

## Details of Objections Received

	<b>OBJECTION</b>	<b>OFFICER COMMENTS</b>
1.	<p><b>ENFIELD CRESCENT:</b> (submitted by two residents, one property)</p> <p>We live on Enfield Crescent which is a private road where residents own the road which fronts their house. We have no driveway (frontage on the street is 1.2m too narrow to install one) and no right to park in the street. We rely on the goodwill of our neighbours to park nearby. Most of the neighbours are protective of their frontage and as a result we frequently rely on parking in the surrounding streets. The proposed scheme would significantly impact on our family. We face having to park in the Acomb Road area if this scheme goes ahead. This will increase the car movements which is contrary to the intentions of the Local Transport Plan 3. It would make it difficult to use the car for family commitments because of the walk and potentially compromises our safety late at night. This is not a situation we would choose and was not anticipated when we bought our house.</p> <p>This scheme penalises our family. We would like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the scheme to be available to us/properties in private roads which do not have parking rights in that street. We believe we are the only property in this scheme in this situation.</li> </ul> <p>Or:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The residents of the private streets be allowed to purchase a household permit or visitor permits for the scheme</li> </ul>	<p>The scheme, if implemented could have a detrimental impact on this family as it would remove their only nearby parking amenity.</p> <p>There is currently no provision written into the Traffic Regulation Order to allow permits to be issued to a resident who does not live within a property boundary area.</p> <p>The private street issue presents a complication. The fact the resident has such a minimal frontage onto the private street presents us with a situation that is unlikely to be replicated in other areas.</p> <p>There is no satisfactory method of writing anything into the TRO to deal with this matter in a manner that would not adversely impact on other residents in this scheme or other schemes around the city.</p> <p>Hence it is suggested that the Executive Member request the Head of Transport use their delegated authority to allow this property address access to 1 Household permit and/or visitor permits at the usual cost.</p>

	<p>We understand an amendment has been proposed for the schools and we would like this privilege to be extended to ourselves who are also in special circumstances.</p>	
2.	<p><b>SPIRITUALIST CENTRE:</b> (submitted by three members)  I am the Secretary of York Spiritualist Centre and spoke at the decision session on the 22<sup>nd</sup> June. We at York Spiritualist Centre have further and equally important considerations for our Centre.  Like all church's we have to consider attendances for naming ceremonies ( christening's) for marriage blessings and for funeral ceremonies. All of which can be on any day of the week as you will appreciate.</p> <p>In reflection we would appreciate consideration for Friday and Saturday evenings on an equivalent basis to our Sunday Services, the attendances for these have numbered 80 to 100 people. Although the events we hold on these evenings are not as frequent (once every three weeks), they do make up 75% of our annual funds. A 24/7 parking restriction for us would not allow our Centre's events on the Friday and Saturday evenings to work well at all, and will in all likelihood fail. This would ultimately jeopardise the Centre's survival On Wilton Rise because of insufficient funds from fund raising events held on the Friday and Saturday evenings.</p> <p>In conclusion the membership and committee of York Spiritualist Centre object to the outlined proposal detailed in your letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> August 2017. However as myself</p>	<p>The request is noted and we could introduce a scheme Mon to Sat, 9am to 5pm without further advertisement (lesser restriction).</p> <p>An influx of 80 -100 attendees with the level of parking this brings would undermine the parking amenity of residents.</p> <p>We have received alternative objections to the proposal because we are not proposing a full time 24 hour scheme which was the preference of the majority of residents who registered one.</p> <p>There are two hour bays proposed and existing 90 minute parking on Holgate Road nearby.</p> <p>Any blue badge holder can park in any of our Resident Parking bays or areas.</p>

	<p>and my colleague Malcolm Senna voiced at the consultation meeting, we would prefer for example a 9am to 5pm time restricted parking scheme as I feel this would not jeopardize most of the local residents and other community needs. This however would eliminate commuter, city working and shopping parking.</p>	
3.	<p><b>ST PAULS CE SCHOOL</b> (Submitted by the Acting Head with the support of the deputy head, EYFS Leader and four other members of staff)</p> <p>Having only Watson Street bays as non-permit holders is going to cause immense traffic congestion problems at drop off and pick up time for parents. Some parents/carers have no other option than to come by car due to work and child care commitments. I worry that this will affect pupil numbers in the future due to accessibility to the school for parents/carers. More non-permit holder bays are required.</p> <p>We are grateful and obviously support the fact that we will be allowed a number of commercial permits which will allow our staff and visitors to be able to park vehicles in the vicinity of the school.</p> <p>However, as stated in Richard Knowles' previous email (20.06.17) the school were originally led to believe by CYC that the cost of a commercial permit would be no more than £90. The cost of £144 annually seems excessive for staff at St Paul's to bear as this is their workplace and they are providing an essential community</p>	<p>The proposal is a parking restriction, not one of access. Parents/carers and drop off and pick up from any legitimate area/space, not just the 2 hour spaces.</p> <p>We are not aware of any conversation with the previous head teacher where it was said that permits would be provided and if they were to be provided the cost would be kept to below £90. We believe the proposed cost of a permit is affordable when compared with other choices.</p> <p>The cost of a commercial permit for one zone is currently £150.00 (from April 2017). This equates over a 39 week school term to £3.85 a week.</p> <p>There is a discount for low emission vehicles, cost reduces to £75 per annum, £1.92 per week.</p> <p>In comparison, a city car park would cost £1,125 per year (£562.50 for low emission) or £150/£75 per month. Park and Ride would cost £11.60 per week. First York Weekly is £15</p> <p>The commercial permit would be applied for by the</p>

	<p>service; we provide a public service educating children, who are members of the local community. We would once again like you to review this cost in the light of our unique situation.</p> <p>We request that these permits are not for a particular vehicle registration but for use by any staff, visitor or contractor needing to park in the vicinity of our school. We currently have a high percentage of job shares, part time auxiliary / kitchen staff and specialist teachers who only work part of the school day / week. Having to purchase an annual permit for 6 hours a week is just not feasible. As stated in our previous letter, in order for the school to run we would need up to 20 transferable commercial permits. Understandably I am concerned about the retention and recruitment of staff at St Paul's in the future. I am also concerned about maintaining the quality service we provide as parking permits will limit the amount of staff on site at any one time.</p>	<p>individual members of staff and would not be transferrable. Consequently this would not limit the amount of staff on site at any one time.</p>
4.	<p><b>ST PAULS NURSERY SCHOOL</b></p> <p>Thank you for informing the Nursery School of the consultation results for the above scheme to extend the Holgate Central R60 Area. Clearly this has an impact on staff at St Paul's Nursery School so we have consulted with them on the latest advertisement for the scheme.</p> <p>We currently have 10 members of staff who regularly drive to work and therefore park in the vicinity, often coming from a long way out and with their own child drop-offs at other schools along the way. They are regularly</p>	<p>We are unable to provide any dedicated parking for school staff.</p> <p>Other comments are noted and reflect those made in earlier objection by St Pauls CE Primary School.</p>

bringing in bulky equipment and resources prepared at home for use in the Nursery School and so having the current ability to park nearby is essential.

If the scheme is going ahead then we very much support the inclusion and consideration for provision of staff parking for the Nursery School. However, your support would be greatly appreciated in looking into whether any alternative arrangements could be made into the provision of dedicated and free parking close by to the school? For example, could the Nursery be allocated named staff parking bays in the alley that encircles behind the square?

Staff feedback is of unanimous concern in having to pay a charge for a permit if that is the only option. The vast majority of staff are teaching assistants (not teachers) with an average basic salary of c.£15k per annum and so £144 for a permit is not an insignificant additional cost. This may have an impact on retention and recruitment of staff, particularly when considering that many schools in the area that can offer similar posts will have provision for staff parking at no extra cost.

It is understood that a residential permit for parking in York can be as little as £49.25 per year and so consideration of lowering the annual permit cost to something similar for our staff would be of significant benefit in mitigating any potentially negative impact on the Nursery School.

<p><b>5. COUNCILLOR SONYA CRISP</b></p> <p>My objection to point 10 is due to concern that the council are not putting a cap on the limit of permits that this school can apply for and that the council notices, and I will bet also that the school, in their lobbying letters to residents, have not made it very clear that the school has indicated that they require 26 permits and if many of the residents had been made aware of that specific point, I don't feel they would have been so in favour of granting the school permits without limit as that number will take up all the parking one side or more of a terraced street in that area.</p> <p>My suggestion if the council is feeling determined to go this way, as it appears to be, is to cap the number the school can apply for at a maximum of 10, although my preference would be a maximum of 2 and some allowance for visitors permits to be purchased, also with a cap. That way, the school will think carefully before using them unnecessarily.</p> <p>No doubt about it, this will add to the parking issues already suffered by the residents in this area because school staff, mobile and well able to get to work by bus, train, park and ride or walking will probably opt to use their cars as they have free parking right next to their place of work.</p> <p>Teachers, unlike GP's, district nurses, occupational therapists and similar occupations who need to use their</p>	<p>The comments are noted and have also been raised by some residents.</p>
--	--

	<p>cars to do their day to day jobs, don't need to use a car every day to do their jobs. Teachers arrive at school, teach and then go home. Yes they may have marking to carry etc but other professionals when needing to transport papers etc use roller bags or backpacks to transport stuff like that, especially in cities.</p> <p>This school couldn't be better placed for links to public transport and we should be encouraging the use of public transport not encouraging more cars into the city and parking in residential streets. This council should doing more to be tackle congestion, and increase numbers using public transport or cycling, not creating opportunities for more unnecessary car usage.</p>	
6.	<p><b>OBJECTION: RESIDENT</b></p> <p>I register the following objections to permit parking on Upper St Paul's Terrace, St Paul's Terrace and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposal was not something that was offered as a specific consultation option – options were 24/7, Mon-Fri 9-5 or “other”. The proposal is to restrict parking 24/6 but we don't recall this being an option on the resident consultation. The results sent to us don't tell us what percentage of respondents chose 24/6 as their preferred option.</p> <p>If the decision to restrict is irreversible, can residents be consulted about their preference on what days/times to</p>	<p>The full results of the consultation were included as an annex to the report of the 22<sup>nd</sup> June and available on the website.</p> <p>24/6 was not listed as an option, but was proposed in consideration of the needs of the wider community and not just the resident views.</p> <p>The decision was taken to allow school employee parking because it was considered the school is part of the local</p>

	<p>restrict? The original consultation was more focused on “do you want to restrict”. Only 118 or 284 gave an opinion to what days/times to restrict, suggesting that only a few who said “no” (99) offered an opinion. Those who originally responded that they didn’t want to restrict might have views on days/times if there is no option but to restrict. Those residents should have a say on days/times.</p> <p>A number of comments on the published consultation were complaining about school staff using the area to park. Given that schools will now be allowed to park, those residents who were pushing for permitting may actually change their minds and decide that it’s not something they want.</p> <p>Parking from the two churches in the area causes a lot of problems on Sundays (far more than the schools in actual fact). If restrictions are to be enforced, we request that Sundays are also restricted. As well as additional pressure, cars are often parked on corners which reduce visibility when at crossroads, mount pavements etc.</p>	community.
7.	<p><b>OBJECTION RESIDENT</b></p> <p>I must very strongly and vehemently object to the proposal for ResPark on adopted Wilton Rise. The results of the survey are far from conclusive except for st Pauls terrace, railway terrace and St Pauls square (many of whom have their own off street parking anyway).</p>	<p>Historically, we require a 50% return from a consultation and the majority of the returns to be in favour to take a scheme forward.</p> <p>It is generally assumed that residents who do not respond to a consultation have no strong feelings either way.</p>



In all my 18 years (nearly) of living on Wilton rise, I have never not been able to park. Yes it can be inconvenient on occasion to have to park a few metres from your door, however the introduction of ResPark schemes do little if nothing to ease any parking issues, it will not guarantee that you can park outside your own property, nor that you won't get blocked in nor will it stop others parking outside your house for weeks on end, because as long as a car has a resident permit, there is absolutely nothing you can do about it. The only issue is ever persons parking for more than 24 hours parking here and going on holiday some of which are non-residents.

Adding another scheme here just pushes parking issues elsewhere. Many early morning workers park here before the park and ride schemes start on a morning, people that work for example at the post office or railway staff. There are insufficient affordable parking schemes for these types of workers. These will just park further away in the next non-ResPark zone.

I see that no properties on Holgate road return surveys, and so I presume and rightly so that you cannot assume that they accept the scheme, a non-response does not mean acceptance?

To adopt the scheme 24 hours a day 6 days a week solves nothing, it stops day trippers, but when most residents are out at work or students that go to college during these hours, it smacks of no more than being vindictive to stop some people from free parking when

The price of a permit is set by full council as part of the annual budget.

A disc zone would equally apply to residents and prevent resident parking for longer than the specified time.

there is almost none left in the city This will just leave these streets empty during the day. To have it overnight from 6pm to 6am again is of no particular use as it always full with residents parking, and to be honest my only problem with any parking EVER has been other residents that have selfishly parked taking up two spaces meaning I have to park a few metres away round the corner, or that others have totally blocked me in.

Also having the scheme at all reduces access to the Spiritualist church where they have meeting on days other than Sundays with no area for parking would mean problems for access for less abled drivers, and as their meeting can be several hours (up to 3 I think), you would need a much longer time than the normal 10 minutes for again for this parking scheme to not be particularly mean to prevent the churchgoers parking here. I would suggest that other streets should be four hours or no more than 9-5 in a disc zone style like Harrogate.

I totally object with the somewhat difficult and expensive day passes for visitors which appear to only be available from your office during office hours, meaning that I would have to take time off work to obtain them. Also with houses being old and with many under some sort of renovation at all times, adds an unnecessary expense for day permits for residents to pay for contractors, which are many times more expensive than that for example Bridlington East Yorkshire that are less and last a week. The price of full permits is also expensive compared to some other councils, for multiple cars is quite frankly

	<p>scandalous many times more than some of the richest areas in London, where even these houses in Holgate are so expensive that you need two full time incomes and likely two or more car drivers to pay for them, and so I see this as yet another enforced stealth tax rather than a service, which quite frankly I don't think we need. Yet!</p>	
8.	<p><b>OBJECTION RESIDENT</b>          Today we received the consultation results for the Priority Parking Scheme for our area (St Paul's Square) I understood that the original request for this scheme came from the residents of St Paul's &amp; Railway Terraces due to the problems of commuter parking. I was therefore surprised that out of 71 houses in St Paul's Terrace only 32 voted in favour of this scheme.          Altogether 284 houses are included in your proposal &amp; out of these only 99 houses voted in favour of the scheme. Based on this result the scheme should certainly not be adopted and I would strongly object to having an unpopular scheme forced on St Paul's Square.</p>	<p>Comments as made for earlier objection</p>
9.	<p><b>COMMENTS: RESIDENT</b>          Concerns raised about the maintenance of the unadopted highway on Wilton Rise.</p>	<p>Concerns about the maintenance of adopted and unadopted streets should be reported to <a href="mailto:ycc@york.gov.uk">ycc@york.gov.uk</a> who will log the issue and pass to the relevant department for inspection and reply</p>
10.	<p><b>PARTIAL SUPPORT: RESIDENT</b>          I am in agreement regarding preventing commuter and day trippers from parking. However I strongly object to</p>	<p>Comments as above.</p>

	<p>having to purchase a permit for a road which is horrendously degraded and in dire need of maintenance, especially Wilton Rise. I hope this concern has already been highlighted by the relevant parties involved.</p>	<p>Highway maintenance is outside the remit of this proposal.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT WITH OBJECTION: RESIDENT</b>  On balance we are broadly supportive of the scheme proposed but would like to see the following changes:</p> <p>1) By definition this is a <b>Residents</b> Priority Parking Scheme and we do not accept that the St Paul's Nursery/Primary school <b>staff</b> and/or <b>parents</b> should be included as they are not residents, they are <b>commuters</b> and part of the overall parking problem for residents. Offering commercial permits to staff is not what we were originally consulted on and this would continue to reduce our ability to park near our house by approximately two dozen (24) vehicles during the working week. All non residents and particularly nursery/school staff and parents should be discouraged from parking here. As a compromise, we suggest an arrangement is made with the Railways so that the derelict land adjacent to St Paul's church - which is completely empty during the working day - is repurposed specifically for nursery/school staff.</p> <p>2) We are unclear what the waiting time will be and would like to see this minimised to no more than 10 minutes like other York city centre streets. This would discourage non residents from parking here and make the scheme much easier to enforce via ticketing. Without clear messaging</p>	<p>Previous comments apply</p> <p>Apart from the marked bays, there is no time limit allowed for non-permit holders unless they are loading/unloading (including passengers). Civil Enforcement Officers would wait approximately 5 - 10 minutes before issuing a penalty</p>

	<p>and efficient enforcement we are concerned that the scheme will be of zero help to residents, thus why bother.</p> <p>3) We would like to see the strip of road at the southern end of St Paul's Square on Watson Terrace explicitly included within the scheme, providing extra capacity for approximately six vehicles. This is currently a single strip yellow line, allowing parking after 6pm and before 8am.</p>	<p>charge notice.</p> <p>The single yellow line is useful as a drop-off and pick up point for the two schools. If the scheme is implemented it will be monitored and changes to this restriction could be considered if necessary.</p>
12.	<p><b>SUPPORT WITH REQUEST: RESIDENT</b></p> <p>I want to lend my support to the above proposal.</p> <p>As a resident of Railway Terrace, this cannot be implemented soon enough!</p> <p>I have one comment – PLEASE EXTEND TO INCLUDE SUNDAYS.</p> <p>Today Sunday 10 September 2017 is a typical example of how difficult it is to park in the street 7 days a week.</p> <p>An example - I drove my partner to work this morning (supermarket on Foss Island Road), leaving our house on Railway Terrace 9am.</p> <p>I then took some recycling to Hazel Court, etc., etc. – returning home in just over an hour to find Railway Terrace packed (not one empty parking space available) with cars from St Pauls' church goers and/or shoppers walking into town (meaning CYC loses carpark revenue while shoppers free park at Railway Terrace).</p>	<p>Comments are noted, but conflict with the previous decision to allow parking for the Sunday services at the church or Spiritualist Centre.</p>

	<p>In fact the car that had taken the space I'd vacated had a Leicester City Council Employee Car Park badge on the dashboard – perhaps here for the day or overspill from one of the many B&amp;Bs in this area? As the Council will be well aware, York really is as 'all seasons' tourist destination so this not just a 'summer' problem.</p> <p>A further example, I would usually go to the supermarket on a Sunday afternoon for a week's groceries (I work full time so weekends is when I time have to do such things). I know when I return in 2 hours' time with all my groceries, I will need to double park outside my house, hazard lights on, just to unpack the groceries from the car - because they are heavy and I will have several bags and I don't want to carry them from the next street or St Paul's Mews where I hopefully can park. This happens weekly.</p>	
13.	<p><b>SUPPORT: RESIDENT</b> I fully support this decision and hope it can be implemented as soon as possible although I appreciate there will be some opposition and this will have to be factored in. Please remove the disabled bay road markings at 28 Railway Terrace at the same time.</p>	Removal of the Disabled Bay is being taken forward as part of the Annual Review Process.