

Second Avenue comments

Second Avenue

Although I was one of the Second Avenue residents who initially supported the scheme, it was with the understanding that the residents' parking would be implemented on all of the streets or not at all.

By just putting restrictions on East Parade, Bull Lane & Parade Court the situation will become even more problematic for residents of First, Second & Main Avenue. Especially as I see from the map that part of Second & First Avenue will have restrictions.

Many of the East Parade residents have said that they won't be paying for the permits and will just park in the side streets with no restrictions.

I would like it to be noted that I object to the proposed plan as it stands. The scheme will only work if the whole area has restrictions. If that is not an option then I would like to request that you leave the unrestricted parking on this end of East Parade as it currently is.

Second Avenue

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed extension to the R30 resident parking bays on East Parade and Bull Lane, which I was notified about in your recent letter informing residents of East Parade and other nearby streets of the results of the recent consultation on the matter. My objection is based on what I believe to be an improper interpretation of the results of the consultation, and what I perceive to be the unnecessarily hasty and undemocratic process by which the decision was made.

First of all, I argue that it is inappropriate to deal with each of these changes piecemeal, as you are proposing. Any change to the parking arrangements on East Parade will naturally impact upon the situation in the adjoining streets, as people who currently park on East Parade or Bull Lane when they use the local amenities will inevitably look for unrestricted parking nearby. As you will be aware, the consultation concerned parking on multiple streets - East Parade and Bull Lane, but also First Avenue, Second Avenue and Eastbourne Grove, and Main Avenue. As the consultation shows, taken as a whole, the residents of these streets were against any changes being made by a ratio of more than 2:1. It is true that there was a slight majority amongst the respondents from East Parade in favour of changes being made, but it is not clear whether the following points were considered:

- The response rate amongst East Parade residents was the lowest amongst all of the streets consulted. It was in fact the only street where the majority of properties did not return a response.
- The returns from East Parade were only in favour of changes by 57% to 43% - a majority, but a small one, particularly when set against the much larger majorities in all of the adjoining streets (94%, 84% and 68% against any changes).
- A far higher proportion of properties on East Parade have private off-street parking than on the other streets. These changes will have much less impact on the lives of people residing in a house with its own driveway and garage than they

will on those who live in terraces on the adjoining streets, who have no other option but to park on the street.

I have spoken to many of my neighbours about this, and *nobody* I have spoken to thought that what you are proposing is a reasonable outcome; many of them are exceedingly frustrated and perplexed by the idea that this was even a *possible* outcome, and might have responded to your consultation differently had they known that making changes on East Parade alone was on the cards.

Simply put, it is wrong of you to use a very small majority amongst a minority of respondents on a single street as justification for changes that will have impacts on the whole area, when it is crystal-clear that there is a very large majority against the changes in the area taken as a whole. The results of your consultation could not have been clearer: it ain't broke, don't attempt to fix it.

I would also argue that ramming this through without a public meeting where people could express their views is undemocratic, and grossly inappropriate. We all know that the pandemic would make such a public meeting impossible at the moment: this pandemic has affected all of our lives terribly, I myself lost my job and a close family member to the virus, I know only too well the importance of avoiding large public gatherings. However, the fact that we cannot have a public meeting *at the moment* does not mean that we will never be able to have one ever again. There is no urgent need for this decision to be made quickly, no reason why this could not have waited until the population has been vaccinated and a public meeting could be held. I am sorry to be blunt, but the optics here are terrible: I'm sure it does not seem like this to the people who made this decision, but from the outside it looks like you are using the pandemic as an excuse for turning what ought to be an exercise in local democracy into an entirely opaque decision, made behind closed doors by people with no personal interest in the negative effects it will have on the lives of those who live in the area.

For the above reasons I urge you, in the strongest possible terms, to reconsider this decision. Ideally, I'd ask you to scrap these unpopular proposals entirely - they are unwanted by the majority of people who live in the area as shown clearly by the results of your own consultation, and they are iniquitous in how they will affect the residents of the streets involved. At the very least however, I would ask that you reverse the decision for the time being, and wait until a proper public meeting can be held so that residents can properly express their views.

Second Avenue

We're emailing in response to the recent consultation exercise and decision taken to introduce resident priority parking for the remainder eastern section of East Parade

Having looked at the proposed plans, we are confirming that we are not in favour of the change. We believe that if only part of the area (and indeed only half our street) is under these restrictions, it will just force more cars onto surrounding streets, where permit parking is not in use, meaning increased congestion and finding it much harder for residents to park.

Second Avenue

I am a resident of Second Avenue and I'm taking this opportunity to object to the proposal of extending the residents parking on East Parade.

The general feeling of the people I have discussed this with, is that the scheme won't work if only part of the area has restrictions, therefore it would be preferable to leave things as they currently stand. As previously highlighted by extending parking restrictions you will simply push the problem to the surrounding streets.

This viewpoint is not uncommon amongst resident and as highlighted in Annex B - 67% of residents who returned their forms were not in favour of the scheme!

Second Avenue

I am writing to object to your decision to extend the R30 Residents Priority Parking area for East Parade in York only. You are not taking this action for First Avenue, Second Avenue, Eastbourne Grove and Main Avenue.

All the above streets are used by car users who are not residents but park and then walk into town for their jobs. We know this because most of them park all day. Also, some of the people who live on East Parade already park in my street - Second Avenue - so if your decision is upheld for East Parade, many more people will be parking here. I cannot see the logic behind this decision as all you are doing is making the parking problem we already have even worse!

The only way you can change our parking problem is to have residents parking for ALL of the above streets or you can leave the situation as it is now. If you go ahead with your decision for East Parade only or you do nothing at all, you have let down York residents either way.

You need to look at the parking problems in York urgently.

Second Avenue

I am emailing in opposition to the extension of R30 resident parking on East Parade.

The impact of less parking on the surrounding streets would be high, Second Avenue & First avenue are already impacted by motorists parking whilst visiting & working in York, there is already plenty of evening parking on East Parade with there only being a single yellow line on the South side of East Parade.

On the map for the proposal the junction of Second avenue & East Parade shows double yellow lines in Second avenue of the same length, I am in favour of this 100% as leaving Second Avenue at this junction is very dangerous with the current length of the double yellow lines at the west side of the junction, I certainly hope these double yellow lines are to be extended & I hope that this is not just a 'typo' on the diagram.

Response for clarification

The double yellow lines annotated for Second Avenue at its junction with East Parade have been refreshed as these are included within the TRO order.

Second Avenue

I would like to object to the proposed changes to parking restrictions in East Parade only as this is likely to exacerbate problems of parking in Second Avenue where I live. I would prefer to leave things as they currently stand.