

ANNEX A

DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION

The draft Order was prompted by decisions taken at the meeting with Executive Member for Transport in August 2020 where it was resolved:

- (i) That the principle that all future zones and extensions in the South Bank area be designated R58.
- (ii) That the principle that the qualification area for properties in ResPark may be set wider than just the frontagers to the controlled streets.
- (iii) That further consultation be undertaken to amend Zone boundaries of R6, R36, R54, R57 and R58 with a view to providing a more equal scheme for all residents.
- (iv) That further consultation, in the sections of streets identified in Annex E, be undertaken to identify what parking measures should be applied at this time.
- (v) That a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) be made to bring the following streets into Residents' Parking Zone R58:

- Bishopthorpe Road (where not already in the zone) between Southlands Road and Terry's Mews;
- Rectory Gardens (by Area signage);
- Balmoral Terrace;
- Albemarle Road between odd numbers 15 and number 69 (inclusive)
- (by Area signage) and
- Philadelphia Terrace.

Set out below is a summary of the responses, issues and comments received in respect of the published Draft Traffic Regulation Order (by section of street).

1. Bishopthorpe Road between Southlands Road and Nunthorpe Drive. This is the first section of street (traveling south from York) not included in a ResPark scheme. This covers the west side, only odd numbers 105 to 125 (inclusive). The main feature of this section is the bus stop which sits to the front of number 111 Bishopthorpe Road which is protected by a marked 'box'. As the proposal is for Parking Area controls there is no need for any additional on street road markings.

2. Bishopthorpe Road between Nunthorpe Drive and South Bank Avenue. The east side of this section of street is also currently within R58. The proposed extension would include odd numbers 127 (The Winning Post) to 145 (inclusive). The main feature of this section is, also a bus stop which sits to the front of number 145 Bishopthorpe Road and which is protected by a marked 'box'. As the proposal is for Parking Area controls there is no need for any additional on street road markings with exception as follows. The proposals would see the three-car-length section to the front of the Winning Post set out as ResPark but also as a Parking Bay where non-permit holders can obtain 'Pay-by-Phone' tickets to park. The intention is to provide some level of visitor parking space for local premises. The spaces would operate as such between 09:00 and 18:00 Monday-Sunday.

3. Bishopthorpe Road between South Bank Avenue and Balmoral Terrace.

The east side of this section of street is also currently within R58. The proposed extension would include odd numbers 155 to 173 (inclusive). The main feature on this section is, also a bus stop which sits to the front of number 169 Bishopthorpe Road and which is not currently protected by

markings. As the proposal is for Parking Area controls there is no need for any additional on street road markings.

4. Rectory Gardens (by Area signage).

Rectory Gardens has 24 properties, each has some off street parking. We received 16 responses to the original (Feb 2020) consultation out of which 14 household indicated support for the introduction of a ResPark. Given the limited width of the carriageway it is not possible to mark parking bays in Rectory Gardens. It is, in fact, not possible to park anywhere on street without partly blocking the carriageway or the footway. For this reason we intend to include the street in the wider R58 zone. This would allow residents from Rectory Gardens to occasionally park on Bishopthorpe Road. Clearly, the reverse would also be the case that Bishopthorpe Road residents might park in Rectory Gardens. It is considered inclusion in the scheme would be better than not bringing in controls or having to apply further parking restrictions (yellow lines) within Rectory Gardens.

We received three objections from residents.

a) Unless we get our own zone the residents parking will be pointless and we will see no benefit.
b) I consider the additional hassle/cost of having to purchase resident/visitor permits outweighs any small benefit from the proposal. In particular considering all houses have off road parking available.
c) The main problem we have in the street is people parking on Rectory Gardens, who actually live on Bishopthorpe Road or other sectors of Zone. This causes obstruction for

vehicles (and) this obviously restricts pedestrian access.

5. Bishopthorpe Road between Balmoral Terrace and Campleshon Road.

Neither side of this section is currently within any ResPark Zone. The extension would include odd numbers 175 to 211 (inclusive) and even numbers 230 to 270 (inclusive). Along the west side there is a General Practitioner's Surgery on the corner with Balmoral Terrace. This also accommodates a Bus Stop (without shelter or 'Box'). There is a Pedestrian Crossing with traffic island at the southern end of this section (near Campleshon Road). There is, regularly, parking on both sides of this section of Bishopthorpe Road. Given the nature of the street and limited width of carriageway this results in pavement parking occurring. There is potential to accommodate parking on both sides by marking bays which would need to be part on the pavement on the west side. The aim would be to leave a minimum of 1.8m of footway. Although not an ideal situation, this would allow parking bays to be marked out on both sides. The detail of this would need to be checked at each point along the street. The alternatives would be:

- To create a Parking Area (signs both ends and no markings);
- To mark bays on the east side and introduce waiting restrictions on the west side for much of the length of this section;
- To introduce Single Yellow Lines; banning AM parking one side and PM parking the other or
- To leave this section out of ResPark controls.

We received three objections from residents. Initial plan needed clarification and a revision was issued to all those affected.

a) Loosing even one parking space from this stretch of road currently can mean parking up to 15 minutes' walk away from the house. Better to retain parking, marked on the road on both sides, and control traffic flow.
b) Initial plan needs clarification; objection not removed after clarification sent to all homes.
c) Initial plan needed clarification; then I would support having a limited ResPark area on Bisby Road, 9-5 Monday-Friday, to keep commuters and shoppers from outside from taking up residents' spaces, but OK for things like family visitors, friends, etc., on nights and weekends.

6. Balmoral Terrace between Bishopthorpe Road and Montague Street. This has terraced, residential properties both sides. There is a General Practitioner's Surgery on the corner with Bishopthorpe Road and a Bus Stop near number 18 on the south side. There is potential for some three cars to park to the front of numbers 1, 3, 5 & 7 without causing obstruction. There is potential for some three cars to park to the front of numbers 2-18 (evens) without causing obstruction. It is, therefore, proposed that this section of street be brought into ResPark control 24/7 (using bay markings). Non-permit holders would be allowed an hour parking, to address the needs of the Surgery.

We received three objections from residents

a) Reduce hours to 8-6 Mon to Fri
b) Change signage to reduce clutter. Reduce hours to 8-6 Mon to Fri

c) With Questions; answers since supplied

7. Balmoral Terrace between Montague Street and Trafalgar Street. This has terraced, residential properties both sides. There is unmarked parking both sides of this section. There is little evidence of pavement parking. As agreed, at Exec, the draft Order includes a Parking Area (no marked bays) along this section.

We received four objections from residents.

a) On the ground of cost to residents...this is a significant extra cost to our family. I have had very infrequent problems finding parking on Balmoral Terrace and do not believe residents' parking is in the interests of all residents.

b) I have never not been able to park close to the house and this creates problem for visitors and trades people. It also just pushes more congestion onto adjacent roads creating issues for other residents. Plus the council tax is high enough without having more cost added to us. The main reason for residents parking is because it is an area where people park for other reasons e.g. Bishopthorpe Rd for the shops and therefore residents can't park. This is not a factor at Balmoral Terrace.

c) These schemes are very hit and miss, I have lived (elsewhere) where parking zones exist and it was still sometimes impossible to find a parking space. A new parking zone will only push the non-resident cars further down towards the Knavesmire and onto

the already dangerous Bishy Road curve adjacent to the Chocolate Works. Cost is very unwelcome. It is an extra cost I could do without. Will affect parking for local businesses.

- d) Never had an issue with finding a parking space here since getting my car, other than when large events are held at the Racecourse, a handful of times a year. I feel the events are not grounds to financially penalise residents, and parking issues during these events could be handled in another fairer way.

8. Balmoral Terrace between Trafalgar Street and Count de Burgh Terrace.

This has terraced, residential properties on the north side and business premises on the south side. There is unmarked parking both sides of this short section. As with the other end of Balmoral Terrace it is proposed that this section of street be brought into ResPark control 24/7 (using bay markings). Non-permit holders would be allowed an hour parking to address the needs of the businesses.

No objections were received; one comment below.

- a) Displacement leading to more inconsiderate parking on other streets. These roads are constantly full of cars down both sides, it will result in cars and vans struggling to get down this street causing more congestion. I have already seen delivery drivers on several occasions getting stuck part way down the street due to poorly parked cars and having to reverse back.

9. Bishopthorpe Road south of Campleshon Road

The proposals have received one objection which also raises several issues.

a) A change to address a specific issue is being made that fails to address the complex issues as an integrated whole. A number of our neighbours were impacted - and this change will add to their parking issues. Creating this ResPark area as an extension of the existing R58 makes it an even more linear zone, (with two small extraterritorially managed patches to the West). A very large but linear ResPark zone exaggerates the disadvantages for those who live at the very edge of that zone. The extension of Residents Parking South of the Terry's entrance would improve parking access for residents as well as providing the above safety benefits. The population density in this new area must be vastly higher than anywhere else in the R58 zone

b) Also comments that, in this narrow case it could at least involve extending the ResPark Zone parking spaces further South than the Terrys entrance, (thus encouraging some parking on both sides of the Road at all times), and offsetting those spaces creating a chicane to help dampen traffic speeds through the area at all times. [Restricting casual parking, as proposed, at staggered times on opposite sides, will prevent all day parking and increase the chances of speeding in and out of that section. all homes. The area needs an integrated highways management plan that reflects the changes, and increased risks, in the area over the last 6

years. Traffic flow in the rush hour is not congested in the immediate area around the Terry's entrance, it may be an issue near Campleshon Road. The current all day parking has the advantage of slowing traffic moving in and out of the area. The proposed change will increase speed by removing the existing chicane effect of that parking

10. Albemarle Road between odd numbers 15 to 37B (inclusive).

This section has residential properties on the northeast side of the road with parking on that side. Knavesmire stry fronts the southeast side; parking here is controlled by Double Yellow lines. Many of the residents on this section signed the early petition.

11. It should be recognised that the Ovington Cricket Club building (on Little Knavesmire) has a frontage to this section of Albemarle Road with pedestrian access from it. Members and visitors have parked along Albemarle Road for many years. The impact of any agreed scheme on their Club should be considered.

12. Albemarle Road between odd numbers 15 to 37B (inclusive) alternative.

As mentioned, Knavesmire stry fronts the southeast side of this section and parking here is controlled by Double Yellow lines. One proposal discussed was to swap the available parking from in front of numbers 15 to 25 (odd) Albemarle Road to the west (Stray) side of the road. To this end we have included, in the draft proposals, deleting the Double Yellow lines on the Stray side and provide continuous Double Yellow lines along the frontage of 15 to 25 (odd) Albemarle Road. This would provide more parking overall and improve inter-visibility for vehicles travelling along Albemarle Road. This parking would be adjacent to a footway. The new section of available 'single-side' parking would be some 76m in length. The

carriageway width here varies between 5.75m and 6.75m. Although in the same draft Order the two proposals (residents parking & changes to the 'No waiting at any time' restrictions) are listed separately and a comment/decision on one proposal will not affect the other proposal.

13. Albemarle Road between odd numbers 39 and 69 (inclusive). This section also has residential properties on the northeast side of the road with parking on that side. Knavesmire Stray fronts the southeast side; parking here is controlled by Double Yellow lines. Single sided parking works adequately here even though the carriageway width is slightly less than the section of single-sided parking to the front of 15 to 37 (odd). As agreed, at Exec, the draft Order includes control by a Parking Area (no marked bays) along this section. As usual, residents fronting this section would be all in Zone R58 and be able to obtain Permits.

14. A number of the concerns expressed by residents relate to the proposal that the qualification boundary (for those who can obtain permits) would extend further down the street than the on street restrictions. The general response (from those with restrictions proposed to their fronts) is that this will change the dynamic of parking to the detriment of most residents.

a) 'to the idea that people living along our road but outside the respark area, can buy permits to park in the respark zone. In short, we could well end up in the same position we were in before – i.e. struggling to park - but now having to pay for the privilege!! It will not go down well.'

b) 'Concerned about one issue that residents outside the designated area would be able to purchase permits. If the scheme goes ahead it should surely be to allow the residents of Albemarle Road and Philadelphia Terrace to park outside their homes.'

c) 'For those of us who live here and are willing as a group to pay for parking permits, it seems only fair that we should in the future be able to park close to our doors. It's likely that people living further down the road will soon realise that they too should be included in the scheme. Up until now the issue has clearly been much worse for those of us who live at this end of the road. There is a very limited capacity at this end of the terrace, and surely that needs to be taken into consideration when thinking about selling parking permits to those living beyond no. 69.'

d) 'There has never been a problem with the parking and a scheme of this nature will only cause problems between residents in the future

e) 'The Cricket Pavilion, that fronts the west side of this section, has a long established use with a need for visitors to park on street. If ResPark is introduced they suggest that the new scheme be limited to 9am to 5pm on weekdays in the same way as the Scarcroft Hill area. They also ask about the possibility of including a small number of parking places in the scheme, with a longer time limit, perhaps two hours? They suggest only one or two cars at any time.

f) 'The Allotments front either side of Albemarle Road, just north of this section. They ask that the scheme include 'one or even two hour parking slots available, or to restrict the ResPark hours to weekday working hours?' They also ask 'if it would be possible to provide temporary parking permits that allotment tenants could use?'

15. Albemarle Road between odd numbers 71 and 109 (inclusive).

This section also has residential properties on the northeast side of the road with parking on that side. Knavesmire Stray fronts the southeast side; parking here is controlled by Double Yellow lines. Single sided parking works adequately here. A key aspect of the proposed approach to the 'border' here as opposed to the treatment elsewhere in York is the suggested soft boundary. As above, residents fronting this section would be all in Zone R58 and be able to obtain Permits to park.

a) Writer concludes that 'this is to prompt complaints so the zone is extended to the whole of Albemarle Road, or to encourage all residents to purchase permits without the council actually having to manage the entire street.'

b) 'to any Residents' Priority Parking at all on Albemarle Road. ' glad your proposal stops at no 71 but it would be even better if there was none at all.'

c) 'against the introduction of any resident parking permit scheme on Albemarle Road. Although the scheme is not proposed to be introduced outside our property, it is strongly felt that it will cause a severe impact on our ability to park for free and on Albemarle Road and will push a parking problem onto us that we do not deserve or need. To restate, we have no parking problems currently.'

d) 'The proposed Res Park in its current form, will have detrimental consequences for the residents of 73-129 (odd) Albemarle Road and for many of the people living on the free-parking roads beyond - and not improve the situation significantly for the residents of 39-71 (odd).'

e) 'thinks we should control our tendency to assume ownership of the public road in front of our property, beyond reasonable convenience. Weekdays 9am to 5pm restriction and 30min short stay, and no restrictions weekends, would an amenable way of sharing this public area. I would also prefer the whole length of Albemarle Road be included in whatever scheme was settled upon.'

f) 'it does not seem right that a whole street is affected by the desire of a few to have "control" of a stretch of road over which they have no call. Because the available roadside here is less than the total length of cars wanting to park, it will mean that even if everyone bought a permit, there would still be no space to park.'

g) 'to the proposed ResPark on Albemarle Rd & Philadelphia Terrace says 'it is not needed or wanted; not needed because many of the original petitioners have off-street parking & have since had double yellow lines clearing their drive entrances; not wanted as only 37% (21 out of 57) of households in the proposed ResPark area voted in favour during the consultation. In the area where permits are being offered, this reduces to 16% (25 out of 154 households).

h) 'It seems to me that the residents who proposed these changes are those with off street parking who objected to people parking in front of their driveways. The residents who have to park on the street and subsequently have to pay for a residents permit, will be funding the regulations which will benefit the residents who won't require a permit. Unfair!'

16. Albemarle Road between odd numbers 109 and 129 (inclusive) and between even numbers 36 and 54 (inclusive).

This section also has residential properties on both sides and parking occurs on both sides of the street. Again, a key aspect of the proposed approach to the 'border' here as opposed to the treatment elsewhere in York is the suggested soft boundary. As above, residents fronting this section would be all in Zone R58 and be able to obtain permits to park.

17. Philadelphia Terrace This street has residential properties on both sides. Parking is available on the south side. Parking on its north side is controlled by Double Yellow lines. As agreed, at Exec, the draft Order includes control, by a Parking Area, of the available space in Philadelphia Terrace. If agreed residents fronting both sides would be all in Zone R58 and be able to obtain Permits to park.

a) 'on the basis that we do not feel we ever have the challenge of finding a parking space nearby our property and feel that this proposal would only serve to prevent visitors or tradespeople easily accessing our property. Additionally having to pay to park on our own road where we previously had no problems with accessing a parking space does not feel fair, especially when many currently have financial struggles.'

b) 'despite the council's addition of extra (unnecessary) double yellow lines in the area to seemingly make parking more difficult for residents and to support the unwanted Sports Centre now in place at Millthorpe School, there remain no obvious parking problems within the street as residents are all prepared to 'give and take' on the matter

and park accordingly. They strongly object to the imposition of an on street parking charge that will in no way guarantee a parking space for (my) vehicle. This appears to be simply another money making exercise by the council to increase revenue from car owners with no clear benefits to residents.'

18. Coggan Close

The available parking within Cogan Close is in private courts. These would not be controlled under ResPark. In a similar way to those living south of 69 Albemarle Road, all residents living in Cogan Close would be in Zone R58 and be able to obtain Permits to park on street.

South Bank Report 22nd June 2021