

Annex 7 - 1st and 2nd informal consultation for Nunmill Street / Bishopthorpe Road: Residents' comments

Nunmill Street / Bishopthorpe Road (68 properties)

1st Informal Consultation

2nd Informal Consultation

Log No.	Yes = 18	No = 10	Comments	Yes = 15	No = 7	Comments
1		1	The alleyways in this area are a quick way of getting around. They are part of the history of this area. It is difficult storing rubbish now so this would make it messy on the main street. These are public rights of way and should not be blocked. This would be an expensive exercise. It would be better to spend money on the bad roads. Hence we don't agree.		1	These open ways are part of the charm of this area. Easy access to and from the different areas. Also rubbish collected from the front would look dreadful. It is bad enough along the road for recycling. These rights of way are the history of our area. Gating everywhere would make it like a prison. I'm sure in the end will do what you want as usual.
23 & 18	1		Our back gate is currently outside the gating area although 50% of our back wall is within. We need to renew our back gate and deal with an issue with the wall. We believe that it will be better to relocate our gate to within the gating area. As a result it will mean the alley gate will go across the door wilst open. I am prepared to accept this. Before gating starts it is important myself and the council agree the exact gating location. I would prefer waste to be collected at the front in Bishopthorpe Road. Also, see email dated 26th June - met on site on 11th July to discuss.	1		
29	1		I spoke to Emily Tones today about vehicular access and, based on our conversation, am pleased to support the proposed gating. Thank you.	1		(Received 27 March 2014)
24		1	I have enclosed the copy of the proposed gate locations. The areas that I have highlighted I feel gates would be totally inappropriate for this community. The walkways/thoroughfares between streets are important as safe passageways as we constantly walk with children (with bikes and scooters and pushchairs) to and from friends houses as well as park and schools. They are also frequently used by cars and cyclists. If the residents of Scott St, Russell St, Thorpe St would like the alleyway behind their properties gated, that's fine but I consider the walkways/alleys road to road to be an important accessway. The alley behind my property..... is a busy and well used lane. Many properties have vehicles and garages but I am a small business and need access. My shopping is considerable, builders, staff, window cleaners and sometimes guests need to use my gate. Where is the security when so many people would need to know the access code?? I simply cannot carry the volume of shopping up the alley by hand, I must be able to drive up the lane. The other issue is the waste, it simply isn't practical for some residents to carry the waste to the top or bottom of the alley, block the lane and I can't imagine the properties at the bottom of the alley are gonna be too pleased with 50/60 black bags by their doors.		1	
13	1		On balance I agree with this. The back alley allows access to anyone. We've been burgled (2009) via back alley as have our next-door neighbours more recently.			
14	1		The gate at the end of Nunmill Street / Bishopthorpe Road next to the Methodist Church would be fine. However, the gate at the bottom end is being proposed to be around the corner (back of 12/14 Nunmill Street). This proposal is not such a good suggestion because being concealed from the main street will make it less secure (a burglar can climb it away from the glare of passing pedestrians). I realise that there was historical opposition to the gate from the "Stables" project building, however I now understand this is being converted to flats. Please can you look into this and see if it's possible to have a gate "on-view" like all the other gates. If it's not possible, we are still in favour of the gates because some gates will be better than none.	1		We have strong feelings in favour of the gates being installed and for the change in refuse as we do not wish to be the only alley unsecured in this area. We also feel that it is a shame that from the council letter accompanying this survey that vehicular access appears to have more significance than the number of residents in favour of the gates. This is particularly strange as access for pedestrians and cyclists was an issue for some residents on the other streets in the scheme yet this has not stopped those streets moving to formal consultation. We also do not understand why residents outside of the proposed gating area are allowed to vote on this issue - the votes of the residents at 45, 47, 49 and 51 Bishopthorpe Road should not be included in the totals. (Previous information stated out of 68 properties when only 47 properties are involved in the proposal).
19	1		(See email dated 26th June. Support gating as long as vehicle access is not impeded.)			
15	1		We are happy for the gates to be put in place ONLY providing that we can still drive around the back of our house for access. The "corners" at each end are very difficult to negotiate and so any structure may impede this access further.			
35				1		

2		1	We are opposed to the proposal to alleygate our lane. We consider it to be unnecessary expense at a time when budgets are tight.		1	My wife and I are <u>strongly opposed</u> to the proposal to "alleygate" the lane between Nunmill St and Bishopthorpe Road for the following reasons:- We require daily <u>vehicular access</u> to our garage at the rear of our property (two or more times a day). Most of the properties on Bishopthorpe Road are set back from the road with <u>many steps</u> - level access is <u>only available via the rear</u> for the disabled/infirm/young families with pushchairs - why make this access route more difficult! <u>Disabled people in cars</u> will be particularly disadvantaged. Waste of public money: No evidence has been presented to justify the expense (and no information regarding cost provided). <u>Why is this necessary?</u> What will it achieve? <u>Will it save money?</u> Waste and refuse bags:-these would need to be taken through the house to the front of the property <u>down many steps</u> then onto a footpath that is a principle route into the city centre for many residents. This makes no sense when there is a <u>perfectly functional rear lane</u> offering better access and less congestion/mess! The lane has been open for over 100 years - we are told crime rates are dropping - spend money elsewhere!
3		1	I'm not in favour of alleygating the back lane and do not like the idea of the alternative suggestion regarding the refuse collection i.e. Black sacks left out at the front of our properties or a central collection point. This could be a problem with people over filling their black sacks and rubbish spilling out on to the street. Nobody will be responsible for clearing the mess up, at least if the mess is outside their back gates they are aware of it and 9 out of 10 will be responsible people and clear it up....		1	
25		1	We do not agree with the gating order for the following reasons: - 1. the gates will prevent vehicular access to garages & parking spaces at the rear of our property & to our neighbours. This would put pressure on the already acute lack of parking spaces on Nunmill St & Bishopthorpe Rd. (our side of Bishopthorpe Rd has double yellow lines). We use our car all the time which is parked in the garage at the rear/accessible only via the alley. On the plans, the gates are positioned very close to the bends. This would not allow space to turn the corner in our opinion. They would need to be set back at least 1 car-length from each corner. 2. the imposition of wheelie bins would also block access (vehicular) at each end of the alley where they would be parked before collection. The alley has a very steep slope and is not gritted during bad weather, therefore pushing a wheelie bin to the collection points as well as retrieving it afterwards, could be difficult even for able-bodied people like ourselves. There are several elderly residents living on our street and Nunmill. Further note: We would ONLY be infavour of allygates (we like the principle) IF the gates were set much further back from each corner bend AND if the black bag collections remained (no wheelie bins).		1	We objected to the original proposal but we are now in favour for the following reasons: 1) Continuation of black bin bags. 2) Moving the position of the alleygates to allow vehicular access at both ends of the alley. We are glad the council has listened to residents' feedback and we now hope the alleygates will be put in place in the new revised positions away from the apex of each corner.
33					1	Having recently moved to this house I was not part of the original consultation. Having the alleygates is a benefit BUT, to my mind, it is outweighed by the possibility that householders would increase the amount of rubbish stored at the front of their houses. Some houses already have rather untidy collections of recycling materials at the front.
26	1		We are in agreement to the alleyway being gated providing vehicular access will remain.			
27	?	?	We have mixed views about this proposal, and have therefore not voted for or against the scheme. However, we would like to make the following comments: 1. The gates should not make it more difficult to get a vehicle round the corners in the alley, which is already awkward. 2. There should be space outside the gated area to stop a vehicle off the road while opening or closing the gates. 3. We would prefer refuse collected from the front of the properties on Bishopthorpe Rd (as with the existing recycling collections), rather than from outside the gated area at the back. Leaving rubbish outside the gates will mean a long walk for some residents, and will block either the pavement, the alley or the road.			
16	1		Our property was burgled in 2011. Following the burglary myself and [my neighbour] spoke to local residents and submitted a petition showing strong support for the alley gates. I have copies if required.		1	Please note, we are one of the 5 properties that have parking behind our property and are <u>fully</u> in favour for the alley gates. We believe they will reduce crime in the area as we were burgled via the rear of the property.

17	1	<p>Early in 2012, myself and my neighbour presented at several council meetings the alleygating proposal for Bishopthorpe Rd / Nunmill Street. We had petitioned all of the impacted households and the vast majority were in favour of the proposal. We are extremely pleased that the proposal is being tabled again, and I would be happy to actively support it in any way that I can. Please let me know if you would like a copy of the petition mentioned above.</p>	1	<p>I would like to make it clear that there are only a handful of residents who use their garages to store a vehicle in. There are only about 5 residents therefore who need to drive along the alleyway (and therefore leave their car to open and close the gates). I don't agree that this is a significant number to be used as a reason to not go ahead with the proposal, particularly as the vast majority of these car-using residents are <u>in favour</u> of the proposal. I don't understand why the decision was made not to have central refuse collection points as used by other streets. Please could you provide more information on this reasoning? As you may be aware, myself and my neighbour canvassed opinion on this subject and feeling was overwhelmingly strong <u>towards</u> the alleygate proposal. We still have a copy of this petition as does Sandy Fraser.</p>
31			1	
28	1	<p>The lane between Bishopthorpe Road and Nunmill St is very different to the nearby alleyways which you are also proposing to gate. Unlike the other proposals, it is not simply an "alleyway" that may be used by the occasional pedestrian. Instead, it is a lane or drive specifically designed to provide vehicular access to the garages and homes of a considerable number of local Bishopthorpe Road residents. As such it plays a key role in our daily lives and is used by many of us several times a day. Given the cumulative impact gating would have on the quality and, indeed, scope, of the access we currently have to our homes, I regret that we must object to this element of the total package</p> <p>1. Any proposal that reduces the width of car that can use the lane or increases the risk of damage to the car negotiating the reduced width is an unacceptable constraint on current access and on the maximum width of car that we or future freeholders can own. (The alternative is an increase in insecure, on-street parking, increasing the risk of theft, vandalism etc and much worse access.)</p> <p>A number of us have invested considerable sums to improve access with automatic doors on our garages so that we do not have to waste time and suffer the inconvenience of getting out of the car. This isn't simple laziness – as some of us get older and frailer, getting in and out of a car is an increasingly fraught and difficult procedure to be reduced to the absolute minimum! If the proposal is for a simple gate to be provided as elsewhere, then it re-introduces these access difficulties. As we understand it, the process of taking a car through the gate would be (in all weathers):- 1. Get out of car. 2. Walk to gate. 3. Enter code. 4. Open gate. 5. Walk back to and get back into car. 6. Drive through gate. 7. Get out of car and walk between the car and the wall in order to get back to gate. 8. Close gate. 9. Walk back to car, again between the wall and the car. 10. Drive on.</p> <p>Apart from the obvious time and inconvenience caused, we'd suggest that, given the space available, every opening of the car door and each getting in and out of the car may be difficult and perhaps even impossible especially for people with restricted mobility / larger frames / larger cars / less precise driving(!). This issue also applies, of course, in stages 7 and 9 when it will be necessary to squeeze between car and wall. In short, because this is not a typical "alleyway" we fear that the practicalities have not yet been fully thought through.</p> <p>2. Far from deterring vandalism etc, the proposal introduces additional risks to people and property. In trying to negotiate the above process, people will inevitably leave the engine running and the car unlocked, probably with the door as open as it can be. While the car is on the "public" side of the gate and unoccupied it will be particularly vulnerable to being stolen, particularly given the "blind" nature of the exits onto Nunmill Street. However, this risk exists on both sides of the gate as does the possibility of both planned and opportunistic raids on cars' contents. With the exception of some minor graffiti, we perceive the level of criminality associated with the back lane nowadays to be very low, not least thanks to the CCTV on Southlands Chapel. If any does occur it is, naturally, when there is no-one around. By contrast, the proposal creates the potential for crime precisely when a member of the public (the driver) is nearby, putting them at risk of assault particularly if they try to intervene or resist.</p>	1	<p>The lane between Bishopthorpe Road and Nunmill St is very different to the nearby alleyways which you are also proposing to gate. Unlike the other proposals, it is not simply an "alleyway" that may be used by the occasional pedestrian. Instead, it is a lane or drive specifically designed to provide vehicular access to the garages and homes of a considerable number of local Bishopthorpe Road residents. As such it plays a key role in our daily lives and is used by many of us several times a day. Given the cumulative impact gating would have on the quality and, indeed, scope, of the access we currently have to our homes, I regret that we must object to this element of the total package. 1. Vehicular access: Any proposal that reduces the width of car that can use the lane or increases the risk of damage to the car negotiating the reduced width is an unacceptable constraint on current access and on the maximum width of car that we or future freeholders can own. (The alternative is an increase in insecure, on-street parking, increasing the risk of theft, vandalism etc and much worse access.)</p> <p>A number of us have invested considerable sums to improve access with automatic doors on our garages so that we do not have to waste time and suffer the inconvenience of getting out of the car. This isn't simple laziness – as some of us get older and frailer, getting in and out of a car is an increasingly fraught and difficult procedure to be reduced to the absolute minimum! If the proposal is for a simple gate to be provided as elsewhere, then it re-introduces these access difficulties. As we understand it, the process of taking a car through the gate would be (in all weathers):- 1. Get out of car. 2. Walk to gate. 3. Enter code. 4. Open gate. 5. Walk back to and get back into car. 6. Drive through gate. 7. Get out of car and walk between the car and the wall in order to get back to gate. 8. Close gate. 9. Walk back to car, again between the wall and the car. 10. Drive on.</p> <p>Apart from the obvious time and inconvenience caused, we'd suggest that, given the space available, every opening of the car door and each getting in and out of the car may be difficult and perhaps even impossible especially for people with restricted mobility / larger frames / larger cars / less precise driving(!). This issue also applies, of course, in stages 7 and 9 when it will be necessary to squeeze between car and wall.</p> <p>In short, because this is not a typical "alleyway" we fear that the practicalities have not yet been fully thought through. Further, we believe that the particular impact on the ease of access for the mobility-impaired is likely to fall foul of what we believe is a statutory duty to protect and, indeed, where possible, to enhance access to premises etc. for both existing and future users with impaired mobility. 2. Far from deterring vandalism etc, the proposal introduces additional risks to people and property. In trying to negotiate the above process, people will inevitably leave the engine running and the car unlocked, probably with the door as open as it can be. While the car is on the "public" side of the gate and unoccupied it will be particularly vulnerable to being stolen, particularly given the "blind" nature of the exits onto Nunmill Street. However, this risk exists on both sides of the gate as does the possibility of both planned and opportunistic raids on cars' contents. With the exception of some minor graffiti, we perceive the level of criminality associated with the back lane nowadays to be very low, not least thanks to the CCTV on Southlands Chapel. If any does occur it is, naturally, when there is no-one around. By contrast, the proposal creates the potential for crime</p>

			<p>For what it's worth, the above process will take so long that the gate will actually be open quite long enough for someone of criminal intent to get through it.</p> <p>In the meantime, if there is a vandalism etc problem, then we would suggest that, following the precedent set by Southlands Chapel, more CCTV and some suitable "Smile you're on TV"-type signs are provided. We suspect that this may be not very different in cost to gating and may, indeed, be considerably cheaper.3. Among the reasons why our refuse is collected from the back lane rather than from the front is that, when it was proposed to change, CYC concluded that negotiating the steep steps at the front represented an unacceptable Health and Safety risk to (trained) refuse collectors. It naturally followed that it was an equally unacceptable risk for (untrained) residents to be carrying the stuff down the steps. The present arrangement also has the value of avoiding having to carry the rubbish through the house itself.</p> <p>It follows that rubbish would still have to be collected from the rear, but, if refuse collectors can't come into the lane (though we don't understand why they couldn't), where would we have to take the rubbish before they arrived? It can't be left within the lane itself as that would prevent residents driving their cars in and out.</p> <p>We believe that, if nothing-else, this consultation is deficient without the practical detail and its implications on this issue.</p>				<p>precisely when a member of the public (the driver) is nearby, putting them at risk of assault particularly if they try to intervene or resist. Further, the process to get through the gate will take so long that the gate will actually be open quite long enough for someone of criminal intent to get through it. In the meantime, if there is a vandalism etc problem, then we would suggest that, following the precedent set by Southlands Chapel, more CCTV and some suitable "Smile you're on TV"-type signs are provided. We suspect that this may be not very different in cost to gating and may, indeed, be considerably cheaper. 3. Refuse collection.</p> <p>We note the consultation statement that collection would move from the rear to the front of our homes in Bishopthorpe Road. However, among the reasons why our refuse is collected from the back lane rather than from the front is that, when it was proposed to change, CYC concluded that negotiating the steep steps at the front represented an unacceptable Health and Safety risk to (trained) refuse collectors. It naturally followed that it was an equally unacceptable risk for (untrained) residents to be carrying the stuff down the steps and as a result the collection remained at the rear. The current proposal should therefore be rejected on the same health and safety grounds alone, though it may also be noted that the disproportionate impact this would have on the mobility-impaired again falls foul of the need to maintain and enhance their quality of access. We therefore believe that, given all the above and on the balance of advantage and disadvantage to local residents (the disadvantage, to some, being potentially very considerable), the specific proposal to gate the way between Bishopthorpe Road and Nunmill Street should be rejected. It is a very particular case and rejecting its gating need not invalidate gating other back-lanes in the area. Finally, we welcome CYC's recognition in the consultation letter that "strong support from residents is essential for a gating scheme to be successful".</p>
20	1		<p>1. The proposed gate is directly at the back of my property. I would not want the gate to have any negative effect on my walls, eg the gate fixings would not be attached to my wall. 2. I am concerned about household waste - I would definitely NOT want the collection point to be at the side of my property - 12 Nunmill Street. THIS WOULD CAUSE MY STRONG OPPOSITION TO THE ALLEYWAY BEING GATED. As well as the obvious smell, unsightliness of lots of waste bags it would cause increased noise at collection time. Also, the access to my yard is from this side alley. If refuse collection is from the front of properties I would agree to the alleyway being gated. This would be more fair I think.</p>				
21		1	<p>Don't want to carry rubbish through the house - that's why the back gates were designed like that. No proof that they will reduce an (already very low) crime rate. Would prefer to see the money spent in ways more beneficial to the local community.</p>				
4	1						
30		1	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed alleygating. I believe it will change the feel of living here. On a practical level it means difficulty for bicycle & car users, bringing rubbish to a collection point could prove difficult for some. I use the alley almost daily. It means I check it & let neighbours know if I see things that need attention. i have spoken with my landlord who also does not agree with the proposal.</p>				
5	1		<p>I think it is a very good idea</p>				
32					1		

6	1			1	I <u>strongly</u> agree with the gating proposals as in the recent past I have been a victim of burglary where access was gained to my property via the back alleyway. Having gates installed to minimise access to the alley would certainly detur thieves & help to lower crime rates.
7	1		Absolutely brilliant. Hope most agree to the scheme.	1	Absolutely! If all the remaining alleys are gated, any problems will automatically end up in the alley Nunmill St / Bish. Road! <u>NOT</u> many houses on Bish. Rd use the alley as vehicular access. Hope our insurance will <u>NOT</u> rise due to vulnerability. I understand most people will <u>not</u> want to take refuse to the front - but we do it for recycling - what's the difference?
8	1		I'm all in favour of the gates, but I don't like the refuse collecting scheme. If the Council are still going to be able to use the lane, why can't they collect the rubbish as usual? After all I have seen it done for 45 years. It doesn't take a man long to throw the bags in a large wheelie bin to take up or down the lane to be picked up. It takes him 2 trips down and 2 trips up and takes a matter of 5 minutes. This is my only objection, as for the gates it's a brilliant idea. If I were you I would send out a voting slip to each resident and ask them to tick whether they want rubbish pick up or gates. It has to be one or the other this will give you the answer. Unless collections can carry on with the gates being put up. (The facts I've given you are correct as I've watched and timed the collection process.)	1	I have been in this house 45 years and agree this is the BEST thing that could happen. As lots of people use our back lane for whatever reason. So please get it done. Thank you.
34				1	
9	1		I'm very pleased about this proposal. We occassionally suffer "spikes" in burglaries in this area so this should help reduce the risk in future. Thank you.	1	
10		1		1	On numerous occasions, youths have congregated in the Nunmill/Bishopthorpe alleyway. They gather at the rear of 50-52 Nunmill St where they can hide from view. This is often late at night and drink (alcohol) is certainly involved. There have been acts of vandalism (graffiti). As a property owner with a young family I do feel vulnerable from the rear of our property. The introduction of gates would certainly act as a deterrent. The argument that gates will be left open is very weak. If they can get out of their car to open the gate then they should be able to close it. I am assuming that they get their cars out of their own garages! I agree that gates would give security. I want the gates, however do not want people leaving lots of rubbish bags at the front of their houses - think rented houses may do this more. Would rather bin bags to be stored in sheds at the back then having to carry them to the front at the agreed times for collection. I am for this proposal however I would not want the big green & black bins to be provided as this would totally spoil the look of these streets as some may leave them at the front.
22		1	Do not wish to be enclosed at either end of Nunmill Street. Furthermore, perplexed by reasons for gating the street as there have been no recent issues around anti-social behaviour. If indeed behaviour such as above re-occurs then the issue of PERPETRATORS should be addressed and NOT the victims freedom to be free in their own homes!! If burglars/thieves are desperate enough to enter a premises, they will do so regardless of gates!!		
11	1			1	We believe that either all the alleyways should be gated or none. The original survey we believed set out these two options. Subsequently the outcome was to gate most alleyways but not Nunmill Street. If this happens, with only Nunmill Street left ungated, then it is likely to leave Nunmill Street a target for break-ins. We do not understand the observation that those with garages will not have access because "of the difficulty some may have getting in and out of their vehicles". This does not seem to be a reasonable objection.
12 - same address, different people / votes	1				

						1	I think it best to have the back lane ungated due to the reasons put forward regarding freer residents access to what is quite a well used route to the rear of our properties. I remain in general pro alley gates. Having recently moved here from East Mount Road (South Side) where gating helped to reduce anti-social use. I have also discussed the Nunmill/Bishopthorpe situation with Sandy Fraser who put me in the picture with the council's decision. Other than having twenty-four hour manned look-out posts with guard dogs floodlights etc. (somewhat expensive) we residents can only hope not to be too troubled by miss-use of back lane. With thanks.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--