

---

**Decision Session Executive Member for Transport and Planning**

**9 June 2016**

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

**Objections received to the advertised Residents Priority parking Scheme to include Aldreth Grove, Cameron Grove, St Clements Grove, Norfolk Street and Bishopthorpe Road (Part)**

**Summary**

1. To consider the formal objections made to the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to implement a residents parking scheme covering Aldreth Grove, Cameron Grove, St Clements Grove, Norfolk Street and Bishopthorpe Road (Part).

**Recommendations**

2. The Executive Member is asked to overturn the objections made and implement the scheme as advertised - to introduce a 24 hour Community Residents Priority Parking area (to be known as R58) to include Aldreth Grove, Cameron Grove, St Clements Grove, Bishopthorpe Road (No's 106 to 154) and Norfolk Street to have two dual zone bay to include R6 and R58.

Reason: This is in line with a well established procedure when dealing with requests for new Residents Parking Schemes. From past experience if one street is left unrestricted, in the middle of a zone, residents generally tolerate the increase of parking within that street for a short time before seeking to become part of a residents parking zone, this is normally due to the increase of parking taking place being the only unrestricted street in an area.

Timescale: The order will be made and operational on street during August/September 2016.

**Background**

3. Following the receipt of a petition from local residents a consultation was undertaken with all residents within the proposed scheme boundary in September 2015, after which the results were

considered by the Acting Director for City and Environmental Services. From the results it was recommended to initiate the legal procedure to formally advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation order to introduce a new Residents Parking Scheme to include Aldreth Grove, Cameron Grove and Bishopthorpe Road (no's 106 to 154), this was drawn in line with the results and did not include all balloted streets.

4. However it was recognised that the result of the ballot was marginal for St Clements Grove and that if a scheme went ahead in the area without St Clements Grove there may then be a request for inclusion at a later date. As such approval was granted to enable us to include St Clements Grove for formal advertising within the proposed new zone if residents demonstrated there was an increased demand for a residents parking scheme within the next year. Before the legal consultation began representations for inclusion were received from residents, some of who indicated they had changed their mind. Rather than wait until a scheme was in place and then have to go through the whole process again it was decided to include St. Clements Grove and Norfolk Street in the formal advertisement at which point any formal objections to the proposal could be considered.
5. The advertisement for the streets to become residents' priority parking was advertised in March 2016. A copy of the formal advertised proposal is included as Annex A. During the advertisement period we received fifteen formal objections to the scheme, of which seven from Norfolk Street whose properties currently reside within the R6 zone boundary. All representations are summarised in Annex B.

## **Consultation**

6. Residents were consulted in September 2015 and asked to return a ballot sheet in order to register their preference. Taking the ballot results for the area as a whole, rather than street by street, the results where as follows:
  - 67 of 100 ballot papers were returned (67%)  
Of those returned:
    - 43 Supported the introduction of a Residents' Priority Parking Scheme (64%).
    - 24 residents did not support the introduction of a Residents' Parking scheme (36%).

- Of the ballots which voted on a preferred time restriction 64% are in favour of a 24hour 7 days a week restriction.
7. It is common procedure to require a 50% return of ballot sheets with the majority of returns in favour of introducing a resident parking scheme before we support a proposal to amend the Traffic Regulation Order to include a scheme.
  8. The order was then advertised in the local press and on street for three weeks. In addition all properties within the proposed scheme and also all properties on Norfolk Street (to advise them of the proposed dual zone bay) were hand delivered details of the proposal and how to submit representation for or against the scheme.
  9. During the advertisement period we received fifteen objections to the scheme. Of the objections; one came from Cameron Grove, one from Bishopthorpe Road, one from Aldreth Grove, four from St Clement's Grove, seven came from Norfolk Street residents who reside within the existing R6 zone and one was an anonymous address. A précis of each representation has been included as Annex B; concerns have been made about having to purchase visitor and builder's permits along with restricting free use of parking for visitors to the park. The main area of objection for objectors in most streets is the issue of having to pay to park in the street. Whilst this concern is understood a commitment has been made previously that the cost of provision and enforcement of this service should come from those getting this service and not fall the general council tax payers. The main concern from Norfolk Street is that these residents did not ask for the proposed changes to be made. It should be noted however that most of Norfolk Street is already in a residents parking zone and the changes proposed are aimed at providing the same level of priority parking to residents at the top of the street and neighbouring streets as most Norfolk Street residents are already benefitting from.

## **Options**

10. The options available are:
  - 1 To overturn the objections and implement the scheme as advertised.
  - 2 To uphold the objections and take no further action to implement a scheme.

- 3 To implement the scheme excluding Norfolk Street (part)
- 4 To implement the scheme excluding St Clement's Grove.

## **Analysis**

11. Option 1 is the recommended action as this follows the procedures currently in place for introducing new resident's priority parking schemes.
12. Option 2 does not adequately meet the expectations of the local residents; as such this is not the recommended option.
13. Option 3 this is not recommended as an area would be left unrestricted in the middle of two zones creating an excluded area for vehicles to aim for as no alternative free parking would be available in the immediate area should the scheme be implemented. Also with this advertised proposal the existing Norfolk Street R6 permit holders would in addition benefit from having extra parking on street rather than being disadvantaged by restricting the use of the new bays exclusively to R58.
14. Option 4 does not acknowledge the extra support received from residents before the advertisement expressing additional support in favour of a scheme. It also does not address the disadvantage residents would have should the scheme be implemented excluding St Clement's Grove only, as this would create an island effect for vehicles and commuters to all seek available parking on the only unrestricted street in the area, thus leaving residents with no alternative near by parking as they would not be in the zone boundary to enable them to park on nearby streets should they need to do so. As such this is not the recommended option.

## **Council Plan**

15. Considering this matter contributes to the Building Stronger Communities strand of the Council Plan by engaging with all members of the local community.

## **Implications**

16. **Financial** There are no financial implications

**Human Resources (HR)** There are no HR implications

**Equalities** There are no Equalities implications

**Legal** There are no Legal implications

**Crime and Disorder** (There are no Crime and Disorder implications)

**Information Technology (IT)** There are no IT implications

**Property** (There are no Property implications)

**Other** There are no other implications

## **Risk Management**

17. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

## **Contact Details**

### **Author:**

**Annemarie Howarth**  
Traffic Technician,  
Traffic Management  
Tel No. 01904 551337

### **Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

**Neil Ferris**  
Director CES

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** April 2016

**Wards Affected:** Micklegate

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

### **Background Papers:**

*Decision Session, Executive Member for Transport:*

Petition – Residents Parking on Aldreth Grove, Micklegate Ward

*Report to the Director of City and Environmental Services:*

Aldreth Grove: Results of the consultation on a Residents' Priority Parking Scheme

### **Annexes**

Annex A – formal advertised proposal

Annex B – précis of representations received

Annex C – Plan of advertised residents parking area

Annex D – Plan showing existing residents parking zones in the surrounding area

# Annex A

**CITY OF YORK COUNCIL**  
**NOTICE OF PROPOSALS**  
**THE YORK PARKING, STOPPING AND WAITING (AMENDMENT) (NO**  
**14/16)**  
**TRAFFIC ORDER 2016**

Notice is hereby given that City of York Council, in exercise of powers under Sections 1, 2, 4, 32, 35, 45, 46, 53 and Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984 ("the Act") and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Schedule 9 of the Act, proposes to make an Order which will have the effect of:

1. *Introducing a Residents' Priority Parking Area for all classes of Residents' Priority Permit Holders to include that length of St Clement's Grove from its junction with Bishopthorpe Road for the remainder of its length, Aldreth Grove from its junction with Bishopthorpe Road for the remainder of its length and Cameron Grove from its junction with Bishopthorpe Road for the remainder of its length the said Area to be identified as Zone R58, that Area to include all properties adjacent to and having direct private access to the said lengths of road with the exception of the properties numbered 1 to 15 Cameron Walker Grove;*
2. *Designating unrestricted lengths of St Clement's Grove, Aldreth Grove and Cameron Grove, York within the proposed Residents' Priority Parking Area at paragraph 1 as Parking Places for use only by Zone R58 'Permit Holders' thereby providing 24 hour unlimited parking for Permit Holders, the said lengths being identifiable by the placement of upright traffic signs at the Area 'entry' and 'exit' points (as opposed to the placement of Residents' Parking signs and road markings adjacent to the kerb).*
3. *Introducing 'Residents' Priority' parking provision in York as follows:*
  - (a) *Bishopthorpe Road, on its east side:*
    - (i) *between the projected southern property boundary line of No. 106 Bishopthorpe Road and a point 2 metres south from the projected southern property boundary line of No. 112 Bishopthorpe Road,*
    - (ii) *between the projected northern property boundary line of No. 114 Bishopthorpe Road and a point 19 metres north from the projected centreline of St Clement's Grove,*
    - (iii) *between a point 14 metres south of the projected centreline of St Clement's Grove and a point 19 metres north from the projected centreline of Aldreth Grove,*
    - (iv) *between a point 9 metres south of the projected centreline of Cameron Grove and a point 31 metres north from the projected centreline of Butcher Terrace,**for use only by Zone R58 'Permit Holders' thereby providing 24 hour unlimited parking for Permit Holders,*
  - (b) *Norfolk Street, York on its:*
    - (i) *north side, between a point 11.5 metres east from the eastern highway boundary line of Bishopthorpe Road and a point 34 metres east of the said line,*
    - (ii) *south side, between a point 13 metres east from the eastern highway boundary line of Bishopthorpe Road and a point 35.5 metres east of the said line,**for use by R6 and R58 'Permit Holders' thereby providing 24 hour unlimited parking for Permit Holders.*

*A copy of the draft Order, Statement of Reasons for making it and relevant maps can be inspected at the Reception, West Offices, Station Rise, York, during normal business hours. Objections or other representations specifying reasons for the objection or representation should be sent to me in writing to arrive no later than 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016.*

**Aldreth Grove, Cameron Grove St Clements Grove, Norfolk Street (part) and Bishopthorpe Road (part) proposed Residents Priority parking objections and comments**

Comment	Officer Response
<b>Cameron Grove</b>	
<p>I do not support the parking scheme and filled in my initial documents to state this. Having living in two other parking scheme areas of York I have found that the residents parking scheme doesn't alleviate the problem, it's not extra people blocking the street, it's people who actually live there</p>	<p>All information originally contained within the consultation documents does clearly state that Residents parking cannot guarantee a space if the existing carriageway lengths already exceed the amount of properties requiring parking on street. It does however give residents priority over non residents.</p>
<b>Bishopthorpe Road</b>	
<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposal as this definitely have a massive negative impact on my newly started Guesthouse business the cost of £400 per permit annually and having 8 guestrooms I would have to pay over £3000 for the permits for guests and more for myself and my partner. This additional extra cost each year would impact the financial viability of the new business and may end up in forcing a closure of Guesthouse.</p>	<p>All permit costs, including business permits, are set by parking services and agreed within the financial review each year.</p>



<b>Aldreth Grove</b>	
<p>I strongly object to having to pay to park outside my own house, when I know I probably won't be able to do so even with the restrictions. I don't believe this is the correct decision for this street, soon it will be impossible to park for free anywhere in York and I don't believe this is beneficial to the York community or its residents as a whole. I don't believe the residents have thought through the full implications of this restriction, is it possible before this is agreed in it's entirety to have maybe a trial for say 3 months I observed last week one side of Aldreth Grove for the duration of the morning had only 2 cars parked!</p>	<p>ResPark scheme gives permit holders priority over non residents. All residents have been given information relating to how respark schemes work along with fees to enable them to make an informed decision. A trial period cannot be implemented, however if residents wished for the scheme to be removed once installed then a petition should be gathered and the same procedure will be followed by consulting residents on removal.</p>

Comment	Officer Response
<b>St Clement's Grove</b>	
<p>Presumably we will have to pay to park in future, I find this totally unacceptable. It will cause problems as visitors to my property will not be able to park, including workmen carrying out work at my property. I was attracted to buy this property as it was unrestricted parking, whether it will affect property values remains to be seen.</p>	<p>Every property was hand delivered letters at every stage, including details of all permit prices at the consultation stage. The responsibility for passing on information to prospective purchasers would be down to the owners during the house sale. Visitor and builders permits can be issued should the scheme be implemented.</p>

<p>I strongly object to having to pay to park outside my own house, when I know I probably won't be able to do so even with the restrictions. I don't believe this is the correct decision for this street, soon it will be impossible to park for free anywhere in York and I don't believe this is beneficial to the York community or its residents as a whole</p>	<p>All information regarding fees is included within the formal consultation to ensure residents are making an informed decision during the ballot; hence a majority vote is required before advertising due to the pros and cons associated with living in a resident's only parking zone.</p>
<p>I voted as requested and was prepared to accept the result; I am not prepared to accept the result being changed because the council thinks it's near enough. I do not believe it is within the councils remit to do this. If so why have a vote. I have democratic right for my vote to count.</p>	<p>The initial consultation carried out (the results are not a binding vote) is used to gain a feel for how much support there is in an area before a formal legal process is entered into. The initial consultation indicated that support for inclusion in a scheme was not the majority wish from the street. However it was recognised that the results of this poll was marginal and that if a scheme went ahead in the area without St. Clements Grove there may then be a request for inclusion at a later date. Before the legal consultation began representations for inclusion were received from residents, some of who indicated they had changed their mind. Rather than wait until a scheme was in place and then have to go through the whole process again it was decided to include St. Clements Grove in the formal consultation at which point formal objections to the proposal could be considered.</p>

Comment	Officer Response
<p>A democratic vote was held and the result was in favour of no respark. This result should stand no matter how close the result was. It is irrelevant that certain members/residents of St Clements Gr disapprove of the result. Have you considered a trial period and issuing visitors/builders permits f.o.c? I pay council tax and do not see why I should pay to park on the street that I live.</p>	<p>See previous response regarding vote on St Clements Grove. In addition a trial period cannot be implemented however if residents wished for the scheme to be removed once installed then a petition should be gathered and the same procedure will be followed by consulting residents on removal. All permit costs are set by parking services and agreed within the financial review each year.</p>
<b>Norfolk Street (existing R6 zone)</b>	
<p>Norfolk St residents did not ask for this change. I see no benefit whatsoever to residents with your proposal. I would also like to see free parking available for an hour rather than 10 minutes to non residents so that they can enjoy the benefits of the nearby park.</p>	<p>Most of Norfolk Street is already included within R6; the current unrestricted area on Norfolk Street has been advertised to become joint use bays to accommodate six vehicles for R6 and the new R58 zone, should this be implemented. Increasing the time for non residents was not included within this order.</p>
<p>Do not agree that your proposal is in Norfolk Street residents' best interest and I object to the Council implementing it. Norfolk St residents did not ask for this change we see no benefit to our street's residents arising from your proposal. In particular, why are you proposing creating a joint residents' parking Zone between R6 and R58? This would only restrict available spaces for Norfolk St residents.</p>	<p>Existing Norfolk Street residents parking bays are remaining the same it is only the unrestricted area that would become joint use bays for R6 and R58 - approximate space for six vehicles.</p>

<p>I do not agree your proposal is in our best interest and object to the Council implementing it. Did Norfolk St residents ask for this change? There is no issue in Norfolk St. Why are you proposing creating a joint residents parking Zone between R6 and R58? This would only restrict available spaces for Norfolk St residents</p>	<p>Permission was granted at an earlier decision session to consult on a wider area after a petition from Aldreth Grove was received for respark, this included the unrestricted part of Norfolk Street. The existing Norfolk Street residents parking bays are remaining the same whereas the unrestricted area would become joint bays for R6 and R58 use.</p>
--	--

Comment	Officer Response
<p>We strongly believe that upper Norfolk Street should be restricted to R06. the current proposal will actually restrict R06 residents even more than at present. For example when we are required to move our vehicles for, say, gutter cleaning, or if there is no space in the current R06 zone. We will have to go much further afield to find any unrestricted parking for our vehicles. As to the top of Norfolk Street, that is already available to us and being required to share it with R58 seems unlikely to alleviate competition for spaces in this zone.</p>	<p>The proposal would give R6 permit holders a greater chance of parking on Norfolk Street as oppose to it currently being unrestricted and anyone can legally park there. R6 permit holders are entitled to also park on Richardson Street, Bewlay Street, Charlton Street, Anne street and Fenwick Street should they need to find alternative parking spaces.</p>
<p>We are writing to object as we do not agree your proposal is in our best interest and object to the Council implementing it. Norfolk St residents did not ask for this change. Why are you proposing creating a joint residents parking Zone between R6 and R58? This would only restrict available spaces for Norfolk St residents.</p>	<p>Existing bays on Norfolk Street are remaining the same it is only the unrestricted area that would become joint bays for R6 and R58 use, approximate space for six vehicles. R6 permit holders are entitled to also park on Richardson Street, Bewlay Street, Charlton Street, Anne street and Fenwick Street should they need to find alternative parking spaces.</p>

	Continued
We feel it would be detrimental to us to have visitors and visiting tradesmen being forced to use a daily parking ticket which we would then have to provide at an additional cost.	Visitors permit should already be used as the property is within an existing ResPark zone. There is a 2 hour limited waiting parking bay within a 2minute walking distance to Norfolk Street which could be utilised by visitors.
The current parking arrangements are just about manageable with residents who have more than one car. Our proposal would be for the top of the street to be respark for Norfolk St only. At the moment it is clear the area is used by non residents parking and going to work in the city centre	If the top of the street is made a joint respark bay for R6 and R58 users, as advertised, this would eliminate non residents parking and give R6 permit holders a greater chance of parking at the top of the street when required.

Comment	Officer Response
<b>Anon</b>	
I wish to object to the discrimination of the whole of the proposed area as zone 58. St Clements Grove, Aldreth Grove and Cameron Grove have been identified as being a "closed area" which only requires entrance and exit signs, to display "permit holders only". This is how you have previously dealt with Nunthorpe Drive, zone R54. Bishopthorpe Road does not fall into this category and should therefore be treated as the rest of the road that is already permit parking zone R36.	If implemented the whole area would be known as R58, however the side streets would be enforced on entry signage only and the unrestricted areas on Bishopthorpe Road would be marked as bays and signs. All existing double yellow lines would remain the same. As with all new requests for Residents Parking they are dealt with by way of one zone.