

---

## **Economic & City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

25<sup>th</sup> January 2011

Report of the Assistant Director Governance & ICT

### **Broadway Shops – Update Report**

#### **Summary**

1. This report provides Members with an update on the outcome of a further facilitated discussion that took place on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010. It also asks Members to consider whether this Committee should have any further involvement with maintenance, parking and safety issues at the Broadway parade of shops.

#### **Background**

2. In August 2009 Councillors D'Agorne and Taylor, Ward Members for Fishergate, submitted a Councillor Call for Action in relation to maintenance, parking and safety issues at Broadway Shops. In response to this the Economic and City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee agreed to facilitate round table discussions between all willing parties in an attempt to resolve the problems being experienced.
3. To date three facilitated discussions have been held. The first two held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2010 and 20<sup>th</sup> April 2010 have previously reported back to the Committee. The third was held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010 and is reported below.

#### **Consultation**

4. All retailers in the parade of shops at Broadway and the secretary of the Residents Association have been consulted and kept fully informed of proceedings as they progress.
5. The appropriate Council officers and Ward Councillors have been consulted and kept fully informed as part of this process.

#### **Outcome of Facilitated Discussion held on 10th November 2010**

6. The third facilitated discussion took place at St Oswald's Primary School, Fulford and was attended by the following:
  - Councillor Madeleine Kirk (facilitator)

- Jim Sotheran - Engineering Technician – City of York Council
- Ward Councillors D'Agorne and Taylor
- Tracy Wallis (Scrutiny Officer) & Jill Pickering (Democracy Officer)
- Regional Property Manager (Co-operative Group)
- Representative from the Greengrocers
- Representative of the Hairdressers
- Representatives of BAGNARA (Broadway Area Good Neighbour & Resident's Association)

7. The aim of the meeting was to:

- i. Discuss the impact on **pedestrian safety**, of a newly painted white line in front of the parade of shops;
- ii. Discuss a **feasibility study** on possible changes to the traffic island (this had been sent to all interested parties prior to the meeting) and is attached at Annexes A & B to this report.

### **Pedestrian Safety**

8. Since the last update report to the Committee a safe pedestrian area had been designated in front of the parade of shops. In late September/early October 2010 a solid white line had been painted approximately 2 metres out from the shop fronts to stop vehicles from parking too close to the buildings and thus affording a safe passageway for pedestrians. Several 'walking man' decals were painted on the pathway to indicate that this was a designated pedestrian route. In addition to this white 'in' and 'out' signs were painted on the tarmac indicating a preferred direction for traffic flow along the service road.
9. Approximately a month was left in between the alterations being made and the 10<sup>th</sup> November facilitated discussion to allow both residents and retailers to judge whether the changes had improved pedestrian safety in the area.
10. At the discussion on 10<sup>th</sup> November the representatives of BAGNARA said they had been pleased with the changes made and felt that pedestrian safety in this area had been much improved. There was now a clear delineation between pedestrian space and vehicular space that meant access to the shops had been made much easier and safer.
11. The retailers felt that safety had been improved as well although there had been incidences of cars parking over the white line, partially blocking the pedestrian area. However it was generally thought that this would stop as people who used the shops got used to the new road markings.
12. A potential new problem had arisen with the changes and that was one of speed. Previously the greengrocers had strategically placed crates on their forecourt but these had now been removed since the changes to the road markings had been made. The crates had acted as a physical barrier, slowing traffic down as it entered the service road. Now that the crates had been removed and a preferred direction of travel indicated (advisory one way

system) the speed of the traffic entering and travelling along the service road had increased.

13. Further discussions ensued and one of the retailers spoke about installing robust bollards on their forecourt in the future to try and further improve access and safety; this could potentially also slow the speed that traffic entered onto the service road.
14. Part of the original plan for the area (discussed at previous facilitated discussions) had been to install bicycle stands and large planters in the area. This had not happened due to the prohibitive cost. Funding for free cycle stands had expired and whilst the stands were available retailers would be expected to pay for installation themselves. There was also limited space for these.

### **Feasibility Study – Possibilities for Changing the Traffic Island**

15. A brief feasibility study was commissioned and paid for by the Ward Councillors and presented at the facilitated discussion on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010. The study was commissioned to investigate possible changes to the layout of the lay-by/access to the shops area used by delivery details and public access to the shops/properties, at the same time maintaining an easy and safe route for pedestrians to cross the road to the bus stop in this area. The feasibility study and accompanying maps are attached at Annex A and B to this report.

16. A Risk Assessment to determine whether a safety audit needed to be carried out had been undertaken and this had highlighted that the:

‘Proposed widening of the entrance to the shopping area in Broadway will make it easier for large vehicles to gain access without overrunning the verge; however the wider access will enable vehicles to enter at a much higher speed which, together with the extra 4 metres which pedestrians will have to cross, will increase the possibility of a vehicle / pedestrian conflict.

It is understood that the access road to the south of the crossing point is in private ownership, nevertheless it is considered that a crossing point with dropped kerbs located across the access road away from the entrance would be of greater benefit, particularly to wheelchair users and pedestrians with pushchairs as visibility would be much improved and the crossing distance would be far less. It would also improve the route between the shops and the bus stop. For this reason it is recommended that Stage1/2 and Stage 3 safety audits be carried out.’

17. The Engineering Technician from City of York Council indicated that the outcome of any safety audit undertaken might increase the costs of the estimate for works, which currently stood at £8,243.00 (including fees and feasibility study).
18. The feasibility study was discussed and retailers said there were problems with vehicles turning into the service road. The larger vehicles, in the main those servicing the Co-op, were causing damage to the drain at the

hairdressers/greengrocers end of the service road and had on several occasions knocked over or damaged a bollard, which had been installed to protect the kerb and drain on this edge of the traffic island. It was established that there were several reasons for this happening namely the size of the delivery lorries and the lack of available space needed to accommodate the turning radius of these vehicles and what seemed to be a misunderstanding as to where the weight restriction area started and finished. This affected the route used by the delivery vehicle drivers and ultimately the way they accessed the service road.

19. As the damage was believed to mainly be caused by the Co-op's delivery vehicles it was suggested that they might like to consider either funding changes to the traffic island or making a contribution to the cost of any changes. The Regional Property Manager from the Co-operative group agreed to discuss possible funding with the Co-op's Head Office.
20. As an alternative the representative from the Hairdressers suggested that if the Co-op would look into paying for refurbishing the forecourt outside of his premises with a suitably robust material and dropping the kerb then they would be welcome to use this area as a 'turning in' space. This might also be a substantially cheaper option than that set out in the feasibility study.

### **Other**

21. There were still ongoing discussions between the Co-op and the Post Office in relation to moving the Post Box from its present location to outside of the Post Office.
22. On consideration of all the information received to date and the ensuing discussions it was agreed that there was probably no need for any further involvement from the Economic & City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee. The interested parties around the table had agreed to discuss potential changes to the traffic island at a future meeting (date to be agreed) but it was not deemed necessary for the Scrutiny Committee to be involved with this.

### **Options**

23. Members are asked to consider:
  - i. Noting the report
  - ii. Consider whether there would be any merit in this Committee having any further involvement in this matter;
  - iii. Adding a further update from relevant officers at the City of York Council to their work plan for March 2011

### **Analysis**

24. Discussions at the last facilitated meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November indicate that the works undertaken to date have had a positive effect addressing both the parking issues and the pedestrian safety issues in front of Broadway Shops.

25. There are still matters to be discussed in terms of making changes to the traffic island to allow for better access for delivery vehicles. These discussions may also go some way to addressing general maintenance of the service road as well. If larger vehicles were to have a better turning area then they may be less likely to cause damage to the forecourts, kerbs and drains along the service road. However, these discussions do not necessarily need the input of this Committee.
26. At a meeting in December 2009, when this matter was first considered the Committee agreed that in the first instance, and in order to offer some support from the Committee, round table discussions be held rather than proceeding with the Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) by immediately progressing this to a full-scale scrutiny review. As previously mentioned progress has been made and positive changes and improvements have been implemented in the area through the facilitated discussions that have been held to date.
27. The discussions have also helped to build relationships in the area with a general willingness from all parties to discuss the problems being experienced. Progressing this matter to a full-scale review may undermine these relationships and have a negative effect. Members should also be mindful of the fact that much of the land in question is not owned by the Council and therefore, legally, there would be very little that they could do in terms of funding improvements. Members, are therefore, advised that there would be little to gain from undertaking a full-scale scrutiny review on this matter.
28. Members may feel that they do not want to lose sight of any future developments in this area so it is suggested they add a further update to their work plan for March 2011. There are likely to be further discussions early in the New Year that the technical officers at the Council will be involved in and these could easily be reported back to the Committee.

### **Corporate Strategy 2009/2012**

29. The contents of this report are directly linked to the 'Safer City' element of the Corporate Strategy.

### **Implications**

30. **Financial** – there are no financial implications associated with the recommendations within this report. However should the Committee choose to proceed with this matter further financial implications may arise.
31. **Legal** – There are no known legal recommendations associated with the recommendations within this report; however there would clearly be legal implications in terms of land ownership should the Committee chose to progress this to a full-scale scrutiny review.
32. **Human Resources** – There are no known Human Resources implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

33. There are no equalities, crime & disorder, information technology or property implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

### **Risk Management**

34. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, there are no risks associated with the recommendations within this report. However, maintenance, parking and safety issues in this area had been ongoing for approximately 15 years prior to the progress that has recently been made.

### **Recommendations**

35. Members are asked to consider:
- i. Noting the report
  - ii. Whether there would be any merit in this Committee having any further involvement in this matter;
  - iii. Adding a further update from relevant officers at the City of York Council to their work plan for March 2011

Reason: To address the concerns raised in the submitted CCfA in light of the difficulties pertaining to private land ownership and the Council's legal status in relation to this.

### **Contact Details**

**Author:**

Tracy Wallis  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Services  
Tel: 01904 551714

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

**Andrew Docherty**  
Assistant Director – Governance & ICT

Report Approved  Date 10.01.2011

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** None

**Wards Affected:** Fishergate Ward

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

**Background Papers:**

None

**Annexes**

**Annex A** Feasibility Report in relation to the traffic island  
**Annex B** Diagram to accompany Annex A