

**Decision Session –
Executive Member for Transport**

9th February 2021

Report of the Assistant Director of Transport, Highways and Environment

Consideration of results from the consultation on the potential implementation of Residents Priority Parking in the Revival Estate (Principal Rise, College Court, Chancellor Grove, Teachers Close, Bursary Court, Academy Drive, Scholars Court and Master Mews) .

Summary

1. To report the results following a consultation undertaken in September 2020 for the Revival Estate and the affected properties that have frontages/access onto the proposed area, then determine what action is deemed appropriate (plan of consultation area included in Annex A).

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that approval be given to take no further action towards the implementation of Residents Priority parking at this location and remove the consulted area from the Residents Parking waiting list.
Reason: The required 50% response rate has not been met.

Background

3. Following a survey undertaken by the Revival Residents Association we received a formal request from the residents association to add the Revival Estate to the waiting list for Residents Priority parking. The request was reported to the Executive Member for Transport and Planning on 19th September 2019.

4. The Executive Member gave approval to consult with residents when the area reached the top of the waiting list.
5. Masters Mews and Scholars Court are apartment blocks built as part of the development (old York College site). There are private car parking areas provided for the apartments but we understand not all have a private parking space and consequently some occupants rely on being able to park on street. Vehicle access to the apartments is accessed from Principal Rise and College Court and we consider both these apartment blocks to be part of the Revival Estate and have consulted accordingly.
6. The estate also has 12 areas of private drives that service properties in all areas of the estate (highlighted boundary plan included in Annex D). The private driveway areas would not be included in any proposed scheme. The residents of the properties serviced by the private driveways were consulted as they have access/entrance to the proposed area, just like the residents of Masters Mews and Scholars Court. These properties may already park within the area should they require it or have visitors that would need to park within the area.
7. The consultation documentation (Annex C) was hand delivered on 16th September 2020 requesting residents return their preferences on the questionnaire sheet in the freepost envelope or by email to highway.regulation@york.gov.uk by 14th October.
8. We also hand delivered a clarification letter (Annex D) regarding the private driveways on 1st October 2020 and advised residents to reply using the freepost envelope or email if this would change their original preference. We received no responses from any residents regarding the private driveways and no changes to their original preferences.
9. The consultation documentation is included within this report as:

Consultation Results (for full details see Annex E)

10. In total 359 properties were consulted and asked to return their questionnaires. The returns did not meet the required 50% response rate. The response rate received across the whole estate was 43%.

11. Traditionally, we require a response rate of 50% and the majority of those returned to be in favour.

	Total	returned	% for	% against
Principal Rise	84	40(47%)	75%	25%
Chancellor Grove	12	11(91%)	45%	55%
Teachers Close	22	11(50%)	63%	37%
Bursary Court	35	25(71%)	96%	4%
Academy Drive	41	28(68%)	82%	18%
College Court	23	11(48%)	72%	28%
Ashfield House	4	1(25%)	100%	0%
The Beeches	2	0(0%)	0%	0%
Masters Mews	88	16(18%)	37%	63%
Scholars Court	48	13(27%)	53%	47%
Results	359	156(43.4%)	71%	29%

Preferred Times of Operation(for full details see Annex E)

12. From the 156 residents who gave an opinion, 46% preferred Mon-Fri 10am to 3pm, 39% preferred Mon-Fri 9am to 5pm and 10% indicated they preferred Full Time Mon-Sunday 24 hours.
13. 10% of residents who gave a preference for a time of operation also suggested they would have preferred 'Term Time only' to have been an option for them to select.
14. The reason for 'Term Time only' or 1st September to 20th December/1st January to 10th July not being an option is because:
- i. Any signs used for these specific times and dates of operation would be very large non regulatory signs that would carry a lot of information on them.
 - ii. Each of the signs would need to be erected on 2 new columns as they would be too large to place on any existing lamp columns.
 - iii. It could lead to requests from residents for pro-rata costs of the permits they require as they would not be for a full 12months as in other Residents Priority zones.
 - iv. The signs would not be in line with the council's current policy for street clutter.

Residents Comments (see Annex E for full details)

15. The most common comment across all residents, who were for or against Residents Priority parking, suggested the problems were being caused by York College students parking on the estate during the day.

Options

16. The available options are:

- A. Take no further action at this time(recommended option)
This option is recommended because the required response rate of 50% was not achieved.
- B. Take forward the formal advertisement of the TRO process to try and get a clearer view of all residents opinion of the scheme, based on the percentage of respondents in favour (71%) of the scheme(not recommended)

This option is not recommended as the required 50% response rate was not achieved.

Council Plan-

17. The Council Plan has Eight Key Outcomes:

- Well-paid jobs and an inclusive economy
- A greener and cleaner city
- Getting around sustainably
- Good health and wellbeing
- Safe communities and culture for all
- Creating homes and world-class infrastructure
- A better start for children and young people
- An open and effective council

18. The recommended proposal contributes to the Council being open and effective as it responds to the request of the residents to solve the problems they are experiencing.

Implications

19. The report has the following implications:

Financial- If the recommended option is not agreed then the following would apply: Residents parking schemes are self-financing once in operation. The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking schemes.

Human Resources- If a scheme was implemented, enforcement would fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load.

Legal – If the recommended option is not agreed then any proposals implemented would require amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014.

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 apply.

Crime and Disorder- None

Information Technology- None

Land- None

Other- None

Risk Management- There is an acceptable level of risk with the recommended option.

Contact Details

Authors:

Geoff Holmes

Traffic Projects Officer
Highways

Tel: 01904 551475

Chief Officer responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist

Assistant Director for Transport, Highways
and Environment

Report **Date** 29.01.21
Approved

Annexes:

Annex A: Plan of Consultation Area

Annex B: Cover Letter

Annex C1, C2, C3: Consultation Documents and Questionnaire

Annex D, D1: Private Driveways Clarification Letter and Highlighted Plan

Annex E: Consultation Results

Annex F: Residents Comments