

Traffic Congestion Ad-hoc Scrutiny Review – Interim Report

Summary

1. This report asks Members to consider and agree any necessary changes / additions to the draft of an interim report for Scrutiny Management Committee attached at Annex A.

Background

2. This topic was originally registered by Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laing in April 2005 in an effort to access the draft of the second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) prior to its submission. It was envisaged that the scrutiny process would ensure that LTP2 met the aspirations of the Planning & Transport Panel and allow time for the Executive Member to be questioned on issues of concern. A decision was taken to defer the topic and LTP2 was subsequently submitted.
3. In November 2006 Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC) reconsidered the topic registration together with a draft remit suggested by Cllr Simpson-Laing. After due consideration, SMC agreed a timeframe of six months for the review, and the following amended remit was agreed:

Aim

To identify ways including Local Transport Plans 1 & 2 (LTP1 & LTP2) and other evidence, of reducing present levels of traffic congestion in York, and ways of minimising the impact of the forecast traffic increase.

Objectives

Having regard to the impact of traffic congestion (based on external evidence and those measures already implemented in LTP1 or proposed in LTP2), recommend and prioritise specific improvements to:

- i. Accessibility to services, employment, education and health
- ii. Air Quality, in particular looking at the five hotspots identified in the LTP2
- iii. Alternative environmentally viable & financially practical methods of transport
- iv. CO² Emissions
- v. Journey times and reliability of public transport
- vi. Economic Performance
- vii. Quality of Life
- viii. Road Safety

Consultation

4. To date, this review has been progressed in consultation with the Assistant Director of City Development & Transport, the Environmental Protection Manager and other key officers in City Strategy. Representatives of the local bus service providers and the Chair of the Quality Bus Partnership were also consulted in relation to Objective (v) - Journey times and reliability of public transport.

Options

5. Having regard to the aims and objectives of this topic remit and having considered the information provided in this report and associated Annexes, Members may wish to agree:
 - i) how to proceed with the consultation of residents on the draft recommendations arising from this review.
 - ii) what additional budget is required in order to carry out the above consultation process, in order that a request for an increase in budget can be included in the draft interim report to be considered by SMC.
 - iii) any amendments or additional information to be included in the draft interim report and annexes to be considered by SMC – see Annexes A & Ab.

Analysis

6. Members have previously expressed their wish to consult residents on the recommendations arising from this review. At a meeting on 9 November information on the costs and timeframe for doing this via either a 'Talkabout Workshop Session' or a 'Talkabout survey and On-line residents survey' were considered. Both of these options were ruled out based on the limited views they would provide and the costs and timeframes involved.
7. In order to ensure a wider response could be gained, Members suggested including a survey in the Your City / Your Ward publications. Information on the costs involved in these options are attached at Annex B.
8. At the meeting held on 12 December 2007, Members requested a briefing paper detailing information on the council's vehicle fleet and the Quality Bus Partnership's vehicle fleet – see Annex C.
9. In regard to the objectives considered to date, Members are asked to agree any further additions or amendments to the summary of findings etc shown in the table attached to the interim report drafted for SMC – see Annex Ab.

Implications

10. Financial – If a decision is taken to proceed with the survey of residents on the recommendations arising from this review, additional funding will be required from the scrutiny budget over and above that which is already allocated to each individual review.

- 11. HR – Any extension to the timeframe for this review will require additional officer resources to support the review.
- 12. There are no equalities, legal or other implications.

Risk Management

- 13. There are no known risks associated with the recommendations contained within this report.

Corporate Priorities

- 14. The implementation of the recommendations arising from this review will support the delivery of the following corporate priorities
 - ‘Reduce the environmental impact of council activities and encourage, empower and promote others to do the same’
 - ‘Increase the use of public and other environmentally friendly modes of transport’.

Recommendation

- 15. In light of the above options, Members are asked to agree:
 - i) the method for carrying out the survey of residents
 - ii) how much additional budget to request from SMC
 - iii) any amendments to the interim report and annexes to be considered by SMC

Reason: In order that this information can be included in the interim report to be considered by SMC

Contact Details

Author:
 Melanie Carr
 Scrutiny Officer
 Scrutiny Services
 Tel No. 01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
 Dawn Steel
 Democratic Services Manager

Interim Report Approved

Date 7 January 2008

Wards Affected:

All

Author: **Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

- Annexes A & Ab – Draft Interim Report for SMC & Summary of Findings etc
- Annex B – Costings for alternative options for consulting residents
- Annex C – Briefing Paper on the Council’s & Quality Bus Partnership’s vehicle fleet