (RTRA 1984, Section 122(2)(b)). The introduction of the residents parking bay, will improve the parking amenity for resident in the local area.
- c. Consider “any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant” (RTRA 1984, Section 122(2)(d)). Consideration has been given to the Council’s Local Transport Strategy and the consultation responses.

## **26. Residents parking and limited waiting restrictions advertised as ‘R66 Wellington Street’ (10:24am)**

The report was presented by the Traffic Projects Officer, who explained that this report had considered representations received during both the statutory consultation and the extended statutory consultation for R66. She noted that representations received to the initial consultation had previously been presented to the Executive Member in May and in response to the Executive Member’s decision then, an extension of the consultation had been undertaken to enable further engagement with residents.

She confirmed that during this extended consultation officers had hand delivered all documents to ensure engagement. This prompted 20 representations against (in addition to the 13 representations received through the initial statutory consultation) and 61 responses in favour, with an additional 45 signed letters (in addition to the 11 responses received through the initial statutory consultation). The options presented within the report took into account these representations and also the local transport strategy.

The Executive Member thanked officers and residents for their patience in extending the consultation.

She accepted that the reports had now properly taken into consideration residents’ feedback through the various stages of statutory consultation, acknowledging that this area of York contains a high proportion of rented

properties which meant that it had struggled to meet the prescribed 50% response threshold to move forward.

The Executive Member stated that she had previously agreed to move ResPark forward regardless of the threshold being met, due to a clear majority of residents supporting the scheme, and indeed since making this decision the council had changed its guidelines to benefit areas with lower response rates. She clarified that while only 30% of households had responded in this case, of these 75% had been in favour of ResPark implementation.

The Executive Member stated that she had considered residents objections to ResPark and she went on to address some of these concerns in discussion with officers.

The Executive Member clarified that - contrary to the understanding of some residents who had objected - ResPark was not a revenue generator for the council, and this was not the reason for proposing this scheme. She explained that Res Park as a service essentially pays for itself and is a policy tool allowing residents parking amenity.

The Executive Member expressed that another concern raised had been with regard to holiday let parking – the Traffic Projects Officer confirmed that the owners of holiday lets were entitled to purchase one annual ResPark space, should they wish.

The Executive Member explained that students had objected to no longer having free parking, responding that the university strongly discouraged students bringing cars with them, and therefore students in general should not be significantly impacted by this.

The Executive Member was therefore satisfied that there was mitigation for most of the objections raised in the consultation, better parking amenity, better passage for buses and emergency vehicles/refuse and a more comfortable living area. She thereby

**Resolved:** To progress the advertised R66 resident's priority parking scheme and limited waiting restrictions on Heslington Road to implementation by amending the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Order.

**Reason:** This supports the CYC transport strategy and commitment to reduce traffic congestion by discouraging driving into the city centre.

Making this location a ResPark area removes the ability for commuters to park, whilst the limited waiting bays on Heslington Road ensure businesses are not adversely affected maintaining short stay parking for customers.

This will also increase parking accessibility for local residents, help reduce obstructive parking along a key bus route and a key cycle route (the orbital route) and improve access around the area for refuse vehicles.

## **27. Proposed diversion of public footpath Nether Poppleton 1 (10:32am)**

The report was presented by the Assistant Rights of Way Officer, who advised that an application had been received from the landowner to divert a public footpath to enable solar development. The proposed diversion would move the current public footpath from the north to the south side of an existing hedgerow, meaning a similar length and size path and very little difference to members of the public.

She advised that an initial consultation had been undertaken between 4 August - 5 September 2025 in which no objections were received. The ward councillor, the Parish Council and the Ramblers Association had all expressed support for the proposed diversion and there had been no further developments or updates since the briefing session with the Executive Member in September.

The Executive Member acknowledged that this proposal would result in a similar length footpath of equivalent quality, with no additional financial burden to the council, and would divert footpath users away from the solar farm. She therefore

**Resolved:** To approve the making of a public path order to divert part of public footpath Nether Poppleton 1 by creating a new public path and extinguishing the current public path, that public notice of the making of the order be given and:

- i. If no objections are received within the period specified, or if received objections are subsequently withdrawn, to authorise the confirmation of the order, as the council hereby has the power to confirm the order.
- ii. If objections are received and not withdrawn, then the matter will be referred back to the Executive Member to

decide whether the proposal is abandoned or sent to the Secretary of State for a final decision.

Reason: This is in the interest of the landowner, and the council is satisfied that the legislative requirements for making an order have been met.

Subject to any matters that may be raised when the order is made and advertised, it is also considered that the proposal meets the legal criteria for confirming the order.

The proposed diverted path is a satisfactory alternative to the current one, the overall length of the route remains unchanged and the wider footpath will make the diversion more comfortable for walkers.

There have been no objections at pre-order initial consultation stage and there will be no practical change in maintenance costs to the council as the council are still responsible for the annual cutting of the footpath.

## **28. Walker Lane, Wheldrake – Proposed One-Way Street (10:35am)**

The report was presented by the Highway Regulation Manager, who explained that it discussed a proposed one-way system for Walker Lane in Wheldrake, following a request from a resident whose property had been damaged by a vehicle due to the width of the lane, which was approximately 3 metres.

The Highway Regulation Manager responded to one of the public speakers, who had said that the report was incorrect. He clarified why the report had stated the hairdressers didn't have parking in front of the business; while officers had been aware that the hairdressers did have access to a parking space, they had been advised that this was staff parking only and not for customer use. He apologised for any misrepresentation on this point in the report.

He also addressed points raised concerning a lack of consultation with residents, noting that during the informal consultation a year ago, officers had received one objection to the proposed one-way system, which came from the speaker who raised the issue again at this meeting, while all other respondents were in favour of the proposal. Subsequent to the informal

consultation, further objections had arisen, after residents had discussed this.

He stated that officers recommended implementation of the one-way system, due to the width of the street and the danger posed to users by two passing cars leaving no room for pedestrians/cyclists and a risk of further conflicts.

The Executive Member noted that this proposal had been instigated by an incident two years ago and that no further issues had arisen since then. She thanked officers for their work and agreed that the one-way system proposed was a logical proposal.

However, the Executive Member was concerned that by doing this, no additional benefit was being provided for people walking up and down the road, and in fact a one-way system could increase the confidence of drivers making the road more hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists. It would also prevent contraflow cycling and force cyclists to cycle a longer way round and the proposed plan therefore did not align greatly with transport strategy.

She was not convinced that there was enough of a concern about damage to the building being a regular occurrence to warrant moving forward with this proposal and stated that she would only want to bring forward a proposal that added benefit for pedestrians, cyclists and sustainable travel, which this did not do.

She was also mindful that public speakers had alluded to alternative solutions, such as the parking around the junction with Main Street, and she wondered whether it was worth exploring traffic restrictions here if this parking was contributing to a risk of collision with the car port.

The Executive Member therefore

Resolved: To approve Option A and to take no further action, leaving the road as a two-way road.

Reason: This acknowledges the representations received in objection to the proposal.

The proposed changes conflict with commitments in the council's transport strategy by failing to provide additional benefit to pedestrians on the road and potentially exposing them to faster oncoming one-way traffic; cyclists would also be



inconvenienced as the proposed scheme prevents contraflow cycling.

This decision leaves in place potential conflict between pedestrian and vehicles and a risk of road traffic collision with potential injury to pedestrians and or damage to properties/vehicles.

The Executive Member suggested that future attention could be given to traffic restrictions at the corners surrounding the junction where collisions had occurred.

Cllr K Ravilious, Executive Member

[The meeting started at 10.01 am and finished at 10.40 am].