

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport

To: Councillor Ravilious

Date: Tuesday, 13 May 2025

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: West Offices - Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on **Friday 2 May 2025**. The attached additional documents are now available for the following agenda item:

5. Consideration of the representations (Pages 3 - 6) received to the formal consultation to implement residents parking and limited waiting restrictions in the Heslington Road area advertised as 'R66: Wellington Street'

To consider the representations received to the statutory consultation and Notice of Proposal for the amendment of the Traffic Regulation Order, advertised on 15 November 2024, which proposed to implement Resident Parking (ResPark) restrictions (advertised as R66: Wellington Street) to include properties on Heslington Road (part), Wellington Street, Willis Street, Gordon Street, Wolsley Street, Apollo Street, Apollo Court, Alne Terrace, Belle Vue Street, Belle Vue Terrace and Barbican Road (part) along with mixed use limited waiting parking bays on Heslington Road and determine what action is appropriate following the results.

This agenda supplement was published on **Monday 12 May 2025**.

This page is intentionally left blank

Additional comments

As Councillor for this ward, I understand and strongly support the residents of Roadgroup R66 in their request for a dedicated parking scheme. The current parking situation is clearly unsustainable, causing significant stress and inconvenience to residents. Implementing a controlled parking zone will prioritise resident access, improve road safety, and enhance the overall quality of life in our community. I will continue to advocate for this scheme to be implemented as swiftly and efficiently as possible.

I am once again frustrated at the painstaking approach to achieving residents parking in city centre wards that need it much like Fishergate. This piecemeal approach and the 50% threshold should have been abolished as a part of my motion to full council last year - I am surprised that this continues to be an impediment. I remain committed to ResPark in R66 and a wider expansion of ResPark to all residents that want it.

Objection

I will not be able to attend the meeting on 13th May, and wish to record my continued strong objection to the proposed scheme. Concerning this, I have not yet received any response to the questions in my email of 18th November last year (pasted below for your reference). I would appreciate some answers and also wish these points to be considered at the meeting on 13th May.

Further to your letter (dated w/c 11 November) and email (14 November) about the proposed R66 Res Park scheme, I would like to reiterate my very strong objection to the scheme as set out in my email of 17 September (pasted below). And I would appreciate responses to the following questions:-

(1) If the proposed scheme is to be imposed upon us, what systems will be put in place to enable residents to purchase permits for visitors and tradespeople?

The scheme seems to require residents to purchase digital permits, with no hard-copy option. I do not have a 'smart' portable device, and mostly only use my desktop computer for basic email as I find it difficult, time-consuming and stressful to do anything else online - I know I am not unique, or even particularly unusual, in this. The proposed scheme would effectively exclude some of us (mostly older) residents from ever having visitors or employing tradespeople to work on our properties. This cannot be right! If the scheme is to be implemented, it is essential that residents are able to buy hard-copy visitor permits (e.g. scratch cards) without having to negotiate any online system.

(2) What evidence do you have that the proposed scheme would make significantly more parking spaces available to residents, our visitors and tradespeople? By 'evidence' I mean numerical data, not just a few people getting annoyed when they see what they think are non-residents parking near their houses. How many parking spaces in the R66 area are typically occupied by vehicles belonging to residents, our visitors, our tradespeople, or 'commuters'? What are these figures for daytime Monday-Friday, overnight, and at weekends? And what are these figures as a % of the total number of parking spaces in the area?

(3) How much revenue is generated by existing residential parking schemes in the city of York? And how much revenue is expected to be generated by the proposed R66 scheme?

Finally, your letter refers to 'congestion' and 'improving road safety'. It should be noted that, while parked vehicles do indeed reduce traffic speed, in a residential area such as Heslington Road/Wellington Street this is in fact highly desirable and helps road safety. Rather than referring to 'congestion', this should be regarded as 'traffic calming' achieved without expensive measures such as speed bumps or chicanes.

Having read through Annex B I note my initial comments in my email to yourself on 25th January 2024 were not included in Annex B, which I believed were to be included based on the email received from Jessica Green on the same date.

Support

I note from the documentation (Decision Report: 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'.) (item 13) there were 72 votes in favour, and 44 against.

It would also appear from the same document that it is a foregone conclusion that the scheme will be rejected, based on the fact that 13 representations were made in Annex A, against 11 in Annex B.

A majority vote of 28 were in favour of the introduction of the scheme.

Democratically the scheme should be implemented. If I don't vote in the local elections but then don't like the outcome I cannot suggest another election.

It would be interesting to know how many of the people objecting to the scheme failed to return the initial questionnaire.

With regards to the objections in Annex A in numerical order. (Highlighted items see summary).

1. A business compounding the issue wanting free parking for Staff and people renting their studio – they also require parking for two vans – they should possibly relocate to a unit with parking, or like most people do when they drive to work park in nearby car parks. The park and ride bus from the designer outlet stops within a 5 min walk of Apollo Street.
2. Belle Vue Street residents are lucky they always find a space – whilst there is a cost (as long as they only have one car not overly excessive).
3. Paragraph 3 highlights the issue – this area is a destination for “free parkers.” The final paragraph indicates in favour once the scheme is passed. Also is on Belle Vue Street and they are lucky as they always find a space.
4. Belle Vue Street residents are lucky they always find a space. The remainder of the statements are incorrect. People do walk into the City Centre / place of work. As for the university a short walk up the hill to Thief Lane and you can get the free bus to the university.

5. **Belle Vue Street** residents are lucky they always find a space. The final sentence indicates in favour once the scheme is passed.
6. **Absolute pointless comment, and incorrect** – I have a car and did not vote against it. This comment should be removed as the statement is incorrect.
7. This sounds like a local resident that rents out numerous (HMO) homes in the area, who also has a business.
8. Judging from the comments I'd guess a Belle Vue Street Resident.
9. Student – short term resident (at best probably only another 2 years until leaves York. The University does not endorse students bringing their cars. **Although the penultimate paragraph is the reason why we need Respark in the area.** Maybe should consider long term residents who pay council tax at £1800.00 per year.
10. **Absolute pointless comment, and incorrect.** The whole Respark scheme does move parking congestion to other areas, however other areas should not be local residents' reasons to object.
We have friends and family who also like to visit, and they can either park behind the Sky Blue restaurant, Q Park or the park and ride at the designer outlet. **Belle Vue Street**
11. Does it matter if the majority of people in the area are students – The University does not endorse students bringing their cars.
12. **Incorrect statement. This comment should be removed as the statement is incorrect. (72 votes in favour, and 44 against).**
13. **Incorrect statement. This comment should be removed as the statement is incorrect. (72 votes in favour, and 44 against).**

I would also like to make the following additional comments for consideration at the meeting on 13th May 2025:

- a. When planning permission is granted on the Barbican Site, and no provision for extra parking spaces is required by the Planning Officers, where will the additional cars park? In the original scheme for the Barbican Site (Application reference 03/0407/GRG4 the 240 flat / apartment residential accommodation was to have 144 spaces in a basement car park. This is no longer in Persimmons application.
- b. To progress the site at the time free & subsidised residents permits were in the proposals.
- c. If ResPark is not implemented where are the construction workers going to park – the same place the construction workers are parking for the Fawcett Street and Blue Bridge Lane developments – Area R66!

To add to item c, I also note from the planning applications for the two construction sites there is limited / no parking spaces included for these flats – where are they going to park as some people will no doubt bring cars – Area R66!

Summary

Out of 13 objections five are from Belle Vue Street (possibly a sixth (item 8)). One comment is a business on Apollo Street. Three statements (ignoring incorrect statements from Belle Vue Street) are also incorrect.

In favour 11 + my statement not included = 12 in favour. (plus how many others of the 72 were not included?).

13 Objections minus 4 incorrect statements = 9 objections.

Travelling from the Victoria Hotel towards Thief Lane – If all streets to the right of Heslington Road were excluded from the proposed R66 area the objections would number 4. (13 minus 6 minus 3 incorrect statements). However, you can also remove two further objections (items 3 and 5) as they are in favour if the proposed R66 area is implemented.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

Option 1 or 2 should not be the recommended option – Option 3 not considered, should be the recommended option.

Option 3 would be to omit the roads to the right as stated above with an option of inclusion to the scheme when the issue they appear not to currently have an issue with moves to these streets due to ResPark in adjacent areas!

Support

I had voted in favour of the scheme in the original consultation and therefore had nothing to add in the subsequent one.

I was however extremely concerned to find out this week about the Persimmon development likely to go ahead by the Barbican, with 240 flats being built astonishingly WITHOUT any parking provisions on site for future residents.

The parking implications for neighbouring streets are only too clear if residents' parking is not implemented. In my view, the proposed development changes the picture quite dramatically, even for those who were originally opposed to the introduction of R66. The fact that other areas around already have residents' parking makes it all the more important that we in Belle Vue Street and surrounding streets should not be the only local area left without any restrictions on parking for outsiders.

I hope that you will give careful consideration to the fact that the information about the Persimmon development, which was not available at the time of the original consultation, changes the overall picture and the way people will view the introduction of the proposed R66 scheme.