

**Decision Session (Public) –
Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and
Sustainability**

2nd August 2012

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

University Related Parking in Residential Areas - Follow up Report

Summary

1. The purpose of this report is to update the Cabinet Member on the trial parking arrangements in the Badger Hill area. These were introduced at the start of the year to alleviate parking problems associated with ongoing development at the University of York's Heslington East Campus. The report also takes into consideration the concerns raised by residents as highlighted in two petitions recently received. In light of this and other consultations/ observation undertaken, a number of proposals are recommended to further amend the trial. The impact of this will be carefully monitored and reported back. The outcome of the trial will be used to influence the development of a comprehensive strategy for the whole of the area around the University.

Recommendations

2. In light of experiences from the recent trial and consultations undertaken, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member approves the following measures. These are aimed at enhancing the current trial and developing a clear strategy for addressing future University of York related parking issues:
 - additional junction protection markings at Field Lane's junction with Sussex Road (no waiting at any time restrictions)
 - extend the areas covered by the Residents Parking Scheme to include the cul-de-sacs of Hesketh Bank, Foxthorn Paddock, Pinewood Hill and Badger Wood Walk

- amend the through-route of Deramore Drive, currently covered by a controlled zone, to be included within the zonal respark scheme
- extend the areas covered by the Residents Parking Zone to include the two through-routes; 140 metres of Deramore Drive and 100 metres of Yarburgh Way
- confirm the operational times of the Residents Parking Scheme and Controlled Parking Zone trials as 8.00am until 6.00 pm for the continuation of the trial
- authorise officers to enter into detailed discussions with the University of York aimed at developing a wider parking strategy that can be applied across the areas previously identified as part of the Planning Inspectors considerations.

Background

University of York - Heslington East Campus

3. At the Decision Session meeting on 26th July 2011 the Cabinet Member for City Strategy approved the introduction of parking measures on a trial basis in the Badger Hill area. These included a Residents Parking Scheme and a Controlled Parking Zone (See Appendix A) and were intended to alleviate the University related parking issues which arise from ongoing development at the Heslington East Campus.

Responsibilities

4. As outlined in the previous report the Planning Process and subsequent Public Enquiry recommended certain obligations of the University and the Council to address parking issues that arise from the planned development of the East Heslington Campus. In general terms these were as follows:

- **University of York**

Carrying out and analysing annual parking surveys, the cost of traffic management measures necessary to tackle parking and if permits are required, these would be at no cost to local residents (less a 40% reduction as enforcement is addressed separately).

Agreeing with the Council, measures to help mitigate parking issues. This includes the cost of providing an enforcement

presence in the area (an initial figure of 20% of a full time equivalent for a Civil Enforcement Officer has been agreed as appropriate for the current scheme).

- **City of York Council**

Implementation of agreed measures to manage the parking associated with the University. Pass on income from enforcement action, less the appropriate administration fee (estimated at 60%) to the University. Undertake suitable reviews of traffic management measures.

5. It should be noted that these responsibilities are only related to an increase in parking issues that can be attributed to or are directly associated with the ongoing development of the University. The Planning Inspectors Report, approved Planning conditions and the Section 106 agreement have outlined these responsibilities and cover a 15 year period which will end in October 2024 (see Appendix B).

Existing Situation

6. Following the approval of the trial parking restrictions at the Decision Session meeting on 26th July 2011, special authorisation was sought from the Department for Transport (DfT) who at the time had to legally sanction the use of the type of residents permit scheme proposed. This unfortunately coincided with the Government's plans to relax legislation that would remove their required approval and delayed its introduction whilst central Government's efforts were concentrated on enacting these changes.
7. The DfT's authorisation was eventually given late in December 2011 (before changes to the national legislation) and measures were introduced in early January 2012 (see Appendix A). It was always anticipated that the proposed parking restrictions would have some limited "knock-on" effects and after a suitable settling in period, minor revisions of the scheme may be needed. With this in mind, consultation has been undertaken with residents living within the restrictions and those nearby properties directly affected. On-site observations, surveys, correspondence from residents and consultation with the University and Police have heavily influenced the recommendations in this report.

8. The recommendations made in the previous report have been implemented on a trial basis. The measures introduced are outlined below:

- **Minor measures: Junction protection restrictions**

Restrictions have been introduced at several junctions across the estate. These are standardised markings to protect the safe through passage of vehicles at junctions. These have been implemented at:

- Sussex Road with Field Lane
- Badger Wood Walk (southern section) with Field Lane
- Field Lane (service road) with Badger Wood Walk
- Deramore Drive with Field Lane
- Field Lane (service road) with Deramore Drive
- Low Mill Close with Deramore Drive
- Deramore Drive with Yarburgh Way

- **Extensive traditional parking measures: Controlled zone**

This operates from 8.00am until 6.00pm hours Monday to Friday and is in place on Deramore Drive between its junction with Field Lane and the 'no waiting at any time' double yellow line restrictions that have been introduced to protect the junction of Yarburgh Way.

- **Extensive traditional parking measures: Field Lane clearway**

A 24hr clearway covering the carriageway and grass verges has been introduced on the section of Field Lane between the (A1079) Hull Road round-about and the signalised junction of Innovation Way.

- **Residents parking scheme: Cul-de-sac access zone**

As with the Controlled zone, the operational times are 8.00am until 6.00pm hours Monday to Friday. Presently, the streets covered by this access zone are Badger Wood Walk (southern section), Field Lane (service road) and Low Mill Close. Cul-de-sac's can facilitate the use of a single point of entry sign to the zone and bays are not required to be marked out.

9. A closure point in the vicinity of Badger Wood Walk and Field Lane junction was originally proposed to create a cul-de-sac arrangement. However, an agreement was reached with the DfT that this would not be necessary in this instance.
10. Following a change in the advice received from DfT, it has now become possible to introduce the zonal residents parking scheme, as presently used only in cul-de-sacs, into 'small road networks' also. This relaxation enables those areas currently operating as a controlled parking zone, namely Deramore Drive, to be included within the confines of a more extensive zonal residents parking scheme.

Consultation/ Survey results

11. Further detailed surveys have been undertaken to canvass the opinions of residents directly affected by the recently introduced measures. Rather than survey the entire estate, a more targeted approach was taken to determine those areas where residents consider measures have become necessary. A questionnaire, to investigate the overall satisfaction and appropriateness of the scheme for residents was undertaken. The results of this consultation are demonstrated below and have shaped both the approach taken and the extent of newly proposed measures.
12. Analysis of the surveys has been undertaken so that it fully represents residents living within the parameters of the scheme and those in the immediate vicinity of and adjacent to the new measures. The streets within each area are shown in plan form in Appendix C.
13. A copy of the questionnaire used is available within Appendix D. The responses received are summarised in Appendix E. The principal results of the consultation indicate that:
 - Residents within the present Respark zone (within the cul-de-sacs) support the scheme and wish the existing times of operation to be maintained.
 - Residents within the current Controlled zone support the scheme and also wish the existing times of operation to continue.
 - Residents just outside of the trial zones have been adversely affected and wish to see the areas of the trial extended (although the level of parking has reduced and dissipated).

14. Two petitions have been received from which are reflected in this report. The first petition (henceforth referred to as the Badger Wood Walk area petition) is from residents of in streets adjacent to the current confines of the trial. This petition, consisting of 129 signatures covering 81 properties, requests a 'controlled parking zone' with references made to wanting a residents parking scheme to cover the entirety of zone nine. (The areas surrounding the University development have been broken down into 13 distinct areas which are periodically surveyed to determine the level of parking against a base year).
15. The second petition (henceforth referred to as the Sussex Road area petition) is from residents who are some distance from the current trial. This petition, containing 24 signatures from 17 premises, requests for an investigation to be carried out at Sussex Road's junctions with Field Lane and Eastfield Crescent.
16. Bearing in mind the feedback received to the current trial, this report will now consider options for alteration to the current scheme and possible other areas of expansion. Further clarification of the situation with DfT, in terms of interpretations used, has also been sought and a positive response has been received.
17. As the trial has only been in operation for approximately three months, it could be considered to be too early to make any significant amendments as there may be issues that only come to light over the period of a full calendar year. There are however, a number of issues that need to be addressed more urgently.
18. Correspondence between CYC and both the University of York and North Yorkshire Police was undertaken to provide an opportunity for representations to be made relating to recommendations made in this report. At this time, there was an acceptance that the measures were appropriate and agreement that a more extensive scheme is necessary in some areas. The wider ethos, with reference to the strategy proposed was discussed and also received support.

Options

19. The amendments and extensions put forward in this report, in accordance with the proposed strategy aim to resolve the key parking issues whilst being cost effective in terms of their

implementation, future maintenance, associated administration and enforcement action. A plan of the proposed measures is available within Appendix F.

20. In line with expectations, several vehicles have relocated into new parts of the estate and so measures were proposed and consulted upon. The results demonstrate that additional areas require the implementation of restrictions.
21. The principle of the trial arrangement previously agreed was to introduce Respark restrictions on cul-de-sacs and a controlled parking zone on the main through-routes of the estate. This is due to the fact that a Respark scheme on a cul-de-sac can be introduced without the need for marked bays, extensive signage and surplus parking restrictions. Following extensive discussions with DfT, minor changes in the legal interpretation have indicated that such scheme arrangements can be applied to the through-routes as well.
22. The majority of responses from those residents within the trial controlled zone (a section of Deramore Drive) support the existing scheme and its operational times. For those locations where cul-de-sac Respark zones have been trialled, the consultation was overwhelmingly in support of the scheme and its current times.
23. As the trial has only effectively in place for approximately three months (at the time this report was written) and appears to have been well supported by those residents within it, it is proposed to adapt the same principles previously introduced. This will involve continuing to use respark in cul-de-sacs whilst extending the parameters of the scheme to additionally include non cul-de-sac routes. This is something that can be reviewed in the future but as highlighted earlier, the impact on any on-street parking capacity would be very significant.
24. As detailed in this (and the previous) report, significant problems are caused by marking out bays, particularly in through-routes as this drastically reduces the on-street parking capacity. As such, a controlled zone including a single yellow line was implemented for the trial in locations that are not cul-de-sacs. As indicated above, this has recently been found to be unnecessary and avoidable and hence the recommendations reflect this accordingly.

25. With regard to the Badger Wood Walk area petition (see Appendix G for an outline of this petition) from residents near to the existing trial in Badger Wood Walk, Pinewood Hill, Foxthorn Paddock, Deramore Drive, Hesketh Bank and Yarburgh Way (totalling 81 properties), the proposals in this report would have the following effects; 51 of the properties would be covered by the newly proposed 'cul-de-sac' respark zones. 23 premises are in the recommended extension to the controlled zone (single yellow lines) and seven households are not included in the second phase of the trial. All seven of these are on the northern section of Yarburgh Way between Vanburgh Drive and Hesketh Bank. The level of parking on this section has not been seen to be excessive and will need to be carefully monitored during the next phase of the trial.
26. It is proposed that all cul-de-sacs within the area recently consulted are included into the access type zonal residents parking. The trial should therefore be extended to Hesketh Bank, Foxthorn Paddock, Pinewood Hill and Badger Wood Walk (northern section). Following the clarification of DfT's legal interpretation of zonal parking schemes, it is considered that the more traffic-sensitive 'through routes' within the estate could be included within the confines of the wider scheme. The consultation of residents living on through-routes within the area indicated that they have been affected to some degree by relocated vehicles. This translated into support for the extension of measures in the area. It is recommended to extend the boundary of the scheme to include an additional section of Deramore Drive and also to Yarburgh Way- terminating at the Hesketh Bank junction. These have been seen to be the limits of where parking is at a concentrated level.
27. The concerns raised by the Sussex Road area petition (see Appendix H for an outline of this petition), from residents some distance outside of the current trial area in Sussex Road, Field Lane, Eastfield Crescent, Crossways, Wolveston Avenue and Burniston Grove (a total of 17 premises) have also been observed on site and the report includes recommendations to address this by extending the existing junction protection restrictions.
28. As part of the original trial, permits were restricted to one per property and no visitor or additional resident permits were allowed. The main reason for this was that this was considered to be the minimum level at which a Residents permit scheme could be introduced that would satisfy the inspectors recommendations. Also

the originally proposed times of operation of the trial were significantly less than the working day to reduce the impact on residents. At the Executive Member meeting the proposed times of operation were altered to 8.00am to 6.00pm in response to representations made.

29. Further detailed consideration will need to be given as to how requests for additional resident and/or visitor permits should be dealt with. This is something that will be included in the development of the strategy in light of the experience of the trial. Where this has been allowed elsewhere in the City the costs of additional permits has been borne by residents.

Longer term Considerations

30. The University of York are currently only a few years into the 15 year expansion programme of the Heslington East Campus and there may well be new parking concerns emerging as the development continues. It would be appropriate therefore to formulate a clear strategy for addressing these issues in light of the experiences of the current trial. This will enable a much more timely response to be given and allow a consistent approach to be adopted.
31. To achieve this it is proposed to enter into detailed discussions with the University of York and the Police Authority to develop a robust strategy that will be adaptable to the ongoing development of the University with respect to the parking issues that can be attributable to this.

Issues to be considered for a strategy

32. There are clear limitations on the type of measures that can be considered for dealing with parking problems, these are the same for local highway authorities across the country. Unlike many authorities, City of York Council have de-criminalised powers in respect of parking restrictions. This means that CYC can undertake active enforcement of any parking measures introduced and without these powers the responsibility would fall onto the Police Authority whose resources are not within our control.

Limitations of measures introduced:

33. With regard to the type of measures that can be utilised, these are effectively constrained to variations of the following:
34. **Minor Measures:** For locations with isolated problems, where driveways or junctions become obstructed on a regular basis, consideration can be given to introducing parking restrictions to protect the junctions and white bar markings across driveways. Whilst the bar markings are not enforceable they have proven to be effective in keeping driveways clear of parked vehicles with limited use.
35. **Wider use of traditional parking measures:** This involves more extensive use of single and double yellow line restrictions and prevents parking from taking place for all traffic, including residents. The controlled zone introduced for this trial is a variation of this approach and reduces the signing requirements due to its zonal nature. Whilst it is not recommended for continued use, the Controlled zones remain unsuitable for use in some locations.
36. **Residents Parking Schemes:** There are a number of variations that can be introduced for Residents Parking Schemes. The one utilised for this trial was initially considered to be limited for use in cul-de-sacs. These are relatively easy to introduce in respect of the signing and lining requirements i.e. signing is only needed upon the entry to the cul-de-sac and parking bays do not need to be marked out within the parameters of the scheme.
37. The introduction of a standard type of residents parking scheme not in cul-de-sacs is more problematic. In some locations more extensive signing and clearly marked out parking bays may be necessary. Furthermore, yellow lines at locations where parking could not be permitted e.g. in between parking bays where the length of carriageway available is insufficient. These requirements can result in on-street parking capacity being severely reduced (potentially by up to 50%) and potentially to a point where demand from residents cannot be satisfied. This is more acute in locations where premises have frequent driveways along both sides of the road or where the available carriageway is narrow. Each location has to be assessed individually as to its suitability.

38. However, a subtle change in the interpretation of intended use of this type of scheme by DfT now allows for a small enclosed network of roads, such as the Badger Hill estate or part thereof to be included within the zonal respark scheme.
39. Outside of the restrictions detailed above the Police Authority do have some powers to address obstruction issues. This type of offence is notoriously difficult to prove in a court of law, has very limited resources dedicated to it and is not in the direct control of the local authority. Local police should therefore not be relied upon to address persistent parking issues.
40. **Cost implications:** The capital costs for the introduction of measures so far undertaken have been the responsibility of the University. This includes the physical works, legal costs and fees for the first resident's permit (less the enforcement cost of 40%). In addition to this, the University pay separately for enforcement costs (20% fte of a Civil Enforcement Officer) and receives the income from any parking fines (less 60% administration fees).
41. Whilst a proportion of costs associated with the implementation of a scheme are picked up by the University, there are also significant costs that fall upon the Council. This includes design, feasibility studies, procurement, extensive site visits, considerable surveying work, detailed consultations and dealing with correspondence etc.
42. **Survey limitations:** The obligations of the University outlined above are only triggered once a 20% increase in traffic, directly attributable to the University can be identified. Whilst these are undertaken in a relatively timely fashion, there can be a considerable delay between when vehicles begin to park in a residential area and an adequate solution being arrived at.

Conclusion overview

43. The results of the trial would indicate that it has been partly successful in achieving its aim of removing the University related parking from those areas worst affected. Whilst there was expected to be some relocating of the problem, it appears to be at a reduced level and has been dispersed across the area. By including those currently within the Controlled Zone within (a more extensive) respark scheme, further reductions in the number of vehicles needing to relocate may be seen.

44. There is obviously now a need to address those areas that have recently become affected and this report proposes the formation of such a strategy. It should be noted however, that as the problem becomes less and is more dispersed- a level might be reached where it is neither appropriate nor proportionate to take any further action.
45. Recognition also has to be given to where the responsibilities for the University to address parking issues lie. There may be, for instance, locations where the majority of any parking issues are not related to the University's programmed development. In these instances, locations would have to be prioritised and addressed in line with the Council's policies used elsewhere in the city where the capital funding needs to be available and scheme only go ahead if the required level of support from residents is forthcoming. The responsibility for any permits would also fall upon residents in the instances.
46. To be able to address the parking issues that arise in connection to the ongoing development of the University, there needs to be a clear strategy in place. Such a strategy will allow a more expeditious response to emerging issues. Any responses do need to take a considered view and not be a 'knee-jerk' reaction to problems that may settle down.

Strategy Proposals

47. It is proposed that a strategy be drawn up following detailed consultations with the University of York and the Police Authority to provide for a more consistent approach to addressing future parking issues related to the ongoing development of the Heslington East Campus. It should be noted that this strategy will be limited to alleviating the parking problems on the adopted highway network and does not cover the range of measures that are associated with the planning conditions such as travel plans and phased development etc.
48. The proposed strategy from the detail discussions will be reported back to the Cabinet Members for approval. The strategy would be applied to all 12 zones previously identified in the planning process when/if surveys demonstrate problems directly attributable to the University (please note- the Badger Hill estate only covers two of these zones).

Analysis

49. The measures introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the previous report have been partly successful in addressing the issue of university related parking in parts of the Badger Hill estate. However, a proportion of the university related vehicles continue to park within the estate and consultation was undertaken to determine where the scheme should be extended.
50. Several areas were identified by correspondence from residents subsequent to the introduction of remedial measures in nearby locations. Whilst the number of vehicles involved appears to have diminished, there are still some residual problems attributable to university related parking. For a complete plan of the recommended action please see Appendix F.
51. Minor measures: Junction protection restrictions
Many traffic-sensitive junctions across the estate were restricted as part of the initial roll-out of the scheme and there have been calls for additional or extended restrictions. From extensive site visits and calls from residents outside the area consulted, it is apparent that vehicles continue to park in close proximity to the present restrictions on the junction of Field Lane and Sussex Road. It is therefore recommended that the present restrictions are extended to incorporate the no waiting at any time measures to prohibit vehicles from parking to the Eastfield Crescent junction also.
52. Additional restrictions could be considered at other junctions in the area although these have not been shown to be necessary at this time. Furthermore, the marking of streets within residential areas with double yellow lines is not common practice owing to their restrictive nature (especially on residents).
53. Extensive traditional parking scheme: Controlled zone
The use of a controlled zone has been seen to be an appropriate way to successfully balance the wishes of residents with the need to ensure the carriageway is usable as a main access-route for traffic. Whilst this has been the case, the minor change in DfT interpretation allows for a more suitable version of the respark scheme to be used. Rather than implementing road markings or restrictions, residents will need to self-regulate and be mindful of through traffic.

54. Whilst there have been several requests for more extensive measures on access-routes, the proposed extensions have been limited to those areas where significant levels of parking have been observed following the impact of the trial. In accordance with this, it is recommended that the zonal residents parking zone is extended to cover a greater part of the through-routes of Deramore Drive (to extend from current location and to terminate at the Vanburgh Drive junction) and to also include Yarburgh Way (to extend from current location and to terminate at Hesketh Bank junction).
55. To extend the present of recommended restrictions to cover additional areas than is recommended is not advisable at this time owing to the limited problems being experienced in these areas. Furthermore, the remaining through-routes in residential areas are more readily able to accommodate dispersed vehicles from newly restricted areas.
56. Residents parking scheme: Cul-de-sac access zones
The cul-de-sacs where residents parking have been introduced have been well received by residents. It is therefore intended to expand the areas covered by this scheme into those locations that have been adversely effected by the current trial. In addition to the current scheme, Pinewood Hill, Badger Wood Walk, Foxthorn Paddock and Hesketh Bank are recommended for inclusion into the scheme.
57. The recommended extensions to the scheme are within the zonal parameters established by University surveys and cover the main areas of concern highlighted by residents in the consultation.
58. The original report suggested that restrictions between 10.00am and 2.00pm / 3.00pm would sufficiently address the problems being faced and have less impact on residents. A full working-day restriction of 8.00am until 6.00pm was approved at the Cabinet Member's meeting in response to representations made.
59. Further consultation regarding the times of operation were recently undertaken and 87% of returned responses were in favour of maintaining the current times. The support for the times of 8.00am until 6.00pm was similarly high in both those inside (81%) and outside (92%) of the current restrictions. It is therefore recommended that this is ratified for the next phase of the trial.

60. Whilst there were some calls (10% of all responses) for other operational times to be enforced or trialled, there was minimal consensus amongst residents on which times were desirable. The suggested times ranged from a full 24hr restriction to a 10.00am until 2.00pm restriction. In line with the above recommendation, whilst the times may be more restrictive than originally proposed, there is general agreement that the current times are most favoured.
61. The trial is obviously still at an early stage having only been in operation some three months. This report recognises the need to make some amendments to the trial in light of recent experiences. There may however be additional issues that become evident as the trial continues. Schemes would normally need to be in operation for at least 12 months to fully regard any issues. There may also be a danger of reacting prematurely to an issue which could resolve itself once things settle down.
62. The purpose of the trial is to develop a robust strategy that can be adapted and extended to address any University related parking issues that are occurring. There may also be parking issues that are not attributable to the University. Such issues would be dealt with and prioritised in accordance with the Council's policies as it does elsewhere across the authority. It is vitally important that the Council work closely with the University of York to develop and appropriate and agreeable ongoing strategy.

Council Plan Priorities

63. Progressing these proposals would meet the Get York Moving Council Plan Priority – creating an effective transport system which lets people and vehicles move efficiently around the City

Implications

64. This report has the following implications:
- **Financial** – The implementation costs associated with this report are currently being met by the University of York. However, ongoing maintenance falls to CYC. Therefore there is a possible capital cost implication if works are extended beyond the University's remit.

- **Human Resources** – The proposals would involve the continued use of Civil Enforcement Officers with a potential need for an increase in presence. These proposals also need to be considered in terms of demands on Officers/ available resources for any future design/ feasibility/ implementation works
- **Crime & Disorder** - None
- **Equalities** - None
- **Legal** – None
- **Property** – None
- **Sustainability** – None

Risk Management

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

Contact Details:

Author:

Stephen Hockley
 Traffic Technician
 Network Management
 Tel: 01904 551469

Chief Officer Responsible for the Report:

Richard Wood
 Assistant Director, Strategic Planning & Transport

Report Approved

Date 2/ 8 /12

Wards Affected: Hull Road & Heslington

All

For further information please contact the author of this report.

List of Appendices:

Appendix A – Plan of original works

Appendix B – Planning conditions

Appendix C – Plan of consulted area

Appendix D – Copy of questionnaire

Appendix E – Summarised responses

Appendix F – Plan of recommended amendments

Appendix G – Outline of Petition One- Badger Wood Walk area

Appendix H – Outline of Petition Two- Sussex Road area