

York Access Forum (YAF)
5th November 2024, 10:30–13:15
Hudson Room, West Offices and on Teams
Notes

Attendees

Name	Organisation (if applicable)
Diane Roworth (DR)	Chair Independent
Anne Norton (AN)	York Disability Rights Forum
Dionne Grover-Jacques (DG)	York ME Community
Belle Whitely (BW)	Sight Loss Council
Marilyn Crawshaw (MC)	York Human Rights City Network
David Carr (DC)	York Carers Action Group
Rachel Barber (RB)	Living 4 Moments
Ian Lawson (IL)	NYDRF Accessible Transport Group
Flick Williams (FW)	Independent
Srish Arjen (SA)	Independent
Julie Day (JD)	Wilberforce Trust
Richard Holland (RH)	CYC Senior Transport Manager (after the break)
Dave Smith (DS)	Access Officer, (CYC)
Christine Kyte (CK)	Support Worker (CYC) – note taker
Greg Morgan (GM)	CYC Active Travel Transport Planner
Andy Vose (AV)	CYC Transport Policy Manager

No.	Item
1	Welcome and introductions
	<p>DR Welcomed new member Ian Lawson, North Yorkshire Disability Rights Accessible Transport Group Chair and everyone present and asked them to introduce themselves.</p> <p>DS General housekeeping re room and etiquette for hybrid meeting re questions, use of mic etc.</p>

2	YAF updates.
	<p>DS summarises progress with issues raised at previous meetings (also emailed to attendees with agenda)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He is now involved with the design of pedestrian/cycle junctions and submits joint reports with Greg Morgan (Active Travel). 2. Station Gateway progress – the majority of changes requested have been incorporated into the design. <p>MC asks if updates will include historical planning and development projects as well as current. DS confirms that it does.</p> <p>DS also confirmed to his knowledge a fifth proposed bus stop at York Station Gateway will not be built.</p> <p>IM YAF notes that a firm decision has been made not to erect a fifth bus stop opposite the Principal Hotel</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Access to Democracy – a response from Democratic Services has been copied to members indicating their planned review of member training programme and desire for Forum member to feedback experiences of attending meeting. <p>DS' full update report will be included with these minutes.</p>
3	Active Travel Greg Morgan
	<p>GM Defined Active Travel as transport that is fully or partially people powered.</p> <p>Government policy – gear change meant cycling was no longer a pedestrian activity. This was supported by the adoption of Local Transport Note 1/20 - cycling infrastructure guidance.</p> <p>He shared budget information for Active Travel via PowerPoint, not circulated previously.</p> <p>Bus stop bypasses - Likely there will be other bus bypasses planned in York as this is the safest way to install a cycle lane on a road where there is a bus stop. Members raised concerns of conflicts between needs of pedestrians and cyclists, citing a recent Guide Dogs report.</p> <p>MC raises CYC 's lack of outward portrayal of their consideration of access issues and the apparent invisibility of disabled people.</p>

	<p>Action</p> <p>GM takes notes of comments that CYC need to evidence more consideration of disabled travellers needs and views in Active Travel planning and implementation.</p> <p>GM Suggestions for dropped crossings or other walking, cycling schemes can be submitted to Greg.Morgan@york.gov.uk or walking.cycling@york.gov.uk</p> <p>His presentation forms part of the record of the meeting.</p>
4	<p>Local Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plan - Andy Vose</p> <p>AV notes that the LCWIP acronym puts cycling before walking. PowerPoint shared to explain what the LCWIP is. Also shows maps of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core walking, wheelchair use and wheeling zones. • Potential Walk and Wheel network. • LCWIP Cycle network <p>Clarifies that the existing route over the level crossing at Copmanthorpe is shown on the map as well as the aspiration route with an accessible footbridge.</p> <p>DC asks when the plan will be adopted and whether it will be part of planning guidance.</p> <p>FW raises blue badge (BB) parking being removed on cycle routes due to the risk of cyclists being hit by a car door opening. Also, difficulty of seeing the detail and requests a list of the streets on the cycle route.</p> <p>AV stresses that this the current cycle network map is an aspirational network to show people that we would like a route between 2 points. So, there may be BB spaces on a proposed cycle route.</p> <p>Cycle network – red routes are the priority which is determined by casualty rate, air quality and feedback from Big Transport consultation. The blue network shows an aspiration for a network in that vicinity. For local routes there isn't a hierarchy, but it will be influenced by developments in the future to gain from Section 106 contributions.</p> <p>The plan is for this LCWIP to be adopted in December 2024 by the Executive. It will be used to formulate bids for funding, and it will be in the public arena and will inform development control. Similar exercise done with the cycle route network in 2016. LCWIP is a living document and will be reviewed.</p>

DR What mechanisms are there for managing conflicts between cycle and pedestrian routes? It is important to develop a standard for each of these routes. How can disabled people contribute to the design of these routes in advance of the planning stage?

AV Conflict will be dealt with on a route-by-route basis and by the person delivering each particular scheme. In the scope of any project it will say that there is an aspiration to minimise conflict between modes. Aiming to engage with stakeholder groups earlier in the process.

DS raises use of workshops as done with York Station Gateway as a suitable model to use. Involve stakeholder groups from the outset. Design a standard between us that will feed into the new highway design guide.

AN Agrees that the walking part is minimal and asks about YAF member being on the steering group.

AV Steering group meeting is just an update. Document for the Executive in December is the concise version that officers are currently writing and will be shared with the steering group. Not planning to have any further steering group meetings. Commitment to LTN 120 and Inclusive Mobility will be kept.

MC BB parking outside homes on cycle routes is a big issue. Concern that disabled people will be stuck in their homes if BB parking spaces are removed as raised by **FW** earlier. Can consideration of this be included as a criteria when deciding on which routes will be prioritised.

Regarding conflict between competing access needs. **MC** suggests that CYC devises a set of 'core principles', and guidance for staff on how to manage this. Asks that YAF puts this forward as something.

DR It is important to see the Social Model of Disability and the Equality Act put into action and represented in plans that go before the Council.

AV Agrees that this would be a good approach as it makes things easier to all involved in the long term. Having the principles written down and put into the scope of the project is crucial. Consultants also need written guidance when working for CYC. If CYC make 20mph city wide this could reduce the need for cycle lanes.

	<p>DR requests that this is taken forward and that workshops are held in advance of the design schemes for each route. Suggests liaising with DS on this and on how disabled people can be involved with new Highway Design Guide.</p> <p>FW echoes that consultants not been fully appraised of Public Sector Equality Act.</p> <p>RB Suggests parking on one side of the road only.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)AV will produce a list of street names in the cycle network map. 2)AV will provide an online version of the map which can be zoomed in on. 3)CYC develops and uses core principles and guidance on how to proceed when you have competing needs. Put these considerations into the scope of this and other projects. 4)CYC uses Workshop style approach to the design of routes and the Highway Design Guide.
5	<p>Changes to Blue Badge access to the city centre process – Richard Holland</p>
	<p>RH Vehicle management scheme work recently inherited by RH. Only involved in the installation part not development of policy. About a year ago BB holders given access to Goodramgate and Blake St. This required staff at both locations. RH looking into the possibility of removing staff element as it is costly - £200,000 per year. This may or may not be possible, but he has been asked to see if there is any scope. The system can be done remotely. Asking YAF for their thoughts. Shows photo of each site. Goodramgate: intercom is on driver side and near kerb edge. Camera within intercom pillar and further down the street to look at vehicle registration plate.</p> <p>Blake St: intercom can only be on the left due to listed building on the right. Systems designed for drivers to get out of their vehicle. Suggests online waiver system or ringing the customer team to get them to do this on their behalf. Asks for suggestions which can be emailed to him: Richard.holland@york.gov.uk</p> <p>FW Always sees 2 staff at barrier – why? Blue Badges are issued to people, not vehicles so an online system will create</p>

barriers for some disabled people. Also concern for people with limited upper limb mobility who are unable to remove their badge from the windscreen. Type of vehicle can affect access. Concerned that people will find it too difficult and not access city centre.

RH Because there are 2 locations CYC has to employ 2 members of staff, one to roam and relieve other staff 10.30 – 5pm. Acknowledges difficulty of meeting everyone's needs, and that online system can be time consuming and exclusive.

MC On behalf of **RB**, how would deaf people be accommodated for example using an intercom? Queries how a trial of the barrier could be carried out. Asks how **RH** will consult disabled groups more widely.

RH Any solution would need to be trialled. He feels that it will be difficult to remove all staff. He is at the early stage of consultation.

DR Suggests **RH** involves York Disability Rights Forum. Need to ensure that certain groups of disabled people are not excluded. Online registration difficult for blind people and what about people who use taxis, and visitors?

An alternative could be that staff have other duties e.g. welcomers to the city for Make It York and share the cost across departments.

AN How would you register taxis and how would a taxi get in if there is no one at the gate? Need for an offline version. Form filling is tiring. What happens if the barrier stops working?

RH Currently staff take notes of taxi drivers so they can get back into the city to pick someone up later.

FW If one barrier is unstaffed BB holders will use the staffed barrier only where there is less parking. Pleased that prebooking system hasn't been proposed.

DS confirms that if YAF consultation is referred to in an officer's report we will check that this has been agreed through the YAF.

Actions

YAF members can contact **RH** via Richard.holland@york.gov.uk with queries, suggestions etc.

DS to contact YDRF for their views therefore consulting more widely.

6	Next Meeting
	<p>Thursday 23rd January 2025 1.30 – 4pm</p> <p>Still processing survey results, will use these to set dates for the rest of 2025. Being able to book rooms in West Offices is becoming more difficult due to increased users of the facilities.</p>