

**Representations against the advertised restrictions**

I write in response to proposed new parking restrictions on the slip way, Water Lane, Clifton - as per the notice attached in the local area.

I would like to put forward an objection to the proposed changes on the following basis.

1. The current arrangements offer important access to the riverside paths - on both sides of the river - which is a well-used and a particularly important local amenity. I understand the principle of people accessing this route via, for example, the #2 Park and Ride bus service, but this cannot apply for dog walkers. I park at this site around 6am most mornings throughout the year, as during the autumn and winter it is one of the only routes with suitable lighting for dog walks at that time.
2. I've also used this area to park to access local services at Clifton Green. Although Clifton Green has parking, this is often full and the slip way provides a good alternative to support these local services.

I wonder if there is a sensible compromise position here, in which restrictions are put in place similar to those at Clifton Green - i.e. parking allowed for a period of, say, two hours. This would enable continued access to the local amenities, whilst protecting local residents from 'long stay' parkers.

The riverside is a really important space for lots of residents. I am sympathetic to those on Government House Road concerned about parking outside their properties, but likewise feel this needs to be set against the benefits to the wider local community of maintaining access to the slip way.

Please accept and read these representations Re Government House Road and the adjacent slipway.

1. I fully support the complete closure log the dangerous slip way but I am asking you to not proceed any further with the proposed 24 hour ban on GHR.
2. There is no evidence of any problem at all on this quiet cul-de-sac. The report and some residents appear from a number of years ago been intent on ensuring once they had the road adopted and paid for by us, that no one could benefit from parking whilst spending an hour or two by the river.
3. I also note no other road that has benefited from so much officer time all aimed at ensuring ordinary people cannot enjoy the river.
4. In fact where else has the council made a ResPark zone purely on imagined anticipated usage. Where else has any form of respark been agreed, only in anticipation there may be a problem? This is the only entirely F banded cul de sac in the city, is seems with this administration, and officers that money really does talk.
5. May I ask you to defer any decision on GHR for at least 6 months after the slip way is closed, to see if there is a problem. It is usually deserted, with home owners

parking in the alleged 'too narrow' street at the top. Surely double yellow lines extended past the first two homes works fix that problem.

6. If there was to be proven any commuter parking, then having a no parking sign say between 11-12, would address that.

7. The residents wanted this road adopting at considerable expense to us, it is the only place where people can park to take their dogs and kids to play and enjoy the river amenity. Why would you limit this in the anticipation of a problem, when all the other non FBand streets have to wait at the back of the queue with dreadful parking issues? The aim of the authority is to encourage active travel

8. There are some legal issues which I believe mean that the process has been unlawfully u

a) the extent of the TRO was changed without a consultation with neighbours as it should have been.

b) the notice itself is so complex, being city wide proposed amendments, so difficult, designed to avoid people reading it and understanding it.

c) the notice re GHR & the slipway does not say how many days a week this Respark is there for, as it is an unused suburban road used for the odd active travel user by the river, then it could be assumed, that weekends would be available. I mean why would this Labour council want to actively discourage river enjoyment in favour of FBand nimbys who don't want anyone parking on their street.

d) the notice is in error, legally, as the traffic island has not been adopted.

I do not believe my comments as part of the neighbour's consultation in the email below were ever considered by the Executive Member when making the decision to advertise parking restrictions on Government House Road. This was a failure of an important part of the process.

I submit these comments again for consideration at this stage, as a formal objection to the making of this order. I do not believe it is proper for the Local Transport Plan to be misinterpreted, which is aimed at external visitors, to stop recreational users from within York accessing the esplanade and Clifton Ings. In addition I do not understand how restricting parking on Government House Road will deal with any claimed narrow width outside number 1 when residents themselves continue to park there. The parking restrictions will not change that, only a complete ban on parking in that area will.

'We still do not know why an application for parking restrictions on Government House Road was made in September 2020 as none of those comments have been shared and no reason given in this report. The current reasoning is that restricting parking on the Water End slip road would cause a displacement of commuters to Government House Road. This was only after a resident had complained, in 2023, about commuter parking on the Water End slip road.

The representations made by residents that have been shared, and the public speaker in support of the 24 hour ban at the last decision session, were clear that their primary concern were commuters, not recreational users.

The entrance to Government House Road, outside number 1, is the narrowest part of the road, something raised by a public speaker on behalf of 8 residents at the last decision session. Residents of Government House Road regularly park outside number 1, narrowing the road width. I do not see what difference it makes to the available road width if it's one car by resident permit, or four cars. The 24 hour blanket ban will still allow residents to park outside number 1 and to narrow the road width. The sensible remedy, if this narrow road width is considered a problem, would be double yellow lines to stop all parking in this area. There is also the possibility of at least some public parking on Government House Road, which would not impact the residents at all, and keep the riverside open to recreational users.

Paragraphs 14 and 36 of the report relies on the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to restrict parking on Water End, and by extension Government House Road. The LTP is not aimed at recreational users from York, and it feels unjust that recreational users of Government House Road will lose their access to the riverside due to commuters on Water End slip road. The Park & Ride sites are aimed at external traffic to York, not internal traffic, which is what the recreational users are most likely to be.

In response to the options for Executive decision, option 2 was refused at the last decision session. Option 3 has not been put to the residents since the change in proposal for Water End slip road. This option does not appear to have had any proper consideration, which could involve finding a balance which would benefit the residents and the recreational users of York'.

I am writing to formally oppose the introduction of a 24-hour parking restriction on Government House Road, seven days a week. This proposal lacks sufficient evidence to justify such a sweeping ban, which was initially discussed to support community access to the nearby riverside recreational area. Imposing a 24-hour restriction directly contradicts the council's stated objective of enhancing public access to shared spaces. Furthermore, this decision appears inconsistent with the council's earlier recommendation, which supported limited parking on the more hazardous slipway while ignoring the safer and more practical option of 1-hour parking on Government House Road itself.

The rationale for this sudden shift remains unclear, and it raises concerns that the council is prioritising its own agenda over the best interests of York's ratepayers. Rather than fostering accessibility, this proposal seems to undermine it, creating unnecessary inconvenience and limiting public use of the recently adopted area—land that was petitioned for adoption by the landowners at no cost, but which they now seek to restrict from public access.

Additionally, it appears that the parking restriction is being used as a smokescreen to address an issue with the road's adoption, raised by the primary petitioner of the road adoption and the subsequent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The petitioner had confirmed that the road was not wide enough to support parking—an issue that should have been resolved before the road's adoption in 2021, especially as the TRO petition was originally submitted in 2020. The City of York Council was duty-bound by legislation to ensure that the road met its standards before adoption, yet this issue was seemingly overlooked. The fact that the council is now recommending a sweeping 24-hour ban, rather than considering any form of public

parking, further suggests an attempt to cover up an issue that should have been dealt with during the 2021 adoption of Government House Road. This unusual focus on the road, alongside a range of other factors that indicate the council's prioritisation of this quiet cul-de-sac, is truly perplexing.

Finally, I would also like to highlight that the map the council is using to justify the parking restriction is flawed. The central island is private property, not part of the adopted area, and legally cannot be included in the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). For reference, please see the adoption map provided by the City of York Council during a judicial review. I can further assure you that there are additional legal flaws in this parking restriction recommendation. I urge the council to reconsider this decision in the interest of fairness and legal competence.