

---

MEETING	EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR PLANNING & TRANSPORT AND ADVISORY PANEL
DATE	28 FEBRUARY 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR REID (Executive Member); COUNCILLOR SMALLWOOD (in the Advisory Panel Chair); COUNCILLORS BARTLETT, HOGG, HYMAN (as substitute for VASSIE), JAMIESON-BALL and SIMPSON-LAING
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR VASSIE

---

## **PART A – MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

### **77. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda.

Councillor Jamieson-Ball declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 8 (The Adoption of Un-Adopted (Privately Maintained) Highways – Establishing a Priority List) as the street on which he rented a dwelling was included on the list at Annex A of the report.

### **78. MINUTES**

- RESOLVED: (i) That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2006 be approved and signed as a correct record;
- (ii) That the minutes of the following meetings be received:
- Green Belt Working Group meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2004;
  - Local Development Framework Working Group meetings on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2005 and 28<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

### **79. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

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

Alf Deuchars, from Dunnington Parish Council, and Peter Wilson, from Dunnington Highways Group, both spoke regarding agenda item 5 (A1079 (Hull Road)/York Road (Dunnington) – Junction Improvement Scheme) (minute 81 refers). They argued that the junction improvement scheme was proposed for the wrong location and that a scheme was needed for the A1079/Common Road junction instead. Mr Deuchars provided Members with a written summary of his comments and a plan of Dunnington.

**80. A19/WHELDRAKE LANE (CROCKEY HILL) – JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT SCHEME**

Members received a report which provided an update on the development and implementation of safety improvements at the A19/ Wheldrake Lane (Crockey Hill) junction, and recommended a signalisation scheme to be considered for inclusion in the Transport Capital Programme for 2006/07.

The report presented three options for consideration:

- Option 1 – To progress the proposed traffic signal scheme, as outlined in Annex D of the report;
- Option 2 – To progress the right-turn lane solution, as previously proposed, based on widening the inside of the bend, which would involve the loss of mature trees;
- Option 3 – To progress an alternative right-turn lane solution, based on widening the outside of the bend to avoid the loss of trees and to improve forward visibility of the junction.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That the signals layout outlined in Annex D of the report be approved as the preferred improvement scheme for the A19/Wheldrake Lane junction;
- (ii) That the inclusion of the proposed scheme as a spending option in the forthcoming report on the “Proposed 2006/07 Transport Capital Programme” be approved;
- (iii) That public consultation on the scheme be authorised, subject to funding for the project being allocated in the 2006/07 Transport Capital Programme (with the outcome to be reported to a future meeting of the Executive Member and Advisory Panel).

Decision of the Executive Member

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

REASON: To improve safety at the A19/ Wheldrake Lane (Crockey Hill) junction.

**81. A1079 (HULL ROAD)/YORK ROAD (DUNNINGTON) – JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT SCHEME**

Members received a report which considered options for improving the A1079 (Hull Road)/ York Road (Dunnington) junction, and recommended a combined traffic signal and speed management scheme to be included in the Transport Capital Programme for 2006/07.

The report presented four options for consideration:

- Layout 1 – Simple signalisation based on the current junction layout;
- Layout 2 – Signalisation based on an enlarged junction layout to provide a separate traffic lane for the right turn into York Road;
- Layout 3 – Signalisation based on a much enlarged junction layout to provide two lanes both inbound and outbound on the A1079;
- Layout 4 – Signalisation based on the current junction layout, but with a banned right turn off the A1079 into York Road.

Layout 4 was the recommended scheme and was described in detail in paragraphs 14-23 of the report. A plan of the scheme was included as Annex B of the report and a local speed management scheme, including a 40mph speed limit, was outlined on a further plan at Annex D.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That the measures outlined in paragraphs 14-23 of the report, and illustrated in Annexes B & D, be approved as the preferred improvement scheme for the A1079/York Road junction;
- (ii) That the inclusion of the proposed scheme in the forthcoming report on the “Proposed 2006/07 Transport Capital Programme” be approved;
- (iii) That public consultation on the scheme be authorised, including the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order covering the proposed 40mph speed limit and banned right turn for all vehicles into York Road, subject to funding for the project being allocated in the 2006/07 Transport Capital Programme (with the outcome to be reported to a future Executive Member and Advisory Panel meeting).

Decision of the Executive Member

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

REASON: To improve safety at the A1079 (Hull Road)/ York Road (Dunnington) junction.

**82. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE MOOR LANE, ASKHAM LANE, & ASKHAM BRYAN LANE JUNCTIONS ON THE A1237 OUTER RING ROAD**

Members received a report which provided an update on the progress of investigations to replace the existing priority junctions on the A1237 Outer Ring Road (ORR) at Moor Lane, Askham Lane, and Askham Bryan Lane with a roundabout. It described a number of options which had been considered, identified three broad options for consultation and sought agreement to proceed with the consultation and to progress design and land issues.

The report presented the following options for consideration:

- Option 1 – A four-arm roundabout in the vicinity of the Moor Lane junction with Askham Lane diverted and linked into Moor Lane.
- Option 2 – A four-arm roundabout in the vicinity of the Askham Lane junction with Moor Lane diverted to link into the new roundabout. The existing Askham Bryan Lane priority junction would be retained.
- Option 3 – A three-arm roundabout in the vicinity of the Moor Lane junction. The Askham Lane junction would be closed with Askham Lane diverted and linked into Moor Lane. The Askham Bryan Lane junction would be closed with the old Askham Lane re-opened as a left in left out arrangement.
- Option 4 – A four-arm roundabout mid-way between the Moor Lane and Askham Lane junctions. The Askham Bryan Lane priority junction would be retained whilst the Moor Lane and Askham Lane junctions would be closed.
- Option 4a – A five-arm roundabout mid-way between the Moor Lane and Askham Lane junctions. The three existing junctions would be closed and the roads diverted into the new roundabout.
- Option 5 – A five-arm roundabout in the vicinity of the Moor Lane junction. The three existing junctions would be closed and the roads diverted into the new roundabout.
- Option 6 – A four-arm roundabout in the vicinity of the Moor Lane junction with Moor Lane and Askham Bryan Lane diverted to link into this roundabout combined with a three-arm roundabout in the vicinity of the Askham Lane junction.

Options 1, 4a and 5 most closely met the objectives of the scheme and were recommended for consultation. Paragraphs 27-29 outlined the proposed consultation process.

Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted;

- (ii) That it be agreed that consultation should be carried out on Options 1, 4a and 5 as outlined in the 'Proposed Options for Consultation' section of the report;
- (iii) That the consultation process outlined in the 'Proposed Consultation Process' section of the report be endorsed;
- (iv) That it be agreed that officers liaise with landowners who may be affected by the options to arrange for access to carry out site surveys and to discuss potential land acquisition;
- (v) That it be agreed that officers proceed with preliminary design and site investigations to assist with a future planning application;
- (vi) That it be agreed that a further report be received by the Executive Member and Advisory Panel (EMAP) following public consultation, to enable a decision to be made as to the preferred scheme to form the basis of a planning application.

#### Decision of the Executive Member

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

REASON: To improve the Moor Lane, Askham Lane, & Askham Bryan Lane junctions on the A1237 Outer Ring Road.

### **83. THE "CYCLE CHALLENGE" PROJECT**

Members received a report which set out the history of the "Cycle Challenge" initiative, provided an update on the current situation and presented options for the way forward.

It was reported that as the detailed design of the approved pedestrian and cycle path at the eastern end of the station was progressed, various difficulties in building on the steep railway embankment, which was currently heavily populated with mature trees, were identified. The most significant difficulty was that the alignment of the proposed path would result in a gradient that would exceed the minimums put forward in national design guidance for accommodating people with mobility problems. This would be a failure in terms of meeting the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act. It was concluded that an acceptable gradient could only be achieved by "zig-zagging" the path up the embankment. This necessitated the alignment of the path going outside the area of the embankment covered by the existing planning application and therefore a new planning application was now required. The revised alignment of the path was shown on the plan at Annex C of the report. At the time of setting the Capital Programme for 2005/06, it was envisaged that the scheme would cost around £140,000 (£68,000 available from the

Cycle Challenge fund, the remainder from the Local Transport Plan (LTP) allocation). However, the estimated cost of the revised scheme was now around £220,000. Within this there were some costs that could not yet be accurately quantified and it was therefore prudent to assume a figure of around £250,000 for budgeting purposes.

The report presented two options for consideration:

- Option 1 – To continue to progress the station access scheme;
- Option 2 – To abandon the station access scheme and divert the Cycle Challenge funding to the provision of more secure cycle parking facilities in the city centre.

Members expressed some concern regarding the significant increase in cost of the scheme and highlighted the need to compare it to other potential capital programme schemes and consider whether it was a priority. They requested that a report be brought back containing further information on the provision of more secure cycle parking in the city centre, either instead of or in addition to this scheme.

Members also highlighted the need for disabled access to be provided for the station bridge extension.

#### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That the provision of a pedestrian and cycle access route to the station, as shown in Annex C of the report, be approved in principle;
- (ii) That the inclusion of the proposed scheme as a spending option in the forthcoming report on the “Proposed 2006/07 Transport Capital Programme” be approved;
- (iii) That a report be brought back containing further information on the provision of more secure cycle parking in the city centre, either instead of or in addition to this scheme.

#### Decision of the Executive Member

**RESOLVED:** That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

**REASON:** To allow an informed decision to be made as to which schemes should be included in the 2006/07 Planning and Transport Capital Programme.

#### **84. THE ADOPTION OF UN-ADOPTED (PRIVATELY MAINTAINED) HIGHWAYS – ESTABLISHING A PRIORITY LIST**

Members received a report which sought approval for the ranking of privately maintained highways into priority order and, through that, the creation of a list of prospectively maintainable highways, so as to allow the implementation of the Council's Policy on the adoption of un-adopted highways to be advanced.

Since the approval of the policy for the adoption of un-adopted highways, 118 streets had been identified for possible future adoption. The resources available were such that it could potentially be many decades before all these streets could be dealt with. Due to the extensive processes involved and given the relatively un-chartered territory of adopting private streets, officers considered that it would be prudent to further reduce this number so as to form a list of streets which had the greatest opportunity to become adopted highways. On this basis all cul-de-sacs or other routes not open to through traffic had been identified and were listed in Annex A of the report. This process reduced the number of potential candidates for future adoption to 11 streets, which comprised through routes and loops linking to an existing adopted highway. This list, attached as Annex C of the report, therefore contained privately maintained highways which were considered to potentially have the most benefit to the general public with regards to highway and traffic matters. It was suggested that this list be published as a formal statement of the Council's view that they were prospectively maintainable at public expense (subject to being brought up to the appropriate standard by the owners). Within that list residents would be able to identify those streets that the Council considered as being more important than others, based on a provisional ranking primarily focusing on condition and safety, and hence where Council assistance to bring them up to standard would be made available first.

Members requested that officers check whether Burniston Grove was an un-adopted road and, if it was, add it to the appropriate list.

#### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That Annex C of the report be adopted as the list of prospectively maintainable streets within the City of York and the provisional ranking of those streets be noted;
- (ii) That consultation be undertaken with all frontagers connected with the streets on this list with a view to establishing 'in principle' support for undertaking works in accordance with the Streetworks Code and hence the establishment of a final priority order, subject to a further report being brought to the Executive Member and Advisory Panel (EMAP);

- (iii) That Annex A of the report be adopted as the definitive list of privately maintainable streets and those where, until action has been taken in respect of streets contained within Annex C (either to deal with the adoption or to formally remove a street from that list), no further action to adopt should be taken;
- (iv) That a further report be presented to the Executive Member and Advisory Panel (EMAP) in due course outlining an equitable method for downgrading streets currently identified in Annex C to Annex A and upgrading streets from Annex A to Annex C.

Decision of the Executive Member

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

REASON: To allow the implementation of the Council's policy on the adoption of un-adopted highways to be advanced.

**85. TRANSPORT CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2005/06 – THIRD QUARTER MONITORING REPORT**

Members received a report which set out progress to date on the major schemes in the Planning and Transport capital programme for 2005/06, recommended the approval of adjustments to the programme where required and reported on budget spend to the end of January 2006, which was ten months into the capital programme year.

A summary of proposed funding alterations was included in Annex 1 of the report and details of progress on individual schemes was shown in Annex 2.

Most individual schemes and funding blocks within the capital programme were on schedule to achieve their programme of works and spend by the end of the financial year. The spend was approximately 15% lower than the equivalent time last year owing principally to the programmed later delivery of the carriageway resurfacing schemes. However these schemes were all anticipated to be delivered within the year. In addition a number of the significant schemes had to progress through the full feasibility, design, consultation and approval processes before being available to construct within the year. These schemes were now starting on site, leading to rapidly increasing expenditure. The overall effect of the budget alterations to Local Transport Plan (LTP) schemes was a reduction in the level of overprogramming from £1,063k to £399k. This was considered to be a comfortable level to ensure that the budget was fully spent at the end of the financial year. However, it was noted that owing to the high level of work being undertaken at the end of the year there was a greater risk of the programme underspending if there was a period of bad weather.



### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That the proposed alterations to the funding allocations detailed in the report and shown in Annex 1 be approved, subject to the approval of the Executive;
- (ii) That the progress in the 2005/06 Planning and Transport capital programme detailed in the report and shown in Annex 2 be noted.

### Decision of the Executive Member

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

REASON: To inform the Executive Member and to manage the capital programme effectively.

## **86. 2005/06 THIRD MONITORING REPORT – FINANCE & PERFORMANCE**

Members received a report which presented the latest projections for revenue expenditure and capital expenditure for the Planning and Transport portfolio, and quarter three performance against target for a number of key indicators that were made up of Best Value Performance Indicators owned by Planning and Transport, Customer First targets (letter and telephone answering) and Staff Management Targets (sickness absence).

An overspend of £40k was projected for the portfolio following the second monitoring report. Following further review the Planning and Transport Portfolio was projected to underspend by £57k (0.1% of the gross expenditure budget). The main reason for this projected underspend was the improved car park income position and further savings identified within the parking expenditure budget. Given that the level of underspend remained small and there were a number of other uncertainties faced before the end of the financial year, relating to winter maintenance and income budgets, it was not proposed to commit additional expenditure.

Performance on key Best Value Indicators was improving, in particular in relation to planning. Customer First targets were generally being achieved or exceeded, with problem areas remaining in Planning and Sustainability letter answering.

### Advice of the Advisory Panel

That the Executive Member be advised:

- (i) That the financial and performance position of the portfolio be noted.

Decision of the Executive Member

RESOLVED: That the advice of the Advisory Panel be accepted and the suggested decisions, above, be endorsed.

REASON: To inform the Executive Member.

A REID  
Executive Member

D SMALLWOOD  
In the Chair of the Advisory Panel

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 6.30 pm.