



## **Decision Session: Executive Member for Transport 19 April 2021**

Report to the Corporate Director of Economy and Place Directorate

### **Consideration of representations received to the advertised R69 Residents Priority Parking Scheme for Principal Rise, Masters Mews, Scholars Court, College Court, Ashfield House, The Beeches, Bursary Court, Teachers Close and Chancellor Grove (Revival Estate).**

#### **Summary**

1. To consider the formal representations received to the legal Traffic Regulation Order, advertised on the 22 October 2021, to implement a new Residents Priority Parking Scheme to include Principal Rise, Masters Mews, Scholars Court, College Court, Ashfield House, The Beeches, Bursary Court, Teachers Close and Chancellor Grove (Revival Estate)

#### **Recommendation**

2. The Executive Member is asked to:
  - a. Recommended that, at the current time, approval be given to uphold the objections received and take no further action in relation to the advertised R69 Residents Priority Parking Scheme.

**Reason:** Due to the objections received and impact that this will have on a number of residents of the area combined with the survey results which show that college parking is having a limited impact on parking levels on the estate.

- b. Add the Revival Estate to the 2022 Annual Review of Traffic Restrictions.

**Reason:** Due to the representations made in relation to safety of pedestrian/vehicles around the estate.

## **Background**

3. We originally received a petition from some of the residents of the Revival Estate requesting that consideration be given to introduce a Resident's Priority Parking Scheme.
4. Once the location reached the top of the waiting list we consulted with all residents of the estate, as agreed at the original petition decision session, during this time we posted consultation documentation to all properties within the proposed area requesting that residents return their questionnaires and preferences.
5. The results of the consultation were considered at a Decision Session on 9th February 2021. During this it was resolved to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Residents Priority Parking for Revival Estate, in order to try and get a clearer view of all residents' opinion of the scheme, based on the percentage of 71% of respondents in favour of the scheme from the 43% of residents that responded.
6. An amendment to the legal Traffic Regulation Order to implement the Residents Priority parking scheme, to be known as R69, was advertised on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2021, a copy of the Notice of Proposal is included as Annex B. The proposed scheme was advertised as a zone entry sign style scheme, meaning minimal signs and lines are required. The operational hours would be Mon-Fri 10am to 3pm.

## **Legal advertisement**

7. The proposal for the Revival Estate was advertised in the usual manner of notices placed on street, in the local press, letters delivered to each property within the original consultation area (outlined in Annex A) and to the statutory consultees. The letter provided an update to the residents and directed them on how to make representations on the advertised proposal.
8. During the advertisement stage we received 36 representations in objection or support of the advertised scheme. 17 of the representations received were in objection to scheme and 19 representations were in support of the scheme. One of the representations received was from Yorkshire Housing, who own 78 properties on the Revival Estate. The representation from Yorkshire Housing was in objection to the scheme. (All representations received are provided in Annex C).

9. Following the advertisement of the scheme, the representations we received in objection highlighted a varied range of reasons as to why they objected to the scheme.

Including:

- The costs or permits.
- The impact on low income households on the estate.
- The impact on apartment residents who do not have an allocated parking space within the private parking area.
- The proposed timings of the restrictions being specifically discriminatory against the students of York College.
- Being charged to park outside their properties.
- No historical issue with vehicles being able to park on the estate.
- The advertisement of the scheme following only a 43% response rate received in the first stage of the consultation.
- The volume of regulatory signs required to be placed around the estate.

10. The representations we received in support of the scheme also provided a range of reasons as to why they support the scheme.

Including:

- To prevent York College students and staff parking on the estate.
- The volume of parked vehicles restricting the free flow of traffic through the estate, potentially leading to emergency vehicles being unable to access streets on the estate.
- Pavement parking leading to pedestrians with pushchairs walking in the carriageway.
- Vehicles driving at dangerous speeds through the estate.
- A limited number of double yellow lines on the estate leading to double parking and restricting free flow of traffic.

11. The above lists in objection or support of the scheme are not exhaustive and all the responses received following the advertisement of the scheme are available in Annex C.

12. Following receipt of the representations, and the issues highlighted within them, two surveys of the estate were completed to determine a number of issues:

- volume of parked vehicles on the estate during the proposed times of operation,
- volume of parked vehicles outside the proposed times of operation,
- double or pavement parking and
- parking close to the junctions within the estate.

The two surveys produced almost identical results and as such indicate there is no further strain placed on available parking spaces during the schemes proposed times of operation, and outside the times of operation. The results of the surveys are available in Annex D

13. An estimated 35% of the properties on the Revival Estate are Low-Cost Housing. The 2011 Census shows only 50% of the households on the Revival Estate live with no deprivation, in comparison to 64% in the city as a whole. The 2011 Census also shows that 18% of the households are deprived in 2 or more of the 4 dimensions of deprivation (Employment, Education, Health & Disability and Household Overcrowding). The cost of permits would also place an additional financial pressure on low income families at a time of rising living costs.
14. Taking in to account the representations of objection received, the traffic surveys completed and the financial implications placed upon the low income households on the estate, the recommendation of this report is to take no further action in relation to the advertised R69 Residents Priority Parking Scheme. However, due to the representations received in support that highlighted the issues of pavement parking, accessing junctions and visibility when exiting them, a further recommendation to place the estate on the next Annual Review of Traffic Restrictions is also recommended with a view to implementing no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) on the junctions and other areas to prevent parking close to junctions, provide a free flow of traffic and encourage parking on the carriageways only, to provide safer access for pedestrians to use the footpaths.
15. **Options for Consideration**
  - a) Take no further action in relation to the advertised R69 Residents Priority Parking Scheme
  - b) Add the Revival Estate to the 2022 Annual Review of Traffic Restrictions

## **Option 2 (not recommended)**

- a) Implement the advertised R69 Residents Priority Parking Scheme

### 16. **Council Plan**

This report is supportive of the following priorities in the council plan in addition to the One Planet York principles, that the Council champions:

- A focus on frontline services
- A Council that listens to residents

### 18. **Implications**

This report has the following implications

**Financial** –The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking scheme, should that option be approved. The ongoing enforcement and administrative management of the additional residents parking provision will need to be resourced from the income generated by the new measures

**Human Resources** – If implemented, enforcement will fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load. New zones/areas also impact on the Business Support Administrative services as well as Parking Services. Provision will need to be made from the income generated from new schemes to increase resources in these areas as well as within the Civil Enforcement Team.

**Equalities** – The impact of the proposals on protected characteristics has been considered as follows:

- Age – The implementation of the scheme will have a negative impact on young people attending the nearby college as it will remove available on street parking.
- Disability – Positive for Blue Badge holders as they are permitted to park on the estate. Negative for student drivers or visitors if they have anxieties about using public transport or have disabilities
- Gender – Neutral
- Gender reassignment – Neutral
- Marriage and civil partnership – Neutral
- Pregnancy and maternity - Neutral
- Race – Neutral
- Religion and belief – Neutral
- Sexual orientation – Neutral
- Other socio-economic groups including:
  - Carer – Neutral
  - Low income groups – Negative as low income residents who use on street parking will need to pay for a parking permit. The charge

is the same for all residents in the zones regardless of their circumstances.

- Veterans, Armed Forces Community– Neutral.

Access to the new online parking permit system - A plan is being developed for the wider Residents' Parking Service to help those that either don't have access to the internet or the skills to use the online system to access the parking system as they do with other similar ICT access requirements

**Legal** – The proposals 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** – no Crime and Disorder implications identified

**Information Technology** – any new residents' parking scheme will need to be included in the new online parking permit system so additional IT resources may be required to set up the proposed scheme and proposed extended scheme boundary

**Property** – no Property implications identified

**Other** –no other implications identified

**Risk Management** – In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there is an acceptable level of risk associated with the recommended option.

## Contact Details

**Author:**

Geoff Holmes  
Traffic Project Officer  
Transport  
Tel: (01904) 551475

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

James Gilchrist  
Assistant Director for Transport, Highways  
and Environment

**Date:** 6 April 2022

## **Specialist Implication Officers**

Finance – Patrick Looker (Service Finance Manager)

Legal – Cathryn Moore (Legal Manager, Projects)

**Wards Affected:**

**All**

**Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Ward**

**For further information please contact the author of the report.**