
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	13 May 2025
Present	Councillor Ravilious
Officers in Attendance	James Gilchrist – Director of Transport, Environment and Planning Annemarie Howarth – Transport Projects Officer

53. Apologies for Absence (10:02 am)

There were no apologies.

54. Declarations of Interest (10:02 am)

The Executive Member was asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any disclosable pecuniary interests, or other registerable interests she might have in the respect of business on the agenda, if she had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. None were declared.

55. Minutes (10:02 am)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on Tuesday 22 April 2025 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

56. Public Participation (10:03 am)

It was reported that there had been 16 registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

10 people spoke on item 5 "Consideration of the representations received to the formal consultation to implement residents parking and limited waiting restrictions in the Heslington Road area advertised as 'R66: Wellington Street'" and six people spoke on the item of Urgent Business from April 22 decision session "Urgent Review of Parking Charges".

- Steve Boden spoke on item 5 supporting the scheme but discussing reasons for the low response rate and suggesting that the methodology of the officers had not been democratic.

The Executive Member noted that clearer communication of the methodology was being addressed.

- Jacqueline Tomkinson spoke on item 5 – expressing concern at how restrictions would impact people with disabilities and those who do not own a car. She felt that daily ticketing would adversely impact people on reduced means.

The Executive Member confirmed that there were mitigations, and she would ask officers to respond via email to specific concerns raised.

- Pippa Cole spoke on item 5 – stating that she was disappointed in the recommendation not to take further action following a low response rate to the consultation. She noted that the majority of respondents had supported residents parking.
- Michael Kearney spoke on item 5 – in support of the Respark scheme. He noted that local residents were often unable to park due to commuter parking and people attending events at the Barbican in the evening, due to the area providing free parking. He suggested that R66 would also encourage more sustainable transport usage.
- Lucy Shaw spoke on item 5 – in favour of the scheme, suggesting that the scheme would improve pedestrian and cyclist safety as well as the congestion and traffic flow on Fulford Road and Cemetery Road. She pointed out that the area was well served by university buses and noted that where residents had objected it had largely been regarding the perceived cost, but she felt the benefits outweighed this cost.
- Phillip Collins spoke on item 5 - speaking as a local resident of 30 years he commented on current car parking pressures – said it has got worse in recent years. When university raised its parking prices it suggested that people come and park there. He felt with the Barbican site now being turned into 240 apartments this could only have an adverse effect on parking.
- Hazel Qureshi spoke on item 5 – speaking against Respark as unnecessary cost and not needed in her particular area, though she acknowledged that those in the R66 area closer to town

generally were more in favour. She suggested the area be split on a geographic area so that the residents closer to town could have Respark and those closer to Heslington could choose not to.

The Executive Member clarified that it was possible to implement a split scheme where there is a clear geographic division of opinion.

- Sarah Busby spoke on item 5 – she clarified that the decision at hand was whether or not to drop the R66 plan, as opposed to whether or not to implement it now. She noted that subsequent to the consultation, many people in the R66 area were changing their minds due to the council's decision to add 240 flats to the area with only 62 allocated parking spaces. She also noted that the number of students and landlords in the area skewed the response rate.
- Guy Hogarth spoke on item 5 – opposing the scheme. He discussed how these changes would represent a significant cumulative cost to those in his residence, and he sought further clarity of what the changes would entail.
- Jacqueline Christensen spoke on item 5 – opposing the scheme. She did not understand why she should pay to park outside her own home. She said that she never had a significant problem parking near her home and felt that her council tax had already been increased with no visible benefit, so did not wish to pay further unnecessary fees.
- Cllr Jane Burton brought to the Executive Member's attention an online petition created by local traders on Bishopthorpe Road regarding the increase in parking charges and its adverse impact on their business. She suggested viewing the car park as more of a community car park than a city centre one.

The Executive Member accepted this petition.

- John Hayes spoke on this same item – speaking as a local resident, trader and campaigner. He suggested that the recent transport decisions, however well intentioned, needed to be reviewed, especially the 500% tariff increase and its impact on local shops in Bishopthorpe Road. Under statutory guidelines the traders wished to exercise their right to challenge guidelines under the Traffic Management Act 2004 through the petition previously presented by Cllr Burton, but Mr Hayes also presented a formal letter outlining this legal challenge and requesting a review.

The Executive Member accepted the letter.

- Todd LePage spoke on this same item – speaking as a local resident and businessman. He spoke of the significant impact on his retail business and that of other local traders, which had been subject to a sudden and unannounced immediate downturn when the fees were imposed. He requested that the charges be reset to a level that benefits all stakeholders.
- Joe Nasson spoke on the same item – as a local resident and trader. He objected to the price rise in parking charges, stating that though he personally was not part of the pro-car lobby and 80% of shoppers travel to Bishopthorpe Road sustainably, some people did make a conscious choice to use the car park rather than go to out of town supermarkets. All shoppers will be impacted by the changes. Since the price rises, he noted that affluent commuters could still afford the fees but typical shoppers who use Bishopthorpe Road could not afford the new fees and were being priced out, costing the shops their trade. If shops are forced to close it will lead to job losses.
- Ruth Phillips spoke on the same item – as a local business owner. She stated that businesses were no longer in growth and traders mental health was being impacted. She raised the lack of consultation with local businesses prior to the Council making this decision. She noted the low percentage of respondents to the initial consultation supporting parking fee increases and officers' acknowledgement of the adverse impact on those with protected characteristics.
- Heather Walsh spoke on the same item – as a local resident, parent and local shopper. She stated her disgust with the 500% price rises for parking in the area where she did her food shop, used the hairdresser and socialised. She condemned the sudden price rise in a cheap and accessible 3-hour car park which allowed people to support local businesses. She emphasised that this was a local area in which people could support their local community.

The Executive Member addressed the people who had spoken on Bishopthorpe Road (and other) parking charges, recognising the strength of support for the speakers' position. She confirmed that many emails had been exchanged and that she had met with local traders.

The Executive Member said that she had reviewed the budget decision from February, and the pricing model agreed as part of this budget. She recognised that the increase in some areas that traditionally had much lower parking fees had been “too much, too soon” and the council were looking to propose a more consistent and pragmatic amendment which would ultimately phase out different pricing around the city.

She stated that officers were now assessing the budgetary impact of any potential changes and looking at how any shortfall in the budget would be addressed if those changes were to come into place.

She confirmed that meetings would be held with local high street traders in different areas of the city within the week, to discuss possible options around amendments and to gather feedback on how changes may be implemented.

She clarified that the council would not be making individual localised arrangements around parking, but that there was a genuine desire to find a solution and work with local businesses and residents.

57. Consideration of the representations received to the formal consultation to implement residents parking and limited waiting restrictions in the Heslington Road area advertised as 'R66: Wellington Street' (11:03 am)

The Director of Transport, Environment and Planning introduced the item, noting that in October 2024 the Executive Member determined, pursuant to a petition, that this item should progress to formal consultation. Consequently, this report updated on the statutory consultation which was the legal process of implementing restrictions.

He began by responding to questions and concerns raised in the Public Participation section:

He explained that a blue badge did provide free parking within a residents' park area and that free attendance permits for carers were also offered in these areas.

He noted that there was a charge for residents to park in a resident's parking zone and this price varied based on the number of cars per residence, but the standard price was £115 per year/32p per day.

The Badger Hill permit had been referenced by a speaker; he explained that this was a residents parking scheme funded through the University of

York's campus development and there had been an obligation they would fund that through the planning process for several years. The agreement had now expired and was under review and officers would be consulting with residents around Badger Hill on the future of that scheme.

Regarding the decision and concerns over methodology, he clarified that the consultation process was not a referendum, and that once advertised it was the legal duty of the Traffic Authority and Executive Member to consider all objections. To put those objections into context it was important to also report support for the scheme, which officers had done, and they had been guided by response rates and the level of support in putting these comments into context.

Once an item has been advertised, a lesser restriction could always be decided upon, but the authority could not request a greater restriction; so there may be ways to accommodate – for example – the short stay parking requested by some residents, or the parking scheme could also be applied to part of the area and not the full extent.

The Traffic Projects Officer explained the additional responses to consultation published in a supplement to the meeting's agenda (two residents in support and one in objection).

The Executive Member acknowledged having read these written responses from residents, as well as a written submission from Cllr Whitcroft on this item.

The Executive Member conceded that the consultation process had been confusing for residents, noting the very low response rate to both informal and formal consultation. Given the difference between the number of responses she concluded there had been a misunderstanding.

Through the informal consultation carried out in January 2024 there had been 116 responses of a possible 485 sent out (72 people in favour and 44 against). While this was less than the 50% officers would normally look to for support in an area, this was a guideline rather than a rule so the Executive Member had made the decision to progress to statutory consultation.

She felt that perhaps the significance of also responding to the formal consultation in November 2024 had not been properly communicated to residents, since only 24 responses had been received for this. She emphasised that the formal consultation was the important one for residents to respond to and she hoped by extending the consultation period this would allow those in the area to properly respond to this issue.

With that in mind the Executive Member

Resolved: To approve Option 2, extending the statutory consultation period by a further 21 days. Press notices, onsite notices and residents' letters advising of the extended consultation end date will be issued.

Anyone who responded to the previous statutory consultation will not need to submit a new representation. Details of the updated fees associated with purchasing permits for residents parking schemes will be included so that residents can make an informed decision.

Reason: While the statutory consultation process was followed, the Executive Member felt that the level of response to both the informal and formal consultations was insufficient to make a representative decision today.

Cllr K Ravilious, Chair

[The meeting started at 10.02 am and finished at 11.15 am].

This page is intentionally left blank