

Annex A

Representations received

Representations in objection

- *We spoke on the phone a few weeks ago about a permitting system that York City Council are considering implementing on the Dringehouses estate. During this call, I informed you of Yorkshire Housings' concerns about the permitting system. Our main concerns are for our tenants, most of whom are lower income households. The permitting system will have financial ramifications on the lowest income households in our communities and risk tenant wellbeing by deterring friends, family and visitors from being able to visit their loved ones. Staff at Yorkshire Housing also use the road-sides to park and visit our tenants for activities such as:*
 - *Gas and electric maintenance*
 - *Repairs*
 - *Managing anti-social behaviour in the area*
 - *Visibility and place plans in the community*

Therefore not only does the permitting system impact our tenants in a negative way, it also impacts our ability to do our jobs and keep our communities safe. As mentioned, we are concerned that the permtting system has little to no impact on the wealthy constituents but a much larger, consequential impact on the lower income households. Should there be any further solutions to address the parking issue in the area, we would welcome you to explore them such as:

 - *The use of road markings in the main problem areas.*
 - *Issuing tenants affected by this with free permits*
 - *Consulting with the wider community to encourage them to offer solutions to the issue.*

We appreciate your consideration of the above issues
- *This is a totally unnecessary scheme borne out of some households having too many vehicles and being unwilling to walk more than a few metres between their car and front door. The cost to residents is completely out of proportion to satisfy the views of a few residents. The lack of response to the initial survey indicates most people simply do not want this and therefore going ahead would be totally against the views of the residents. The lack of respect among residents towards students parking legally on public roads is also highly embarrassing, and preventing them from using the roads as they are entitled to should not be a justification for this scheme to proceed. I hope that sense prevails and this scheme can be scrapped.*

- *I am objecting on the basis that when I purchased my flat as a result of a Parking Permit Scheme being introduced it was made clear that you could park on the public highway outside the car park boundary. This included the rest of the estate which you are now trying to change. I have parked my car throughout the day on the estate and there has never been an issue with residents not being able to park nor being a nuisance to home owners? I understand that students from the college are parking on the estate? But apart from one student parking their bicycle I haven't seen any evidence of this?*

If parking is a issue perhaps it is because people who live on the estate have more than one car? By introducing permits would only encourage people who are home owners to have more than one car as their ability to park would be far easier. At the moment they have to take pot luck if a car parking space is vacant. As we are all trying to reduce our carbon footprint, this can only be a risk if you introduce a permit system.

The system works well at the moment, and I don't see the need to change it.

Furthermore, the time period 10.00 am to 3 pm Monday to Friday makes no sense, people are mainly at work during this period and the people who will be directly affected by this change will be people who are either not working, retired, elderly people or mums (female) who need to access car parking quickly and therefore this could be seen as being indirect discrimination against these people.

- *I object to the proposal. If you need me to include my reasons please let me know.(not received but objection noted)*
- *The scheme that has been proposed is based on complaints relating to parking by students attending York College.*

The scheme proposes to operate between 10am-3pm Mon-Fri. This suggests that the scheme upholds the views of a limited (minority) of the residents, who have been campaigning for the introduction of this scheme.

This is discriminatory against the students, who need to access parking to enable them to attend college.

The incidents that residents complain about are not restricted to parking. This suggests that the parking restrictions are directed at students for reasons other than the demand for parking.

The situation was monitored and assessed prior to lockdown and there has been an easing of weekday parking and greater demand for weekend parking and parking from contractors. The

scheme will not affect the demand for free leisure and contractor parking as the hours are directed at students.

To conclude, I submit that the scheme is discriminatory, unnecessary and out of date.

I sincerely hope that the council will reverse their decision.

- *I have only lived on the estate since June this year. I was surprised to get the recent communication concerning the proposal as I have not had any issues with parking. After talking to people I understand this is because of student parking. I wanted to find out for myself whether there was a problem that I've not noticed. So since receiving the communication I have done a number of walks round the entirety of the estate noting where vehicles were parked on the road (or quite often half on the pavement)*

This is summarised in the following table:

	Sun 11:30am	3:30p m	6pm	8am	5p m	1pm	1pm	Sat 6pm	Sat 1:30pm	Sat 8am
Principal Rise	25	28	29	21	20	40	26	35	30	24
Academy Drive	8	11	6	6		6	8	12	5	17
College Court	17	22	19	18		19	11	20	9	12
Teachers Close	3	1	2	4		1	5	10	5	3
Bursary Court	1	2	1	1		0	2	1	1	2
Total	54	64	57	50		66	52	78	50	58

As will be obvious to anyone on the estate, most cars, parked on the road, are on Principal Rise, College Court and Academy Drive.

The highest and third highest totals occurred outside the proposed restricted hours. The actual variation for day / time of day is not huge.

The second highest, which included 40 parked on Principal Rise with several trade vehicles included, was a Monday.

The section of Principle Rise from the entrance to the estate through to the T - junction has enough parking for 12/13 vehicles and it is unusual for there to be fewer than 8 vehicles (this did not

occur on any of my visits). This parking significantly reduces the speed of vehicles along this section which is good - arguably the estate should have a 20 mph speed limit and the parking along the three key roads certainly acts to reduce speeds. In fact, it is probably more effective than 20 mph speed limits which are hardly ever actually imposed.

College Court 'feels' the most congested but my observations are that most cars belong to residents. I suspect that during the day the section at the top of Academy Drive adjacent to the play area also contains students' cars. Even so, there is still room for parking on Academy Drive.

The entrance to the estate is squeezed by the (currently) allowed parking on both sides of the road - personally I would like the double-yellow lines to be extended here although doing this would probably increase vehicle speeds.

Comment Related to the Consultation Results provided by the Council

I have not seen the original consultation document as it predated my arrival on the estate, but the structure and numbers suggest that there was no requirement for there to be one response per household. This means that if there were only one response per household then only $111/359 = 31\%$ of properties were in favour of a scheme. If there were two or more respondents from some properties then, of course, this percentage decreases. Given that there does not appear to be a parking problem on Bursary Court (see my table, many houses there have quite large drives) I'm surprised that the Council Consultation shows such a large number of Bursary Court responses in favour - perhaps their objection is based on having to drive slowly along Principal Rise when entering / exiting the estate.

Summary

I don't think the proposal will reduce the parking 'problem' significantly. If residents can live with the parking in the early morning / evening which they cause and won't go away with the proposed system then it seems perverse to penalise a few students parking on the public road during the day. It sort of feels that some people want the roads to be 'private' and more upmarket. If implemented the proposal will just move any students to other nearby roads.

For the record we don't park on the road but visitors need to do so. We used to live in Osbaldwick so do have experience of UoY student parking.

If the scheme is implemented I will probably buy a permit (perhaps that is what the Council wants - cash cow) and park one vehicle on the road permanently so a visitor can park on the drive and I don't have to use the online system to book a visitor in and risk making a mistake which results in them getting a £70 or £50 fine. This will not improve the parking situation! The lack of a physical /visual permit for residents / visitors is a very negative aspect of the recent change to an online system.

- *I moved out of York centre for many reasons but one of them was a residents scheme. I have 2 cars and my wife and I are both teachers and our schools are not possible to get to by public transport.*

I have one driveway space but I cannot put another one because of a tree in front of the house. The lack of consideration during holidays not term time for people is not fair.

Furthermore, I don't feel it is fair for the people in the flats who are in similar situations to us. I not the responses and see that in bursary court where the large houses are with double driveways and more are voting for the scheme. I was the one against!

I would rather give my drive to a student during the drive than have this. How about working together rather than against each other.

- *Whilst I appreciate the efforts of my fellow residents in relation to this scheme and can understand why some people might have strong feelings in favour of the scheme, I don't feel the proposal is fair outcome for everyone on the estate and in my opinion this is reflected in the results of the consultation, you kindly provided. Whilst across the entire estate 71% were in favour on the scheme. I'd like to make the following points regard the results:*
 1. *The total response of 156 was from a possible representation of 359 and therefore the total returned representation was just 43%.*
 2. *Those streets which were especially in favour of the scheme (70% or more for in favour) made up 67% of the returned representation, but only 52% of the overall possible representation. This in my view suggests a particular localised bias of opinion, that should be considered.*
 3. *29% of those who responded clearly have an objection to the scheme which I'd argue suggests the issues for which the*

scheme is designed to address, can't be seen in general opinion to be causing significant inconvenience to residents overall.

4. The street with the highest percentage returned representation were actually against the scheme.

It would seem to me, that the introduction of the scheme would result, in the residents of the estate are being charged for what are some sporadic occurrences of bad parking through the day of 'non-residents'.

I feel the charges for the permit are unjust to give me, as a resident of the estate, the freedom to park on the road, and those adjoining, where we live, for 5 hours of the day, for 5 days a week.

We are a two-car household, but only have off road parking for one car. It would be very rare that both cars are at the property between the hours of 10am and 3pm (the hours the permit would cover), yet I'd have to buy two permits for the freedom to park on the estate roads through the week at any time, ie, not be limited for parking between the hours of 10am and 3pm.

This would be a significant additional cost, especially given this would be at most 10 days or so a year for our household, when the restrictions would apply. It also adds additional cost to have guests, who have the need to park between those hours.

I am all for democracy and as I stated earlier, I appreciate the efforts of those on the estate who have worked hard to ensure this scheme is given proper and fair consideration. For me, the results just aren't strong enough to give a clear-cut final conclusion. Had the returned representation been higher and those for the scheme been better distributed throughout the estate, I'd have backed the majority decision, despite my personal opinion and objections.

- *Clearly I am in the minority as I object strongly to the possibility of being charged to park outside of my own house. If the charges were nominal and simply covered the cost of administering the scheme I would be more likely to agree. I assume that the most expense is associated with the installation of signage?*

As there is little to no policing of current parking restrictions, perhaps you can let us know what to expect once the scheme is up and running?

Can you also tell me if the section of road across my driveway access would be included in the scheme?

I think the whole concept of residents parking is flawed. the real problem is that you as the local authority failed to provide for sufficient parking when approving the planning consent for both

the flats on the Revival estate and for the new college. If this had been better thought through, you would not be asking us now to pay to resolve a problem of your making!

I am very disappointed with York City Council, this shows where there is a lack of professional planning on your behalf.

- *I am not sure what the reasons are for introducing a Residents' Priority Parking Scheme as my guess is that most properties on the estate have at least one parking space on their property or in a designated car park.*

The proposal for a scheme that restricts parking between 10 am and 3pm suggests to me that the purpose is to stop people parking during the school/college day, and whilst I have observed some young people parking here during the day, my observation is that most of the cars parked on the road (or more commonly on the road/pavement) are there beyond those hours and are more likely to belong to a household that does not have enough space on their property.

Most of the cars that are parked on the estate roads are there outside college hours and a 10-3 permit system would not resolve the problem, and would just make life more difficult for residents.

In particular there would be difficulties for residents when tradesmen are working in their house - it is not clear how this would work, as the CYC website states that Visitor Permits "can only be used by the permit holder, or a friend or family member visiting the property where the permit is registered."

A move to digital permits may also cause difficulties for some residents who do not have ready access to the internet and to buy visitors permit (and this issue is not particular to Revival of course).

I would suggest that the bigger parking issues are that cars park too close to the junctions, and also on the footpath, making it difficult for pedestrians, particularly those pushing pushchairs or in wheelchairs. I would propose that to improve safety the double yellow lines are extended at each the junctions, going further round the corners, particularly around the 'dog leg' in Principal Rise around nos 9, 33, 54 and 20 and also along the full length of the first section of Principal Rise after the Tadcaster Road junction.

- *I am objecting towards the parking permits as I regularly have family come over to help me with my 1 year old daughter & the cost of me paying for 2 permits is disgusting. I have a vehicle and have to park it far away from my front door which is*

ridiculous & hard work carrying everything, inc. my daughter from the car to my door - and to pay for such an inconvenience is just disgusting and quite insulting.

- *I do not feel that this warranted or fair that we have to pay for a permit to park outside our own property.*

The residents completed a ballot and it was clear that this was not wanted by the majority however on the back of a handful of residents they disputed this. I do not see how this is correct or justified.

A lot of people are going through a tough time at the moment and the concerns of additional costs when we are all still trying to make a living is worrying.

Whilst the permits will only be Mon to Fri 10 to 3 the cost of the permit is still for a 24/7 cost.

- *We personally have experienced no issues with parking in our area of the development and while we are sympathetic to some residents we don't see the need for permits in the area.*

It worries me in general that so many of our roads are becoming permitted in general in the country as it sends quite the message about our ability as a society to share and all use what used to be public space. I have also seen no recent examples of dangerous parking that could prevent emergency vehicles accessing homes, and otherwise poor parking (such as blocking pavements) is simply a fact of life.

Following a particularly difficult two years economically and rising bills we are already struggling to accommodate the new normal financially and adding permits to outgoings further exacerbates that. I also see it as unfair that some households who simply can't afford permits will have to get one to have visitors on top of existing costs for living here such as Greenbelt and council tax, again on the rise.

- *Whilst I am in favour of the need for residents priority parking, I do not agree that the best way to do this is to charge residents for the privilege.*

Council tax and an annual estate fee to live on the estate are already high. The parking issue is not something the residents should have to be responsible for, particularly as the main issue is students from the college.

If permits are now digital it seems there must be a way for residents to digitally register vehicles to their property to advise that we pay to live here and as such do not face parking charges. Yes there does need to be non resident parking systems in place but not at the expense of residents.

- *I live in the Masters Mews flats, and do not have an allocated parking space. I wish to object to the proposal to introduce Resident's Priority Parking on the Revival Estate. My reasons are as follows:*

As I don't have an allocated parking space I always have to park on the council maintained roads, unless I am lucky to find a vacant visitors' bay. I come and go at various times of the day and have never failed to find somewhere to park on the Estate. The proposals seem to be designed to stop college students from parking on the estate. I think this is wrong as some students live in the outlying villages and public transport is not always a viable option for them. Also, many of the residents who live in the houses with a single drive but have two cars, one of which is parked on the road, have gone to work when the students arrive, freeing up spaces for them.

Any difficulty in finding a space only exists at the Tadcaster Road end of the estate. It is not an issue affecting the whole of the estate.

The need to purchase a residents' parking permit would be unnecessary expense at a time when other costs faced by owners of the flats are rising eg. Ground rent, service charges, electricity and no doubt council tax.

- *I am a resident on the Revival estate in Dringhouses and have 4 children still at home. We have lived here since August 2013, although we have a small issue regarding the college students using the estate to park whilst attending college this is very minimal and only affects the estate in term time (34 weeks a year) and not every day is the same. I object to having a residents parking scheme on the estate due to there being no option to offer a term time permit only yearly and this would create a further £949.10 outgoing for us as a family due to having 3 cars at the moment with my son now becoming of age to drive this could lead to 4 cars at the address. The downside on the estate is that the larger homes like ours 5 bed have only a single drive with smaller homes having a double. Not only am I objecting due to the high cost and not needing for the whole year, I am a Tenant with Yorkshire housing along with many other residents, we are on low incomes, and some not working at all due to ill health or other reasons. There are also Tees Valley homes managed by York City Council on the estate and I am not sure the associations have been contacted regarding this and how it will affect their tenants. People are already struggling due to the pandemic and high rises in the costs of living (fuel etc) this is going to make vulnerable*

families struggle further and don't think it is fair that they should be pushed from their homes due to not being able to afford to park their vehicles or have friends and families call due to not being able to cover the extra costs of visitors.

- We objected to this scheme based on several concerns which are found in Annex F-residents comments. We were very disappointed with the lazy cut and paste response from the council that did not address our concerns. The council response was:*

'This request for a residents priority parking scheme is driven by the local residents and permit prices are set at full council committee within a budget report on an annual basis'.

An analysis of the figures shown in the 'Revival Estate Consultation Results' clearly shows that anyone with a basic understanding of numeracy and democracy can obtain that is 'not' a scheme driven by the majority residents of the Revival Estate, but a scheme driven only by a small minority of residents. The council sought the opinion of 359 residents on the Revival Estate, only 156 residents returned (43%). Of this number, 111 residents supported the scheme and 45 residents did not. This shows that only 31% of residents support the resident parking scheme on the original number of 359, so I reiterate, this is not a scheme driven by the residents of the Revival Estates, only a small minority. The lack of responses from residents on the initial consultation clearly shows that this is not a priority need of the residents on the Revival Estate.

The Executive Member for Transport and Planning, Councillor Andy D'Agorne's decision to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a Residents' Priority Parking Area for the Revival Estate to operate Mon- Fri 10am to 3pm, ignores the outcomes of the original consultation and wishes of the majority of the residents on the estate, and is based on the support of only 31% of residents. I strongly object to this amendment as it is not a priority for the estate. This amendment shows a lack of democracy and is flawed.

I am a resident on one of the most affected roads in the proposed resident parking scheme area, 'Principal Rise'. Yes there is a small number of students who park on the street, but this is only during the day and in term time when the vast majority of residents are at work and do not need the parking spaces on the road. There are always parking places free on the road, so it is disingenuous to suggest the issue and problem is due to York College students.

The real issue with parking comes from the poor planning permission granted by York City Council to allow the construction of apartments on entry to the Revival Estate without sufficient parking spaces. On an evening residents of the apartments use the parking spaces available on Principal Rise. I do not begrudge these residents using the spaces on Principal Rise as they need a place to park. Many of these residents are hardworking people who should not have to spend hard earned money on a Residents Parking Scheme driven by a minority of residents who have a garage and a driveway. There are always spaces available for residents to park on Revival Estate during the day and on an evening and I object to Councillor Andy D'Agorne's decision to advertise an amendment to the proposed Residents Parking Scheme. This scheme is not needed.

Residents also chose to live on the Revival Estate on the outskirts of York to avoid resident parking fees and permits. These fees/permits are yet another financial burdens to hard working people during uncertain times and with the rise in the cost of living. York has become an expensive city to live in, local people are pushed out and struggle to get on the housing market and don't need to be financially punished anymore by the council.

I also strongly object to the installation of more unnecessary 'street furniture', road signs displaying information on the proposed resident parking scheme on the entry to Principal Rise. These signs will be an eyesore and could cause an accident on the entry/exit road on the corner of Principal Rise. This is due to the poor planning of double yellow lines. There is a lack of yellow lines on the entry/exit to Principal Rise. This is a blind corner which is not fully protected by double yellow lines. Due to cars parked where double yellow lines are needed, residents are forced to drive on the opposite side of the road into oncoming traffic on a blind corner. At times, to avoid an accident residents must mount the dropped curb pavement to avoid a head-on collision, the signage for the proposed resident parking scheme is in this very spot and could cause injury to both drivers and pedestrians alike.

I would be in support of a 20 mile an hour speed limit covering the estate.

Again, I object to Councillor Andy D'Agorne's decision to advertise an amendment to the proposed Residents Parking Scheme. This resident parking scheme is not needed and is only driven by a minority of residents who have driveways and

garages to park their cars, but choose not to do so. Parking on Revival Estate is adequate for the needs of the estates residents. A Residents Parking Scheme with permits would not guarantee or make more spaces available on the Revival Estate.

Representations in support

- *This will be a welcome attempt to reduce the parking problems we face which make it difficult to reach our homes and access our drives.*
- *I live on the revival estate and would support the introduction of the residents priority parking scheme.*
- *I live on Principal Rise with my family and would support the introduction of a ResPark scheme to allow residents priority parking on the estate.
I frequently struggle to negotiate around parked cars on the estate which do not belong to residents when walking and cycling with my children during the day and when my elderly parents visit there is often nowhere close to our house for them to park due to the on street parking being used by non residents.*
- *I myself did vote in favour of this, however, I wonder if you could take into account the residents of the flats on the estate?
The vast majority of residents of the flats (I personally live in Scholars Court) have designated parking spaces for which, I am informed by other residents, they pay a monthly fee of £10. However, there are a few flats - mine included - that, for some reason, don't have a space allocated to them.
Could this please be taken into account when deciding the pricing structure for the on-street permits? It will seem a little unfair to charge the residents of the flats more than their neighbours are paying for their designated spaces right outside their homes. After all, it's through no fault of our own that we have to park on the street (and often at the other end of the estate).
It would be greatly appreciated if this could be taken into account for the unlucky minority of flat residents who were deemed unworthy of designated parking!*
- *I have lived on the estate, on Principal Rise, for 10 years. During that time access problems due to parking have steadily worsened. We have had occasions when the bins could not be collected due to lack of access and delivery firms telling us that they could not get their vehicles down the road. I have seen one occasion when a fire engine struggled to pass, with firefighters slowly guiding it between parked cars. Neighbours on the lower part of the estate have complained about sometimes having to use Academy Drive to get to their homes because Principal Rise was blocked, or vice-versa.*

The problems are not only caused by York College students/staff because, as I walk the dog each morning, I always see a few adults driving onto the estate, parking up, and walking straight out to Tadcaster Road. However, the vast majority of the problem is caused by students/college staff, evidenced by the fact that major problems rarely occur during college holidays. The problems ceased when the college was closed due to the pandemic but they are now building back up.

The Revival Residents Community Association (RRCA) was in fact originally formed as a group trying to sort out the parking problems. The scope of the group has widened but it continues to receive many complaints from residents about parking and for not yet "having sorted it out". Parking has been a continual agenda item on the RRCA committee meetings for about 7 years.

When I moved to this estate 10 years ago, the reasons for the choice included the excellent public transport links and cycle path. One can quickly reach York centre or Leeds by bus from the entrance of the estate. A spur to the York/Selby cycle path runs actually through the estate. We now even have electric scooters and bicycles to hire at the old Park and Ride site, across the road. Few households really need to run multiple cars if they would only take advantage of the other readily available options. I believe we need City of York Council's help in encouraging the city's residents and students to stop running multiple vehicle and to take more to foot, bike and bus. A side effect of the ResPark will be to encourage this.

Finally, the additional cost of ResPark permits is only a small fraction of the cost of running a car. Visitor permits will be also available and I will quite willingly pay the miniscule cost of these, when needed.

- I am a property owner/landlord in Master Mews and wish to submit my proposal IN SUPPORT of the Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark)*
- I am homeowner and reside in Academy Drive within the Revival Estate and have lived at this address since May 2019. My home is located on a cul-de-sac on Academy Drive at the top of the Revival Estate. On a daily basis students from the nearby York College park in a manner which is illegal (parking fully across a dropped curb) and poses an obstruction impairing the ability of residents to safely enter and leave the private road within the cul-de-sac. There are at least six children who reside in this cul-de-sac, not to mention many other children who reside in the*

surrounding households and impairing pedestrians and road users' ability to safely enter and leave the cul-de-sac is inconsiderate, dangerous and unacceptable.

I have attached photographic evidence of the dangerous and illegal parking encountered on a daily basis, which is entirely attributable to the College students using the Estate to park their cars, when in fact the College operates a permit parking scheme of their own (at a cost of £1 per day of parking) and has a large open plan car park available for the students to use. I have reported the issues raised above on several occasions directly to Mr Probert, Principal at York College and I have not received a direct response from him to date. I have received responses from his colleagues, however the situation has never improved and the College have been unable to offer any constructive solution to alleviate the volume of their students' parked cars on the Revival Estate since at least 2019. It has also been brought to my attention that the College has actively encouraged students to park on the Revival Estate (when students have asked where they can park without having to pay for permit parking at the College) and this has led to an increased flow of traffic through the Revival Estate which is dangerous and entirely avoidable. I take no pleasure in asking the Council to introduce a Residents' Priority Parking Scheme as this will lead to additional expense for householders across the estate. However no alternative solution has been proposed by York College and it would seem the only method of discouraging their students from parking dangerously and frequently illegally on the estate is to have a scheme in place which will preclude them from using the estate as a car park.

I hope that the request for a Residents' Priority Parking Scheme will be met favourably and approved.

- I would like to register my full support for the Residents Parking Scheme as outlined in your letter of 21 October*
- I am in support of the proposed ResPark Scheme on the estate that you recently proposed.*

It will make the estate safer for all, but avoiding lots of people parking here who do not live here and therefore will provide better visibility on the roads.

- Having lived on the estate for many years I wanted to register my support for the proposal communicated in the letter dated 21st October.*

As someone who drives regularly in and out of the estate in the times being proposed I have lost count of the times I have had

near misses with cars such is the volume of traffic and impact of parking on the estate especially from the college in the week. On many occasions I have been forced to turn around due to cars being parked as to make it impossible to continue down the road, this would pose a significant risk in the case of emergency vehicles.

The proposal for 10-3 seems very reasonable to me and has a reduced impact on residents who on the whole there is more than enough capacity on the roads.

- *Given that that only limited double yellow lines were introduced some time ago, double parking continued to be a significant issue, and the parking scheme will hopefully reduce that problem.*

I attach a photo of the type of situation encountered on Principal Rise. On this occasion I was delayed in getting to a hospital appointment, and there would be little chance of an ambulance or fire engine getting down the street in event of an emergency.

- *I am a property owner/landlord of Scholars Court and wish to submit my proposal IN SUPPORT of the Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark)*
- *My wife and I are in full support of the proposed changes to parking regulations.*
- *I originally voted No to the proposed parking scheme however my circumstances have since changed and I would now vote Yes*
- *What a fantastic idea! Our development has been over crowded by cars belonging to students for far too long.*

These extra cars not only make it difficult for us and our visitors to come and go from the estate (I have to weave carefully around all the cars) but also make access for emergency service or delivery vehicles very difficult and in some cases impossible. Many of the students park badly or up on the pavement which makes it dangerous for people with pushchairs who are forced to walk out into the road.

I have seen students chucking their litter onto the road before leaving, and when I have politely asked them to pick up their rubbish, I have received an earful of abusive language. Students turn their cars around on our drive and when we have pointed out that this is not a considerate thing to do, again we are faced with a rude and indignant response.

York is a green city which I am very proud to be part of, so let's encourage students to ditch their cars and catch the bus or cycle or use the electric scooters instead.

I think the timing is perfect (Monday to Friday 10am to 3pm) as it still lets our visitors park on the road in the evenings or at weekends, which is usually when they are with us anyway. Many thanks for taking our concerns seriously and for hopefully, turning priority parking for residents living on the Revival Estate into a long awaited reality.

- We moved here in May 2019 and have noticed an ever increasing problem with erratic parking on the streets, often related to the nearby York College. Often getting in and out of our drive is an issue due to how cars are parked in the surrounding vicinity. We are both Doctors who perform emergency on-call work, and so being able to get out at short notice is imperative. We feel that the proposed scheme will limit the amount of traffic on the estate in general, which is also a bonus with a young family and lack of footpaths. For us, the need to purchase occasional visitor permits is a very small price to pay for the intended benefits and we would welcome this.*
- I'm absolutely fed up with the students parking here. They drive far too fast, park irresponsibly and cause a significant increase in the volume of traffic at times of the day when children are walking to and from school. They drop litter and are aggressive/unhelpful when confronted.*
- I live in Bursary Court on the Revival Estate and I wish to offer my unqualified support for the amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to include a Residents' Priority Parking Area for the estate to operate Mon-Fri 10am to 3pm.*

My reasons are as follows:

- 1. Students who use the estate as a free car park often park in a dangerous manner by blocking the narrow roads which could prevent emergency vehicles from accessing residents in times of need.*
- 2. Students often park on the footpaths and block the walkways for wheelchair users and those pushing prams, pushchairs and buggies.*
- 3. Students often drive at dangerous speeds around the estate without due care for the residents and small children - and have caused several accidents as a result of bad driving.*
- 4. Students often throw litter out of their cars and leave litter behind when they leave the estate.*
- 5. When politely asked to pick up their litter or park more considerately, students often become aggressive and abusive.*

6. People of all ages should be encouraged to use public transport and bicycles rather than cars - York has an excellent rail, bus and cycle lane infrastructure that will serve students extremely well.

Furthermore, the proposed Priority Parking schedule will cause the least inconvenience to Revival Residents.

- Further to the receipt of your letter dated 21st October 2021, I would like put forward my support for the residents parking scheme. I live in Principal Rise and have 'parking spaces' directly opposite my house. Inconsiderate (bad) parking by students and staff at the college often restricts my access to and from my driveway.
I FULLY support the scheme!*