

Decision Session
Executive Member for Transport and Planning

16 November 2017

Report of the Director of Economy and Place

Consideration of the objections received to the advertised proposal to amend the Traffic Regulation Order to include Residents' Priority Parking in the Holgate Ward for: Holgate Central

Summary

1. To report the objections received within the legal consultation period for the consideration of the Executive Member for Transport and Planning and request a decision from the options given.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that approval be given to implement the advertised proposal to amend the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Residents' Priority Parking Area as outlined in Option One:

Reason: To progress the majority views of the residents consulted and to take into consideration the needs of the schools and churches in the area

Background

3. Petitions were received from Railway Terrace and St Paul's Terrace. In addition, we received details of a wider consultation undertaken in the area indicating there is reasonably strong support for residents parking in the surrounding streets These were reported to the Executive Member for Planning and Transport at a public decision session on 10th November 2016. The Executive Member requested we undertake a formal consultation over a wider area, including the private streets of Enfield Crescent and Wilton Rise (part) to ascertain the level of support.

The reports and decision notices are available to view on the website.

4. On 22nd June the Executive Member considered the results of the consultation undertaken and decided to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Residents' Priority Parking as an extension of the existing R60 scheme to be known as Holgate Central. The reports and decision notices are available on the website.
5. The Executive Member decided to take the needs of the wider community into consideration and provide some parking amenity for:
 - St Pauls CE Church and the York Spiritualist Centre on a Sunday by introducing a Monday to Saturday scheme.
 - St Pauls Primary and Nursery Schools by permitting employees of those educational establishments to purchase a commercial permit for the R60 zone.

Advertised Proposal

6.
 - a) Extending the R60 Residents' Priority Parking Area to include the consultation area with the exception of the private streets and St Paul's Mews.
 - b) Marked parking bays on Watson Street to allow 2 hour parking for non-permit holders.
 - c) Adjusting the eligibility requirements of Commercial Permits to allow staff from St Paul's Nursery School and St Paul's CE Primary School to purchase permits to park.

A copy of the Plan clarifying the boundary of the scheme advertised is included as Annex A.

A copy of the Advertised Notice of Proposals is included as Annex B (highlighted items refer to Holgate Central)

Objections received (Full details with officer comments are included as Annex C)

7. **Précis of Objections (including comments and requests)**
 - Request from residents of Endfield Crescent (without on-street frontage) to be able purchase visitor or household permits in the scheme.
 - Request from the York Spiritualist Centre for 9am to 5pm

operational times to allow parking amenity for their evening events/meetings

- Request from St Paul's Nursery School for cheaper permits and dedicated spaces allocated for staff
- Request from St Paul's CE Primary School for a different type of permit which is transferrable between staff members and one of less cost
- Objection from Councillor Crisp and some residents to the proposal to adjust the eligibility requirements of Commercial Permits to allow staff from St Paul's Nursery School and St Paul's CE Primary School to purchase permits to park, the general consensus of opinions on this part of the proposal is:
 - I. School employees should not be allowed parking at all
 - II. if permits are allowed, then there should be a cap on the number issued
 - III. Further consultation on this issue should take place with residents
- Objection from Residents to the advertised hours of operation; requesting:
 - I. Further consultation
 - II. 7 days a week (to exclude church parking and Sunday shoppers)
- Objection from Residents to the scheme in total
 - I. The scheme will not improve the parking situation
 - II. It will displace the parking elsewhere
 - III. It is vindictive to remove the free parking
 - IV. Reduces access to the Spiritualist Centre and Church
 - V. Permits are expensive compared with other authorities
 - VI. Insufficient support demonstrated in the consultation
- Concerns raised about the maintenance of roads
- Request for the removal of the single yellow line on Watson Terrace
- Request for additional clarity on waiting times for non-permit holders

Options with Analysis

8. **Option 1 (Recommended Option): Implement as advertised (as detailed at paragraph 6) with a concession for the property on Enfield Terrace (private street) as outlined in item 1, Annex C**

Analysis

9. This is the recommended option because:
It better reflects the residents' views from the consultation process whilst giving some consideration to the needs of the wider community.

The objections raised in the legal consultation period were similar to the issues raised in the first consultation and have already been considered. The views expressed are conflicting; the schools and Spiritualist Centre would like further concessions regarding permits and times of operation which conflicts with some objections received to the school being permitted permits and requests for a 24 hour, 7 day a week restriction. The advertised proposal is a balanced proposal taking into account some of the needs of the wider community as well as the residents views.

10. **Option 2: Further Consultation**

Undertake an additional consultation before implementation on the:

1. Times of operation
2. School Permits

The results of the additional consultation to be brought back to the Executive Member before proceeding.

Analysis

11. This is not the recommended option because:-
Further consultation on the logistics of the scheme would allow residents additional opportunity to select their preferred hours of operation. However, the results are unlikely to be conclusive due to the conflicting viewpoints already received.

Additional consultation would delay implementation of the scheme by 3 to 6 months and depending on the results we may require additional legal advertisement.

12. **Option 3: Implementation with reduced Operational Hours**

Uphold the objection from the Spiritualist Centre and introduce a 9am - 5pm Scheme, Monday to Saturday to allow unlimited evening parking.

Analysis

13. We could introduce a scheme Mon to Sat, 9am to 5pm without further advertisement (lesser restriction).

This is not the recommended option because:

An influx of 80 -100 attendees at an evening meeting with the level of parking this brings would undermine the parking amenity of residents at a time when they need it most.

We have received conflicting objections to the proposal because we are not proposing a full time 24 hour scheme which was the preference of the majority of residents who registered one.

There are two hour bays proposed and existing 90 minute parking on Holgate Road nearby which can be used if available.

Evening visitors to the Spiritualist Centre who have mobility issues and in possession of a disabled permit (blue badge) will be able to park in any available space within the zone.

14. **Option 4: Implementation in part**

Uphold the objections received to school employees being eligible for permit parking by not implementing this part of the proposal or re-advertising the proposal to introduce a limit on the number of permits we can issue to school employees.

Analysis

15. This is not the recommended option because:-
The schools would be disadvantaged by the scheme. We assume the area is currently used for school parking and we have received no indication that school employees have difficulty finding space in the area. Because other commuter parking would be removed, space should be available for residents during the school working day.

Re-advertising a proposal to limit the number of permits issued to school staff would delay the implementation of the scheme.

16. **Option 5: Re-advertise the proposal to introduce a full-time scheme**

Uphold the objections received to the proposed times of operation and re-advertise the proposal to operate 24 hours, 7 days a week.

Analysis

17. This is not the recommended option because:-
The Church and Spiritualist Centre are considered to be part of the wider community and the advertised proposal gives additional opportunities for the congregation and members for parking on a Sunday.

18. **Option 6: Non-implementation**

Uphold the objections to the full proposals and take no further action at this time.

Analysis

19. The issues raised during the formal consultation are common to many Parking schemes when first introduced. It is very unlikely that a scheme could be devised that would satisfy everyone.

This is not the recommended option because:
a significant proportion of residents have indicated the parking situation is not acceptable in the area and have requested Residents' Parking.

Consultation

20. The notice of proposals was mounted on street throughout the area and advertised in The Press.

Details were:

- hand delivered to all properties in the proposed area
- hand delivered to Enfield Crescent, Wilton Rise (part) and St Paul's Mews
- posted or emailed to non-residents who had expressed an interest during the consultation period
- sent to Housing Services (Cecilia Place)
- discussed with Parking Services

Council Plan

21. The above proposal contributes to the City Council's draft Council Plan:
- A prosperous city for all
 - A council that listens to residents

Implications

22. This report has the following implications:

Financial – Residents parking schemes are self financing once in operation. The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking schemes.

Human Resources – None

Equalities – None

Legal – The proposals require amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014: Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 apply

Crime and Disorder – None

Information Technology – None

Land – None

Other – None

Risk Management - There is an acceptable level of risk associated with the recommended option.

Contact Details

Authors:

Sue Gill
Traffic Project Officer
Transport
Tel: (01904) 551497

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris
Corporate Director: Economy & Place

Report Approved: ✓

Date: 2/11/17

Wards Affected: Holgate

All

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Annexes:

Annex A: Plan of Advertised Property Boundary

Annex B: Notice of Proposals

Annex C: Full details of Objections Received