

ANNEX D3

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>Comments Received from those supporting the introduction of Residents' Priority Parking, St Peter's Quarter</p>	<p>Officer comments (where appropriate)</p>
<p>We wish to stress the mayhem that existed prior to the developer/managing agent/Residents Association restricting parking by bringing in Private Parking Enforcement</p> <p>Additional cars are now regularly parking on the streets of this development – this will get worse if no scheme is in place to prevent it.</p>	<p>At this time the level of non-residential parking is not significant, we believe this may be because the private enforcement signs are still mounted around the estate (and will remain in place for enforcement of the private areas)</p>
<p>Concerns were raised about the costs of permits/visitor permits.</p>	<p>The cost of providing the residents parking service is funded by the residents rather than the general council tax payer.</p>
<p>The number of parking permits should be restricted to one per household</p>	<p>This view is unlikely to be supported.</p>
<p>What provisions will be in place to prevent parking and obstructing the entrance to resident parking bays?</p>	<p>No provisions initially, this may be an area we have to revisit in the future</p>
<p>The additional signage should deter all opportunist parkers and help with the increasing problem of non-residents parking in our personal private spaces.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Please ensure signage is sympathetic to the</p>	<p>All regulatory signage has to conform to Highway regulations</p>

development and fixed securely.	to enable enforcement
Proposed parking restrictions at the entrance to the estate are excessive and would inconvenience many residents. Under the private enforcement scheme three vehicles could park at this location and they should be allowed to remain.	The proposal has been reviewed to allow some parking at this location as requested
Parking areas should be marked with double yellow lines elsewhere on the estate to prevent obstruction of the private parking spaces.	This is an expensive option and maintenance liability that would only be considered after implementation if necessary
Any scheme needs to be operational full time because of the proximity to the city centre and local amenities.	This is the majority view of residents
Comments Received from those not supporting the introduction of Residents' Priority Parking St Peter's Quarter	Officer comments

<p>Unwillingness to pay for permits to park outside their homes. Child care issues would create extra costs they cannot afford and the stress of obtaining permits.</p> <p>Additional cost for residents will require them to be organised and ensure they have visitor permits in place including those for trade vehicles.</p> <p>We already pay for permits with the service agreements to the management company for traffic wardens to patrol the area.</p> <p>Would like the parking to stay as it is – parking tickets provided FOC by management committee.</p>	<p>We are unable to retain the current private parking enforcement for areas of adopted highway.</p> <p>This is a discretionary service, therefore the cost of provision, permits, administration and enforcement is charged to the residents requiring the service rather than adding to the cost of the Council tax for those who do not require it.</p>
<p>We already have parking and the bay outside my house with XXX marked on it is mine.</p>	<p>The scheme only refers to areas of adopted highway, private parking remains unchanged.</p>
<p>It is unnecessary to introduce this for the whole estate. Problems are mainly occurring near the entrance, yellow lines would prevent this.</p>	<p>Waiting restrictions will displace vehicles further into the estate.</p>
<p>All there needs is more rigorous enforcement of existing parking arrangements on the development.</p>	<p>The current parking arrangements cannot remain for areas of adopted highway</p>
<p>Prefer yellow lines on all corners, opposite parking areas and around fountain.</p>	<p>Some restrictions are recommended as part of the scheme. We will continue to monitor</p>
<p>Martins Court and Carleton Street</p>	<p>Officer comments</p>

<p>In Support: We have lived here for 20 years, the parking has got much worse in the last 5 years. It is frustrating not being able to get parked.</p> <p>We have waiting restrictions in place on one side – would these be lifted if the scheme is implemented?</p> <p>Parking amenity not sufficient for all residents now – concerned that permit parking will not rectify this situation. Can the area of land to the south west of the street be altered to provide extra parking?</p> <p>Even at the weekend when the York workers are at home, the area is plagued with visitors to York and the Railway Museum who do want to avoid paying parking fees. Therefore a 24 hour 7 day a week restriction would be appropriate for the whole area. Should only St Peter Quarter be admitted to the scheme then the overflow of vehicles would naturally fall on Martin's Court and Carlton Street and cause massive chaos. A similar consultation would have to be repeated for Martin's Court and Carlton Street. So to act now on all three areas would be a savings for the future and makes sense.</p>	<p>If the available on-street parking amenity is not sufficient for the needs of residents, a Resident Parking Scheme will not improve the situation for weekends/evenings.</p> <p>There is no budget for the provision of any extra parking amenity.</p> <p>The land referred to is not highway and cannot be used for this purpose.</p> <p>The recommended option requests authority to consult further with residents of St Martin's Court and Carleton Street should we be petitioned to do so within 12 months of implementation of a scheme on St Peter's Quarter.</p>
<p>The following comments are made by residents against the introduction of a scheme</p>	
<p>This would be a huge inconvenience, there is ample unused roadside parking. I would resent having to pay for a permit for space which I can currently use without hassle.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>This would be a financial strain on us.</p> <p>The area is not over parked, please refrain from trying to charge us for parking.</p> <p>Fee for second permit is extortionate.</p>	
<p>Agree area is used by commuters, but this is not a problem. This is a selfish proposal and energy should be put towards congestion on the ring road.</p>	Noted
<p>I support the proposal but how would the scheme work for holiday lets?</p>	There is currently no provision for holiday let properties within any of our Resident Parking Areas/Zones
<p>Apart from the proposed parking restrictions at the entrance, the scheme is unnecessary.</p>	View not shared by the majority
<p>Charges consist of an additional council tax. Unjustifiable to give discounts on CO2 emissions.</p> <p>Why should we pay for parking when we already pay a premium to have a property with its own private parking space.</p>	Private parking spaces off areas of adopted highway are not relevant to the proposed scheme.
<p>Council should invest in better provision for bicycle use as an effective way of reducing car usage.</p>	Noted