

Ambrose Street objections (x26)

We have lived on Ambrose St since 2009 one of the reasons we moved here was because of the free parking, we turned down housing opportunities on roads closer to the city. So for this reason and the reasons below we do not want you to proceed with the resurveying of Ambrose St.

We object to the resurveying of Ambrose Street for the following additional reasons:

1. The survey has already been completed and residents objected enough previously that the permit scheme has not proceeded. We have enough foresight to predict the implications of permit parking in this area.
2. This parking issue has been caused by the Frederick House development consisting of student flats. The original proposals stated that the students would not be allowed cars and this has now changed, the council should not have allowed this change of status. We as residents do not benefit from these student flats. The University and the developers: Student Roost and Summix Capital benefit from this scheme and in turn the council will benefit too.
3. Furthermore, because the University and the developers will benefit from this scheme. It should be the developers: Student Roost and Summix Capital and the University who should cover the cost of our parking permits and pay the Council. The financial pressures on our family are continuing to grow including rising energy costs, a hike in national insurance and a hike in food prices. It is unacceptable that corporate organisations and the University should be adding to this pressure at these difficult times. If you wish us to have these permits then it should only be on the condition that these organisations should cover these costs that are being unfairly put upon the residents in surrounding areas..
4. Anecdotal evidence from York residents who we have spoken to has shown that a resident's parking scheme does not automatically confer an ease on the ability to park, so we disagree with the very one sided leaflet that you sent to residents entitled Residents Parking Scheme, in fact we found the way it was presented to be one sided and coercive.
5. We can count only a couple of days this year where we have had trouble parking and this is a risk we are prepared to take when the permit parking is implemented in surrounding streets.

We want you to take all of the points above into consideration and respect our rights to maintain the current free parking on Ambrose St. If we really desired these schemes in the first place we would reach out to the council.

Annex I

I am concerned by the recently approved resident parking scheme for Alma Terrace and Alma Grove. I did not vote in the survey last time as I was unsure about a parking scheme, however I did not expect that some neighbouring streets would get resident parking and some would not. I live on Ambrose Street and am concerned that visitors and residents who do not have a permit will park on the non-permitted streets. Since the survey, the parking issue has become worse, and I am worried about the impact of the new student accommodation. I think **all** the nearby streets should have resident parking rather than just the recently approved ones. I think the streets should be re-surveyed on this issue.

I would like to object to the proposal to bring in new parking regulations in Kilburn Road, Alma Terrace and Alma Grove.

Simply put, I live in Ambrose Street and feel that if restrictions come into place in nearby streets, it will put additional pressure on those that are to remain as they are, i.e. anyone can park there.

I have lived in Ambrose Street for eight years now and have noticed over the last year that it's become more difficult to park in my own street. I'm presuming this is because a number of houses in Wenlock Terrace have been turned into flats and so the 'spill over' from there is finding its way into our street.

If, as you propose, Kilburn Road, Alma Terrace and Alma Grove is made residents' only, car drivers looking to park anywhere in the area will have those streets taken away from them, so will look to Ambrose Street and Frances Street. Hence the extra pressure for us.

You need to bring in changes to all the streets in the area or none, otherwise you are just moving the problem around.

In addition, the council is proposing to build new homes off Ordnance Lane with far fewer parking spaces than homes. I understand that you want to discourage car use (a noble goal), but you must know that a good many of the people who buy those homes will have cars. And they will have to find somewhere nearby to park them, probably in Wenlock Terrace, Ambrose Street and Frances Street.

Finally, could you make more of an effort to make your letters clearly understood? No one but you knows what the 'R20' and 'R70' schemes are. You need to explain them clearly. Also, in your letter about the proposed changes you don't say what the percentage in favour of change had to be. I'm guessing it has to be 80%, but you don't say so.

I hope you will consider this submission.

Annex I

As per your letter, that any objections should be received no later than 4th February 2022. I am therefore writing to OBJECT to the outcome of the consultation process re parking.

I live at _ Ambrose Street, which despite voting by a clear majority for the introduction of parking permits has been excluded from the scheme which will now mean that Alma Terrace, Alma Grove, and Kilburn Road will have parking permits. I presume that this is because some kind of threshold for turnout has not been reached in our streets (though the letter does not state this). There are various reasons why I do not agree with this:

1. We do not, in elections in England, deny the results of wards or constituencies on the basis of majoritarian turnout. I do not accept that that turnout should be used as a barrier to what is a clear majority democratic indication that Ambrose Street (and other streets) have indicated that they want parking permits. The use of some turnout requirement means that abstentions/non-votes are effectively vote for the status quo. This is not equitable for those that participated in the vote.

2. The treatment of each street individually denies the basic contingent and whole nature of the linked community that is made up of Alma Terrace, Alma Grove, Frances Street, Ambrose Street and Wenlock Terrace. The decision to introduce parking restrictions on only part of this community will impose negative impacts on the those living in the areas without permits, by forcing more of the pressure of parking on the neighbourhood into the unpermitted streets. And our streets are already overwhelmed with parking. This is because our streets are used as a parking lot by people seeking access to the river, by commuters who drive into York, and on weekends and during the tourist season by people driving into York and parking within walking distance of the city centre. This is compounded by the increasing number of holiday lets and AirBNB lets in our neighbourhood, as well as having a number of B&Bs, which is set to increase with the opening of the "The Vices" hotel on Alma Terrace (I assume their guests will park on my street). It is routinely difficult to park.

3. The decision to only partly issue permits is also contrary to the overall intention to reduce car usage in York—something which I support. To understand this, what also needs to be taken into consideration is the development of a large amount of private student accommodation on Fulford Road on the site of the North Yorkshire Police station (just over the road from here), and also the new Hospital Fields housing development. Both of these are, quite understandably, being developed without substantial parking for environmental sustainability reasons. However, students with cars will bring them to York, and seek to park them where free parking is available. And—and this is the part I think really needs attention—the plans for the development of the Hospital Fields site will involve the use of the back lane of Ambrose Street for site access. What this will do is remove the current walls/fences that mean that from Ambrose Street you cannot *currently* easily access the streets in the Hospital Fields area and vice versa. But that will change with the site development. I attach a map from your own planning department that shows this (I have added the arrows to show where access will occur). In order for housing development that does not provide parking to be successful in reducing car ownership in York it is also necessary to ensure that adjacent areas do not have easily accessed free parking. Yet this is precisely what will occur if you persist without introducing permits to the whole of the area in the consultation.

Annex I

Continued

4. On numerous occasions this year, parking has not been available in Ambrose Street or any of the surrounding streets. As a consequence people have been parking illegally. But what alternative do they have? From this area of Fishergate there is no nearby alternative parking. People with family or caring responsibilities especially need to be able to park near where they live. The decision to not issue some of the houses in our community with permits, while allowing others to have permits, discriminates in favour of those living especially on Alma Grove and Alma Terrace, and Kilburn Road.

I therefore conclude that the decision to exclude Ambrose Street, Frances Street, and Wenlock Terrace from the permit scheme should be reversed immediately, hence my objection.

I would quite happily meet with you or any of your team, or any of the local councillors, in my neighbourhood to discuss this with you. It might help, perhaps, to see the problems (and foreseeable future problems) in person.

I am a resident on Ambrose Street and voted for ResPark on my street. I would like to request for Ambrose Street to be resurveyed for ResPark as I have heard that a lot of the residents on Ambrose Street have changed their mind, as their situations have changed since Alma Terrace and Alma Grove have been approved for the Resident Parking Scheme and would like to have residents parking now.

I just wanted to send an email regarding the parking permits around the Fulford area, in particular Ambrose Street.

At the time of the survey I didn't live in the street and would like to have my say.

It would be great if Ambrose Street and the streets nearby could be considered for permit parking please.

I am objecting to the partial approval of the resident parking in my neighborhood.

Please may I have answers to some questions.

Did your survey sufficiently reflect the residential choice of those two streets?

Was the survey accessible in a timely way and transparent to all neighbors?

What effort was taken to ensure people are well informed before making their choices and of what consequences?

Kindly provide evidence.

I am saddened by a decision that could be divisive! Should we not be encouraging more good neighborhoods?

So either we all get ResPark or not at all!

You could of course do the survey again with due consideration.

Annex I

I am writing as an Ambrose St resident who voted in favour of ResPark parking permits. It is simply not feasible for us to not have permits whilst other streets near us do (Alma Terrace and Grove), and I was not aware this was even a possibility. Visitors to those streets and residents who don't want to pay for parking will be using our non-permit street for parking (and parking is already a major and steadily-worsening problem). This is completely untenable.

This changed situation of the imposition of ResPark on some streets but not others requires a new survey please as it is vital all area streets are considered together for this to work.

Please can I request that Ambrose St is re-surveyed regarding resident parking scheme. If Alma Terrace and Alma Grove have a scheme in place and the other nearby streets don't then the availability of parking for residents in those streets will become worse than it is now. I don't think anyone thought that some streets would get scheme and others wouldn't, which is why there was a low response rate on some streets.

We own 2 properties on Ambrose Street- _and _ and we're unhappy with the outcome of the resident parking street vote.

We voted against it and didn't expect that some streets would get ResPark and others wouldn't, which will make the upcoming situation even worse.

I think there should be a re-survey. Please let us know.

I wish to register my objection to making only Alma Terrace a resident parking zone.

I'm sure this will just put pressure on all the adjoining streets, Frances Street and Ambrose Street. These streets are already clogged with cars from people who park and walk off to another area!

I understand that an inadequate response was received to the previous survey, given this decision was based on poor response, I feel you should resurvey as the situation has changed since then.

Annex I

Me and my partner recently learned that the Resident Parking Scheme will not be introduced on Ambrose Street.

We wish for the decision to introduce a Parking Scheme on our street be reconsidered as so far it was extremely difficult to park on the street, especially during late evenings and during nice summer days when everyone is going for a walk by the river. Introduction of the scheme on only a few streets can increase the chances that there will be no parking on Ambrose Street and there is no space anywhere else in the close neighbourhood.

Please reconsider your decision, or resurvey our street, as I am aware that the majority of residents are concerned about the availability of parking spaces on Ambrose Street.

I am writing as a resident and home owner on Ambrose Street because I am concerned to hear that Alma Terrace and Alma Grove are to be given Resident Parking permits, but Frances Street, Ambrose Street and Carey Street are not.

It's extremely difficult to find spaces for parking already, and this will cause it to be even worse, as people can simply park where there isn't a permit in our street.

The reason is I believe that less than half responded to the survey, although a majority of people who did respond wanted a permit scheme.

I think we need to re run the survey in order to get the required number of residents to respond to get a usable response.

I personally had no idea that some streets might get ResPark and others wouldn't which is quite a different proposition.

I would personally be invested in going round to local residents and knocking on doors in order to get people to respond with their opinion, whatever that might be.

I'm writing to you as a concerned resident on Ambrose Street. I am surprised that Alma Terrace/Grove have been given ResPark yet neighbouring streets of Carey Street/Frances Street/Ambrose Street have not. It's already very difficult to park on Ambrose Street in the evenings so I can only imagine this situation worsening. There may also be increased demand as visitors to Alma Terrace/Grove May park on one of the three streets not chosen for ResPark, as well as the new student development on Fulford Road. I think it would make sense for all 5 of these streets to be given ResPark, rather than just the 2.

Annex I

I am surprised and hugely disappointed that whilst Ambrose Street had a majority a resident parking system has not been approved. I did not expect some streets to get it such as Alma Terrace and Alma Grove but Ambrose street did not. With the latest decision I strongly believe that we should get one based on both the majority vote gained and the fact that the variable resident parking was unknown at the time of the vote and will lead to everyone will now parking on this street.

I see that resident parking failed to be adopted on Ambrose Street where I live. I voted in favour of the scheme as parking has become a major problem with people parking here and walking into town or over to Rowntree park. I didn't expect that some streets would get ResPark and others wouldn't. As the two neighbouring streets will get the scheme, the parking situation on Ambrose Street will only get worse. Therefore please could you reconsider the status of Ambrose Street or at the very least, arrange another vote as the availability of parking for residents has become increasingly worse over the past year.

I have been made aware that Alma Terrace and Alma Grove have been approved for a Resident Parking Scheme recently and the neighbouring streets haven't. I live on Ambrose Street and the parking situation currently has been getting increasingly worse since the original vote took place. There have been countless times that I have had to park on another street far from my house, especially in the evenings. I didn't expect that some streets would get ResPark and others wouldn't so I think we should all get it, as it will only make the situation worse for the neighbouring streets that don't currently have the ResPark scheme approved.

Annex I

I am writing with regard to the proposal to introduce a Residents' Priority Parking Zone (R70) for Alma Terrace and Alma Grove (and Kilburn Road).

As a resident of Ambrose Street I have concerns that this will further worsen the parking situation on Ambrose Street, Frances Street, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace where the available parking spaces are already close to capacity usage; particularly on evenings and weekends. There are limited spaces available on Fulford Road, which I have had to use at times. If the situation remains as presently proposed, we would be completely surrounded by residents priority parking zones – where would residents park if all spaces were taken?

The introduction of the R70 zone doesn't require residents of Alma Terrace and Alma Grove to purchase a parking permit and some could decide to park on the neighbouring streets instead (currently) for free.

Whilst I appreciate the % of returned surveys was lower from Ambrose Street, Frances Street, etc than from Alma Terrace, Alma Grove and Arncliffe Mews, none of the streets achieved a 50% response rate, which used to be the minimum trigger point for taking action. All streets had a majority of respondents in favour of introducing residents priority parking. I'm struggling to understand how the student accommodation being built off Fulford Road, one of the main drivers for the survey, can be deemed to impact those streets included in the proposal and not our neighbouring streets which are going to be impacted in the same way. This is also before taking into account any impact from the Hospital Fields development.

I have estimated that there are a maximum of 203 spaces available across Ambrose Street (82), Carey Street (17), Frances Street (74) and Wenlock Terrace (30). This assumes all cars park efficiently, making best use of the space, which with the best will in the world never happens! Looking at parking this morning, I'd estimate a minimum of a 5% reduction on spaces due to spacing of cars parked in Ambrose and Frances, losing 8-10 spaces. So, say, **195 spaces available**.

Based on your numbers of residences included in the original vote results there are **333 residences** directly using these spaces; this includes Holly Terrace but not New Walk Terrace. It also doesn't allow for any overspill from Alma Terrace.

There will obviously be a proportion of properties that are not car owners, however there will equally be some properties with multiple cars. Then allowing for visitors, commuters, dog walkers and others heading to the riverside, being used as free parking for people heading into the city centre, tradespeople etc, I'm sure you see how the problems arise.

The original proposal voted on takes on a different perspective now Alma Terrace and Alma Grove are having residents parking introduced. Additionally due to the number of rental properties in the area, there will be a proportional turnover of residents since the previous survey was conducted.

I voted in favour of the original proposals, however allowing for all of the above, I ask for residents to be re-surveyed on whether residents priority parking should be introduced in Ambrose Street, Frances Street, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace.

Annex I

I am writing to object to the proposed resident parking scheme which will cover Alma Grove, Alma Terrace and Kilburn Road.

I am a resident of the neighbouring Ambrose street and voted in favour of the parking zone to apply to our street. Unfortunately, due to a lack of people responding to the survey on my road, the proposal was rejected as it didn't meet the minimum response level.

Given that the Alma Grove, Alma Terrace, Frances street and Ambrose street are all interconnected, i believe they should be treated as one entity and the scheme should either apply to all or none of the streets. Leaving some of these streets not covered by the scheme will make it extremely difficult for us to park.

I also believe that residents of Ambrose Street are being unfairly unrepresented due to the growing number of HMOs, student lets and Airbnb/holiday lets. These properties are unlikely to have voted in the survey and hence are the reason why the minimum response level was not reached. This negatively impacts on the remaining home owners of the street whose responses are overturned by the inaction of others.

I am resident at 23 Ambrose Street and should like to you to re-consider the decision to omit Ambrose Street, Francis Street, Carey Street, Wenlock Terrace et al. The pressure on parking for residents in these streets is already considerable and can only become increasingly problematic once neighbouring streets are granted residents' parking and proposed developments e.g, Ordnance Lane Project; Student Accommodation (visitors to Fulford Road site); visitors to those streets which have residents' parking; those residents in parking restricted areas who do not wish to pay using free streets to park. Ambrose Street is particularly attractive to visiting motorists as it is wide, allows easy access to the river walk, Rowntree Park and the city Centre. The pressure has increased during recent months and it becomes increasingly difficult during Spring/Summer/Autumn and school holiday times. The more residents' parking streets in our vicinity the more traffic will move to the few remaining free areas. Not only is the issue an inconvenience but has safety issues also as parking is so tight it can be difficult to manoeuvre vehicles, especially at night.

I am assuming that the decision was influenced by the results of the ballot. Despite the low returns by some residents in these streets, the % in favour was generally higher than 50% . The problem with parking has certainly worsened since the date of the ballot. Some of the low returns may also be accounted for by student residents/landlord lettings who have no vested interest in expressing any opinion. I understand reluctance to pay to park on your street of residence , especially if your household has more than one vehicle but do not think that is the main reason for the low return of surveys.

I would ask you to seriously consider extending the scheme to all streets whose residents had a majority in favour or introducing another ballot (a costlier, time-consuming option) .

Annex I

I object to the introduction of Residents parking in Alma Terrace and Alma Grove because:-

The analyses of the replies fails to take account of the number of houses in multiple occupation in Ambrose Street that were probably empty when the survey was done and also did not take account of the number of holiday letting properties, similarly empty at time of survey.

Parking is getting worse as time goes on. There is a total disregard for double yellow lines in the area now, never mind when parking increases due to the proposals in Alma Terrace and Alma Grove.

I hope you are having a good day and this email finds you well.

I am writing to you regarding the recent development on resident parking that has only been approved for Alma Terrace and Alma Grove.

As some context, I am one of several students that live in accommodation on Ambrose street, where a few of us own cars and struggle on a daily basis trying to find a place to park due to the overwhelming number of cars that park on the street.

By allowing only some streets residential parking, you have forced visitors to park on streets that are already struggling to fit their own cars. An example of this is the many occasions I have come out and found people parking on double yellow lines because there is genuinely no space nearby. Now whilst it might not always be an issue for students, I can completely understand and back the concerns of the residents on the street. This decision disregards the reasons why people may want to park on the street closer to their homes, not all of our disabilities are visible, but some people may struggle to walk long lengths to get to their homes.

Another reason for your decision was writing about the new fulford accomodation allowing parking for visitors elsewhere. When will this actually be made available? Do residents on surrounding streets from Alma terrace and Alma Grove have to wait for their own street to have more parking? Some of these people have lived here for years and yet are being made to wait for accomodation to open, so they can get a car space back. I think this is incredibly unfair to the residents of Fulford.

I have lived on this street for several months now and have had to make the decision to move out after my degree, mainly based on the fact that finding parking will not cease to be difficult until it is either made residential or remains how it is, unchanged.

I voted previously on making all street parking in the area residential. I remember the post coming through at a very quiet period last year and this could be the result of less people voting on their rights for residential parking. Since the survey was done, we have received even more volumes of cars parking on Ambrose street. I implore you to relook into the upcoming resident scheme, and allow a re-survey for the residents to take part in. We can't allow some streets their own residential parking and disregard the rest of the residents that live here.

Annex I

I have received notification that Residents Parking is to be introduced on Alma Terrace and Alma Grove but not on Ambrose Street and that you must receive objections by 4th February to re-consider this decision.

I am fortunate as I rent one of the newer houses on Ambrose Street and, therefore, have a parking space behind my house.

However, I can rarely use this as someone has taken to parking there as they cannot park in the road. The number of properties that are still HMOs (student accommodation) is declining in number due to the increasing number of properties being built by the university so you would think that the road would be quieter car-wise, but this is not the case and lockdown made no significant difference to the number of cars being parked.

The new flats going up near the Police Station on Fulford Road could contribute to the number of cars parked on nearby side streets if insufficient parking has been set aside on the grounds round the flats (which appears to be a common development issue). Additionally, one of the problems is the redeveloped houses on Wenlock Terrace being converted into flats with car ownership by the residents being a probability. Where there may have been one car per house previously there is a potential for five+ cars per converted house (I believe each house has been divided into five flats) - when there is no room on Wenlock Terrace for these additional vehicles to be parked. I have been told that a condition of residency was that no cars were owned but I fail to see how this can, logically, be enforced with the reduction in police numbers - and I haven't seen a traffic warden in this area in years!

In an age when we are supposed to be taking dramatic steps to improve the environment introducing Residents Parking on the neighbouring streets to Alma Terrace would go some way to reducing the number of vehicles on the road (particularly if the permit was for one vehicle per household) - it might make new residents think carefully before moving in but enforcement would be necessary.

I would ask you seriously reconsider your decision.

I would like to request that our area is resurveyed in relation to the Resident Parking Scheme.

I did not expect some streets in the area to be accepted for the scheme and others not as this will surely result in the parking on Ambrose Street to be even worse. I frequently already struggle to park on my own street. I worry visitors to the permitted streets will now simply park on the non-permitted streets.

I failed to vote previously but my situation has changed so I would like to be resurveyed.

Please reconsider the decision.

Annex I

Following receipt of the consultation results for the resident parking survey in Fishergate and decision to only progress resident parking restrictions on Alma Terrace and Alma Grove I was dismayed to see the poor survey response from Ambrose Street and would like to raise my objection to the scheme proposed to Alma Grove / Terrace and would hope that all the surveys be carried out again for the following reasons.

The survey was carried out at an especially quiet time. One positive by-product of the covid pandemic was the fact that students were studying remotely and away from campus, resulting in far less of the large number of student rental properties on Ambrose Street being occupied. For the last 2 years parking on Ambrose Street has been markedly improved during the pandemic. Permanent residents have been able to park on their own street, rather than parking on neighbouring streets or illegally.

Following the relaxation of restrictions and opening up of Britain, teaching on campus has resumed and since the new semester in Sept 2021 the availability of parking on Ambrose Street and Frances Street has deteriorated. For the last two evenings I have had to park on double yellows on a neighbouring street.

I believe had the survey been carried out now, and not after 18 months of parking with ease, due to the pandemic, I believe the survey response rate would have been far greater and with more votes in favour of residents parking.

It must also be noted that the large number of temporary residents and students are unlikely to respond to the survey as they have no vested or long term interest and even less likely to be in favour of paying for parking restrictions. A large number of vehicles arrive in September, do not move and only leave at the end of semester. You can always tell it is outside of term time because you can get parked on your street with relative ease.

We are also concerned that those residents on Alma Grove / Terrace who are unwilling to pay for permits, will instead look to park two streets away, adding yet more pressure on neighbouring streets. Further pressure will also be added by the new student residences currently under construction on the old Fredrick House site, Fulford Road.

I am sure I will not be the only permanent resident to feel this way and hope the Council will review this objection and those lodged by others and consider re-consulting with residents.

Annex I

My partner and I are homeowners at _ Ambrose St. where the resident parking scheme was not accepted. We object to some of the streets on our block being resident streets and others not. We already have horrific parking conditions on Ambrose Street. Especially on the weekends and at night.

We have 2 young children and are not the only ones with young children on Ambrose Street. ferrying them back and forth to the car on another street trying to unload my groceries is unacceptable and it happens now frequently. Plus people who don't live on Ambrose get nasty toward us when we are trying to park and I have had a woman yell at me with the kids in the back of the car to get out of her way.

Changing some of these streets to resident parking and others leaving for tourists to park and walk into town on the river is not a good idea. It will mean that people who live on Ambrose Street will be left without a place to park at all. *What do you expect me to do when there is no parking on Ambrose or Francis Street? There are no other streets around which we can park without being a resident! What do you expect my 2-year-old to do? Walk a mile to get home while I carry all of the bags from nursery and his brother's things too?*

We absolutely object to some of the streets having a resident scheme and others not. It is not only unfair, but it is making the lives of people on Ambrose St. and those that did not get the scheme much harder for no good reason. Either all of us should get the scheme or none of us and we stay in the parking hell we are already in.

Please could I get a real person to email me and not a form letter so that I know someone has actually read these arguments and taken them onboard?