

<b>Meeting:</b>	Decision Session for Executive Member for Transport
<b>Meeting date:</b>	22 April 2025
<b>Report of:</b>	Director of Environment, Transport and Planning
<b>Portfolio of:</b>	Cllr Ravilious, Executive Member for Transport

## **Decision Report: Review of Statutory Consultation for Parking bays on Tadcaster Road**

### **Subject of Report**

1. The report reviews the representations received from residents in response to the statutory consultation for a proposed amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The proposed amendment to the TRO was to introduce limited time parking bays on both sides of Tadcaster Road and remove a section of loading bay on the north west side of Tadcaster Road, between its junctions with Royal Chase and Slingsby Grove.
2. The parking situation within the bays has been an issue for the businesses in the area for a number of years, recent changes to the road lay out along Tadcaster Road, led to businesses requesting a review of the restrictions.

### **Benefits and Challenges**

3. The benefit of the recommended option is that it will provide a greater availability of parking for users of the businesses within the vicinity by removing the loading bay and the long-term parking that has been occurring. This will create a better availability of parking due to the higher turnover of use of the bays, which will help to remove the short-term parking on Slingsby Grove near its junction with Tadcaster Road, which is currently occurring.
4. The challenge of the recommended option is it may see more vehicles parking in nearby residential streets, if they need to park for longer than the approved limit of the bays.

## Policy Basis for Decision

5. The recommended option within this report will comply with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) objective of “*the transfer of inward commuting and visitor trips to the Park & Ride service, combined with restricting the availability of city centre parking, will remain a key strategy for reducing trips in the urban area*”. Including reducing vehicle miles and creating high quality public realm for residents.

## Financial Strategy Implications

6. Funds allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the advertised restrictions for the parking bay to implementation. The ongoing enforcement of the additional parking provision will need to be resourced from the parking department's budget.

## Recommendation and Reasons

7. Option 1 – Implement as advertised by amending the Traffic Regulation Order to remove the Loading Bay in the parking bay on the north west side and change the duration of parking on the bays on Tadcaster Road between Royal Chase and Slingsby Grove so the restrictions on the use of the bays are as follows:
  - North west side of Tadcaster Road - 1-hour limit Monday-Saturday 9am-5pm
  - South east side of Tadcaster Road - 3-hour limit Monday-Saturday 9am-5pm

Reason: The proposed change to the parking amenity on Tadcaster Road will help to remove the long term parking and create a higher turnover of vehicles within the bay, which will help provide a better level of parking amenity for the clientele of the businesses along that stretch of Tadcaster Road. The proposal did receive some objections due to the impact on the neighbouring streets, but as stated by some representations received, there is already an occurrence of short-term parking that is occurring on the streets.

## Background

8. The highway works to Tadcaster Road, required changes to the road layout and introduction of 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions, in the vicinity of the parking bays. As part of the statutory consultation that was undertaken for the amendment to the TRO, the highway authority received representations which questioned why the proposals did not affect the parking bays and why no consideration was given to an amendment to the bays.
9. The residents/businesses provided representation requesting that the bays be reviewed, with several requests for the area of loading bays to be removed to offer greater parking amenity in the area. The representation received offered a number of differing viewpoints on how the bays should be used. The representations received were included within the report to the Executive Member for Economy and Transport at the decision session on 14 November 2023. The report recommended further consultation was undertaken with the resident/businesses to better understand the preferences on the use of the bays.
10. The consultation asked for the views of the residents and businesses on the duration of available stay within the bays and if the loading bay should remain in place or not. The consultation was undertaken between 26 January and 16 February 2024.
11. The consultation responses were presented in a report to the Executive Member for Transport on the 19 July 2024. The results showed that the residents/businesses felt that the loading bay was no longer required, with the bays better utilised as a parking bay.
12. The Executive Member approved the recommended option within the report to:

Advertise a proposal to amend the Traffic Regulation Order to remove the Loading Bay in the parking bay on the north west side and change the duration of parking on the bays on Tadcaster Road between Royal Chase and Slingsby Grove so the restrictions on the use of the bays are as follows:

- North west side of Tadcaster Road - 1-hour limit Monday-Saturday 9am-5pm
- South east side of Tadcaster Road - 3-hour limit Monday-Saturday 9am-5pm

This is the recommended option, as it allows for the views of the residents and businesses to be taken into consideration to help provide a more suitable parking arrangement in the vicinity for the residents and businesses.

13. The initial consultation letter in January 2024, was only sent to the properties on Tadcaster Road, which led to some complaints from the neighbouring streets. The residents of the neighbouring streets requested to be consulted in future as any restrictions on the bays, is likely to see additional levels of parking on those streets. It was therefore agreed that the Statutory consultation for the proposal would include a larger area and the neighbouring streets would be notified.

## **Consultation Analysis**

14. The initial consultation for the review of the parking bays on Tadcaster Road only went to the properties on Tadcaster Road. This provided the basis for the proposal to the Executive Member for Transport for approval to undertake the Statutory Consultation. At the decision session, when the proposal was discussed a local Ward Cllr made representation on behalf of residents of the neighbouring streets to be included in any future consultation and it was agreed to include the residents of the neighbouring streets within any future consultation on the bays.
15. The statutory consultation for the proposed amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order was undertaken on the 13 September 2024. A letter (Annex A) was sent to residents and businesses 64-94 Tadcaster Road, and all properties on Kensington Court, Regency Mews, Royal Chase and Slingsby Grove. The consultation documents were also shared with Ward Cllrs and the required statutory consultees.
16. There were 9 responses to the statutory consultation from resident and businesses of the local area. 5 of the representations received were from residents of Slingsby Grove, who raised objections to the proposed limited time parking due to the impact it may have on parking levels on their street. The residents reported that they are already experiencing issue with inconsiderate parking occurring, which is blocking driveways and creating issue of visibility at the junction of Tadcaster Road.

17. The visibility issues at the junction have been occurring for vehicles exiting Slingsby Grove trying to turn right on to Tadcaster Road, due to large vehicles parking in the loading bay area. The removal of the loading bay will not remove this issue as the area will become a 1-hour parking bay, so the area will still have vehicles parked in the bay near the junction on a regular basis. One representation requested that the loading bay remains in place, with better enforcement of the restriction, with the hope that the area would not be used as often to help improve visibility.
18. Residents of Royal Chase and Slingsby Grove did raise concerns about the potential for an increase in parking on those streets for anyone who needs to access the premises for longer than the bays allow. There are concerns that driveway will be obstructed by parking on the streets affecting residents access, with one resident requesting white H bar marking across the drives to provide an improved visibility of the locations of the driveways.
19. The residents of Slingsby Grove also raised concerns about vehicles parking on the double yellow lines near the junction of Tadcaster Road to access the shops. This has been reported to the Council Civil Enforcement Officers, so they are aware of the reported obstructive parking that is occurring. A request has also been made to the highway maintenance team for a review on is the lines require a refreshment of the lines.
20. One resident of Tadcaster Road submitted a representation in objection to the proposal, as they currently park their vehicle in the unrestricted parking bay south east side of the road. The removal of the availability of parking will require them to park in an alternative location and they were concerned about the impact this would have on the residents of the neighbouring streets.
21. The consultation only received one representation from a business on Tadcaster Road, who raised concerns about the reduction in parking following the recent highway works on Tadcaster Road. This has reduced the availability of parking for the local community and users of the different businesses. The representation also raised concerns about staff parking, as their business has 5 members of staff and the proposal for time restriction on the parking bays will remove the availability of all day parking from the bays. This may affect the staff, who will have to find alternative parking for the working days, or use a different form of transport.

22. There were three representations received from residents of the local area that vehicles parking in the bays on the shop side of Tadcaster Road was obstructing visibility of the bus stop, which was leading to buses not stopping at the stop. This has been reported to the Sustainable Transport team, who have passed the information on to the service providers which use the stop to avoid any further issues with the stop.
23. The representations received focused on the impact of the proposal on the parking levels on the neighbouring streets. This is a problem that is already occurring as the residents are already reporting an issue on the neighbouring streets, as one of the parking areas is unlimited parking, which is reducing the availability within the bays and increasing the pressure on the neighbouring streets. The proposed change to make both bays limited time parking will remove the all-day parking and increase the turnover in the bays, which will help to remove the short-term impact on the neighbouring streets.
24. The issue raised by the business about the lack of parking available for staff is not something that the highway authority would consider in making a recommendation. As noted in the policy section an objective of the LTP is the transfer of commuting trips to the Park & Ride service, the removal of unrestricted parking will help to encourage this move to the Park & Ride Service for commuters.

## **Options Analysis and Evidential Basis**

25. Option 1 – Implement as advertised by amending the Traffic Regulation Order to remove the Loading Bay in the parking bay on the north west side and change the duration of parking on the bays on Tadcaster Road between Royal Chase and Slingsby Grove so the restrictions on the use of the bays are as follows:
  - North west side of Tadcaster Road - 1-hour limit Monday-Saturday 9am-5pm
  - South east side of Tadcaster Road - 3-hour limit Monday-Saturday 9am-5pm

(recommended)

The proposal did receive some objections due to the impact on the neighbouring streets, but as stated by some representations received, there is already an occurrence of short-term parking that is occurring on the streets. The proposed change to the parking amenity on Tadcaster Road will help to remove the long term parking and create a higher turnover of vehicles within the bay, which will help provide a better level of parking amenity for the clientele of the businesses along that stretch of Tadcaster Road.

26. Option 2 – Remove the loading bay (not recommended)  
In the initial consultation of the area all the businesses that responded were in agreement that the loading bay was not required and did not offer a benefit to the local amenity. The statutory consultation received one response which request the retention of the loading bay but only if there was proper enforcement of the loading bay, which would require constant enforcement of the area. The removal of the loading bay allows for a greater allowance of parking in the area of the shops and the area would become a limited time parking bay of 1 hour, which would be sufficient time for loading activities to occur at the nearby businesses when required. This is not recommended as it does not solve the issue with the bays that were initially raised by the businesses.
27. Option 3 – Take no further action (not recommended)  
This is not recommended as the issues raised by the business in the original request will not be met.

## Organisational Impact and Implications

28. This report has the following implications.
- **Financial**, Funds allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the advertised restrictions for the parking bay to implementation. The ongoing enforcement of the additional parking provision will need to be resourced from the parking department's budget.
  - **Human Resources (HR)**, If the proposed recommendation is approved and the restrictions do come into effect then enforcement of the traffic restrictions would fall to the Councils Civil Enforcement Officers, this would not constitute an extra demand on their workload, as they are already enforcing the restriction.

- **Legal**, The proposals require an amendment to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014. The provisions of sections 1 and 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 apply, along with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996.
- **Procurement**, The additional required signage will be procured in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and where applicable, the Public Contract Regulations 2015. The Commercial Procurement team will need to be consulted should any purchasing for additional signage take place.
- **Health and Wellbeing**, There are no Health and Wellbeing implications.
- **Environment and Climate action** There are no Environment and Climate Action implications.
- **Affordability**, There are no affordability implications.
- **Equalities and Human Rights**, The Council recognises its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions). The impact of the recommendation on protected characteristics has been considered as follows:
  - Age – Neutral;
  - Disability – Positive, as blue badge holders would be able to park longer than the restricted time on the north west side of the road;
  - Gender – Neutral;
  - Gender reassignment – Neutral;
  - Marriage and civil partnership– Neutral;
  - Pregnancy and maternity - Neutral;
  - Race – Neutral;
  - Religion and belief – Neutral;
  - Sexual orientation – Neutral;
  - Other socio-economic groups including :
    - Carer - Neutral;
    - Low income groups – Neutral;



- Veterans, Armed Forces Community– Neutral
- **Data Protection and Privacy**, , the responses received to the statutory consultation by residents and businesses does not contain any personable information.
- **Communications**, there are no communications implications.
- **Economy**, there are no economy implications.

## Risks and Mitigations

29. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there is an acceptable level of risk associated with the recommended option.

## Wards Impacted

30. Dringhouses & Woodthorpe Ward

## Contact details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

### Author

<b>Name:</b>	James Gilchrist
<b>Job Title:</b>	Director of Transport, Environment and Planning
<b>Service Area:</b>	Transport, Environment and Planning
<b>Telephone:</b>	01904 552547
<b>Report approved:</b>	Yes
<b>Date:</b>	09/04/2025

### Co-author

<b>Name:</b>	Darren Hobson
<b>Job Title:</b>	Traffic Management Team Leader
<b>Service Area:</b>	Transport, Environment & Planning
<b>Telephone:</b>	01904 551367
<b>Report approved:</b>	Yes
<b>Date:</b>	09/04/2025

## **Background papers**

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s171082/Tadcaster%20Road%20TRO%20Consultation%20Report.pdf>

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s177509/Tadcaster%20Road%20Parking%20Bays%20Report%20v.1.pdf>

## **Annexes**

- Annex A: Residents Letter – Tadcaster Road Cllr
- Annex B: Residents Representations