
Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	16 December 2025
Present	Councillor Ravilius, Executive Member
Officers in Attendance	Garry Taylor – Director of City Development Annemarie Howarth – Transport Projects Officer Darren Hobson – Principal Engineer Traffic Manager

29. Apologies for Absence (10:01am)

There were no apologies.

30. Declarations of Interest (10:01am)

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 respect of business on the agenda, if she had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. None were declared.

31. Minutes (10:01am)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session held on Tuesday, 18 November 2025 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

32. Public Participation (10:01am)

It was reported that there had been 7 registrations to speak at the session under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

One registered speaker was unable to attend and one unregistered speaker was permitted to speak at the Executive Member's discretion.

Chris Walton spoke on item 5, as a resident of the area in support of the ResPark scheme, citing people from outside the area and students from St Peters school parking unfairly in the residential area. People parked to

work or shop in town; residents from nearby areas parked additional vehicles in this area to avoid paying fees in their own area.

Eric Graham spoke on item 5 as a resident of the area in opposition to the ResPark scheme, feeling it was no longer necessary. He noted that St Peters had started a bus scheme from various parts of the city which people did not know about when they were consulted. He had not seen a St Peters student in his street since June. He felt that this was a money-making exercise on the part of the council, as the amount of money paid by residents would generate the council a lot of money. Mr Graham was concerned about only having seven days of the decision session. He also expressed concern that the literature distributed by the council discriminated against those who were not computer literate.

Andrew Squires spoke on item 5 as a resident of the area discussing parking in his street by inexperienced sixth form students taking up space intended for residents, and damage had been caused to vehicles by cars accessing this awkward cul-de-sac.

Ciara Cecil spoke on item 5, supporting of the proposed scheme as a resident of the area. She discussed her concern that outside parking had led to no spaces for residents. As a parent she needed to park close to her house but often could not. There was also no parking for visiting workmen and overcrowding has led to residences being blocked.

Cherry Potter spoke on item 6, as a resident/owner of an HMO business who lived and ran a business housing people in the same building. She opposed the revocation of the Multiple Occupancy Permits since both her home and her business would be affected.

Andrew Mortimer spoke about general items in the remit of the Executive Member – resurfacing of Hull Road, the quality of which had been highlighted by the recent resurfacing of Tadcaster Road to a high quality. He also discussed 20mph zone for Windmill Lane and Millfield Lane.

The Executive Member addressed these points, acknowledging that ward councillors and residents had also highlighted the poor condition of these roads and she recognised this specific case. £10m was being put in to roads per annum and while it was not possible to bring all roads up to standard on this budget, Hull Road was definitely on the radar for next year.

Andy D'Agorne spoke on behalf of York Green Party, commenting on the council's transport policy. He suggested that bus services remained in a poor state and improvements for buses had been scrapped in favour of

funding the railway station frontage. He noted that York was still at the lowest rating of capability score. He also asked whether traffic marshals might be placed on Picadilly when the Castle car park closes, and warned that the £1m jubilee terrace/riverside path funds were depreciating.

The Executive Member addressed these comments, stressing that the council was on its way to delivering both a bus improvement plan and park and ride improvements. Rougier route consultations were underway and many of these issues stemmed from having a popular city that many people wished to visit, and bus prioritisation needed to be balanced.

She acknowledged that it had been disappointing for York to receive a capability score of 1, but this was in large part due to being unable to complete schemes such as the station frontage.

She advised that the Riverside path project was underway – although the collapse of the current riverside path needed to be managed as this progressed.

33. Residents parking extension to 'R65 Clifton Dale' (10:33am)

This report was presented by the Traffic Projects Officer, assisted by the Director of City Development, discussing the advertised extension to the area R65. She noted that during the informal consultation, the majority of residents had supported the proposed scheme. The scheme had been advertised within the zone and during the statutory consultation there had been five responses against and six in favour, and officers had recommended the scheme for implementation.

The Executive Member acknowledged the contributions of speakers and the responses to the consultation. She also acknowledged points raised regarding blue badges and other concessions.

She noted the concerns raised by one of the speakers that while the majority supported the scheme, people who didn't respond may have felt differently, stating that if people didn't respond the council could not make assumptions and she could only make decisions based on the views of the people who responded.

She also confirmed that standard practice had been followed here, in that seven days' notice is given of decisions to be made, with additional notice on the council's forward plan.

The Executive Member addressed the point raised about the St Peter's school bus service meaning there was no longer an issue with student parking, stating that this was not the only issue, and that there were further contributing factors. Additionally, the council had no control over whether or not St Peter's would continue to provide this service in the future.

She advised that the council did everything it could to avoid residents being digitally excluded, and paper permits are available in addition to online applications.

She also responded to a resident who had contacted her online, concerned about the fact they used hire cars and would not have a consistent registration for ResPark purposes. She confirmed with officers that residents would be able to change the registration on their parking permit.

The Executive Member asked officers about parking on Grove View and whether this would change; officers advised that this would remain as is.

The Executive Member concluded that on balance she was comfortable that the points in objection could all be mitigated; that points raised about parking getting worse were not solely on account of St Peter's student parking, but also the hospital, visitors, shoppers and businesses. She believed that ResPark would make the streets safer for families and aligned with the council's transport strategy, and she thereby

Resolved: To progress the advertised extended R65 resident's priority parking scheme and limited waiting bay on Compton Street to implementation by amending the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Order 2014.

Reason: This supports the CYC transport strategy and commitment to reduce traffic congestion by discouraging driving into the city centre.

Making this location into a ResPark area removes the ability for commuters to park whilst the limited waiting bay on Compton Street ensures that local businesses are not adversely affected maintaining short stay parking for customers.

This will also increase parking accessibility for local residents.

34. Review of Statutory Consultation for the removal House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) Parking Permits (10:43am)

This report was presented by the Principal Engineer Traffic Manager, who outlined the proposed scheme. He acknowledged the unique position of the speaker whose residence was also a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) business. He suggested that this resident would need to separate the household part from the HMO business (effectively creating two separate properties within the same building). He also acknowledged another resident who had contributed to the consultation, opposing the scheme on the grounds of cost, but whose comments had not been included in the original report document, noting that these had been published in supplement 2.

The Executive Member said this scheme had been designed to align council policy with national guidelines concerning HMOs. She acknowledged all concerns received via the consultation and in public participation, also acknowledging feedback received from the Guildhall ward councillor. The proposed permits would actually be issued at a residential rate for the first issued per residence, so would potentially work out cheaper for many households. ResPark holders can park anywhere within the whole ResPark area.

The Executive Member agreed that the situation of the speaker who lived in the building from which she operated an HMO business was unique when compared to other residents positions – and that in fact hers was the only such situation in York. She proposed a discussion with the speaker outside of the session to attempt to achieve an equitable solution.

Addressing further concerns expressed over the proposed scheme, the Executive Member confirmed with the Principal Engineer Traffic Manager that the current system of registration needed to be updated to allow more than one separate registration per household, and the scheme would not be put in place until assurances had been given that this was in place.

The Principal Engineer Traffic Manager added that the new arrangements proposed that each resident in an HMO would be able to apply for their own visitors permit rather than being restricted to one for the whole communal household, which would hopefully be more accessible for residents who needed additional permits.

The Executive Member therefore

Resolved: To approve an amendment of the York Parking Stopping and Waiting Order 2014 to remove the Multiple Occupancy Permit

and Discounted Multiple Occupancy Permit from the available permits within the residents parking scheme.

This will remove the permits from available permits, with all residents currently utilising the permit being moved to a household permit.

This will require a change to the online permit system, to allow for all households permit holders to apply for visitor permits, to ensure all residents of HMO's are able to have visitors not just the first permit holder.

The amendment to the Order will not be able to be made until the systems have been upgraded to allow more access to visitor permits.

Reason: The removal of the permit reduces the impact on the Residents Parking scheme from the increase in the properties that are Houses in Multiple Occupancy; if the Residents Parking scheme were to become oversubscribed it makes the scheme ineffective, as there would be too many vehicles for the available spaces.

Cllr K Ravilious, Executive Member

[The meeting started at 10.01 am and finished at 10.53 am].