

Annex B

Representations made to the Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

Item 1 - Barley Rise, Strensall

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Balfour Way	<p>The number of vehicles in Balfour Way will increase, as the parking from Barley Rise will move round the corner. This will be a problem for elderly residents and children.</p> <p>The restrictions will reduce the property value.</p> <p>There will be less space for friends and family to park.</p>	<p>Some parking may relocate to Balfour Way.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>There is no legal right to park on the public highway.</p>
Barley Rise	<p>Against the proposals because the shops are being given greater priority than residents.</p> <p>There will be an increase in vehicles parking opposite their driveway making it more difficult to get in and out.</p> <p>The parked cars act as traffic calming and keep speeds down.</p> <p>The problem will be moved elsewhere.</p> <p>Double yellow lines will reduce the value of their property.</p> <p>There isn't a problem that needs to be fixed.</p>	<p>The proposals were put forward following complaints about the parked vehicles causing an obstruction to traffic flows.</p> <p>There may be an increase in vehicle speeds.</p> <p>Some parking is likely to transfer to other areas.</p> <p>There is no legal right to park on the public highway.</p> <p>See above.</p>
Barley Rise + 20 signature petition	<p>The proposed restrictions will lead to increased vehicle speed and reduced safety because the road will be clear.</p> <p>The all day parking is by people working in the shops and they shouldn't be given preference over residents.</p> <p>Not everyone has a driveway.</p> <p>Reversing off driveways will be more difficult due to increased vehicle speeds.</p> <p>They do not have enough space to park both their vehicles off the highway.</p> <p>Cars parked outside the shops overnight get vandalised.</p> <p>Property values will be reduced.</p> <p>The parking will transfer further down the road.</p>	<p>There may be an increase in vehicle speeds.</p> <p>There is long term parking taking place outside the houses. If restrictions are put outside the shops drivers are likely to ignore them for the brief period they need to park for the shops, hence there would be little change to the current situation.</p> <p>There is no legal right to park on the public highway.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>There is no legal right to park on the public highway.</p> <p>Some parking will transfer to other areas.</p>

Strensall & Towthorpe Parish Council	Objects to the proposals because they do not take in the requirements of the businesses and residents.	The proposals were put forward following complaints about the parked vehicles causing an obstruction to traffic flows.
Barley Rise	Supports the proposals, but would like additional restrictions on Barley Rise between Balfour Way and York Road.	Comments noted.
Pelham Place + 19 signature petition	Support the proposals.	Comments noted.
<p>Recommendation Clearly, as there are petitions both in favour and against the proposals, the parking in the area is of concern. However, it is also clear that those residents in the immediate area will be inconvenienced and as the area is predominately residential rather than a main through route the needs of residents in this case outweigh the needs of through traffic. Take no further action at this time.</p>		

Item 2 – Shipton Street

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the visibility at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Burton Stone Lane.	Would like the proposed 15m of restrictions reduced to 10m in line with the highway code. This would retain much needed on street parking.	The proposed restrictions are 15m from the centreline of the road and will therefore extend approximately 10m from the junction.
<p>Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.</p>		

Item 3 – Endfield Road

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local resident and MP about parked vehicles obstructing access to properties.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Endfield's Crescent	Not objecting to the proposals but concerned about where vehicles will be able to park.	There are no other restrictions in the area. However, the road is only one car width so any vehicle parked in this location would block the road.
Endfield's Road	Concerned about where vehicles will be able to park.	See above.
<p>Recommendation Implement a reduced set of proposals as shown on the attached plan.</p>		

Item 4 – Fossway

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the turning head area and adjacent footways / verges

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Fossway	Objects because there are limited places on street for residents and their visitors to park vehicles.	A request for action on parking came from a resident and the estate manager due to the extensive parking that takes place on the verges and footway, which obstructs pedestrians.
Fossway	This will move the problem further down the street where speeds are higher so safety will be reduced. Does not want to park their vehicle out of sight from property. Disabled neighbour would have to park further away and therefore have increased difficulties.	The parking is almost certainly by residents so the parking will transfer to the rest of Fossway. Comment noted. Comment noted.
Recommendation Whatever action is taken residents will be inconvenienced to some degree. As this is not a through route take no action at this time and review at a later date if there are further complaints.		

Item 5 – Main Street, Heslington

Proposal for no waiting at any time and changes to the maximum permitted stay in the parking bays put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Walnut Farm	Supports the proposals, but would like some parking provision in the University for some residents.	Comments noted, but parking within the University is something residents would have to negotiate themselves.
Wedgewood House	Supports the proposals.	Comment noted.
Turners Croft	Supports the proposals, but would like the maximum parking limit to be 2 hours not 12.	The 2 hour parking bay is not well used and extending the maximum stay to 12 hours should prevent the displaced parked elsewhere in the village.
Woodyard Cottages	Their property does not have any off street parking available.	The highway authority does not have a responsibility to provide parking provision for vehicle owners.

Sinclair Properties	Supports the proposals, but would like some parking provision in the University for some residents.	Comments noted, but parking within the University is something residents would have to negotiate themselves.
Hawthorn Cottage	Against the proposed 12 hour parking on main Street as it does nothing for the village, but in favour of banning parking elsewhere in Main Street.	The 2 hour parking bay is not well used and extending the maximum stay to 12 hours should prevent the displaced parked elsewhere in the village.
Woodyard Cottage	The proposed restrictions will disadvantage local residents and more consideration of their needs should be given. Does not want 12 hour maximum stay in the parking bays, but would like permit parking for residents and their visitors. Not in favour of no waiting at any time, but supports the banning of parking in peak periods.	Local residents have asked for action to be taken to prevent parking on Main Street. The 2 hour parking bay is not well used and extending the maximum stay to 12 hours should prevent the displaced parked elsewhere in the village. The introduction of residents parking is only taken forward when local residents are able to show there is strong support for such a scheme, which is not the case in this instance. Parking is an issue throughout the day, hence the proposals initially put forward.
Cherrytree Cottages	Against the proposed 12 hour parking on main Street because the spaces will be constantly in use by university staff and students. The yellow lines will mean there is no available parking within half a mile of their property for them or their visitors. Traffic speeds will increase and be the road will become more of a rat run.	The 2 hour parking bay is not well used and extending the maximum stay to 12 hours should prevent the displaced parked elsewhere in the village. Traffic speeds are unlikely to be significantly affected in this situation.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 6 – Melrosegate / Heworth Hall Drive

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the visibility at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Finsbury Street	Group leader at the church hall and has to park at the front to load and unload equipment.	Only parking would be restricted, loading and unloading would still be permitted.
Highthorn Road	There won't be anywhere close by to park for the busy church hall except in the residential side roads. Parked vehicles do not obstruct Melrosegate.	This is correct. The view from the side road is obstructed by parked vehicles.
Rev M Woodmansey	Objects because the road is wide enough for parked vehicles. The restrictions will seriously inconvenience users of the church hall and encourage more users to park in the side roads. Visibility from Heworth Hall Drive is adequate.	The view from the side road is obstructed by parked vehicles. Unrestricted parking is still available in the area. This view is not shared by those who originally requested action.
Main Avenue + 90 signature petition	Objects because of the detrimental effect on the use of the church hall facilities.	Comments noted.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 7 – Osbaldwick Lane

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Murton Way	The parking deters large and speeding vehicles. Yellow lines will not be in keeping with the village area.	This is a bus route and the road needs to be able to accommodate large vehicles. Many villages have yellow lines and they are the only effective way of controlling parking.
Osbaldwick Lane	The proposals will adversely affect local businesses and residents who will have nowhere to park except further into the residential area. Also, the parking deters speeding, which would make it more difficult to cross the road.	See comments above. Traffic volumes are not so high that crossing the road will be difficult.
Osbaldwick Lane	The proposals will adversely affect their business.	Unrestricted parking is still available close by.

Osboldwick Lane + 198 signature petition	<p>Objects to the proposals on the following grounds:</p> <p>The removal of parking will lead to an increase in vehicle speed.</p> <p>Increased likelihood of short term parking taking place on their forecourt.</p> <p>The loss of parking would cause problems for their customers and staff.</p> <p>The proposals will increase parking on the bend.</p> <p>Are not aware of any accidents at this location.</p> <p>Would adversely affect their, and other small businesses, in the area.</p>	<p>Increase in vehicle speeds is unlikely to take place.</p> <p>The short term parking that he local shops generate may lead to some drivers parking on private property.</p> <p>The parking on the bend has lead to complaints from other road users, hence the proposals put forward.</p> <p>The proposals have been put forward following concerns raised rather than in response to an ongoing accident problem.</p> <p>The highway authority does not have a responsibility to provide parking provision for vehicle owners. Unrestricted parking is still available close by.</p>
Osboldwick Parish Council	The proposals will not cure the problems in the area and will move the parking elsewhere. They will also financially ruin local businesses.	The restrictions will prevent parking on this stretch of road, but it is likely to transfer into adjacent streets.
Osboldwick Lane	The proposals will damage the viability of the local businesses and increase the parking that takes place on the verges. Vehicles would also be moved to outside other properties.	See comments above.
Yew Tree Mews	<p>Yellow lines will cause inconvenience to church goers and transfer the parking to other streets.</p> <p>They will also adversely affect the local shops.</p> <p>The removal of parking will also lead to increased vehicle speeds.</p>	<p>The highway authority does not have a responsibility to provide parking provision for vehicle owners and the parking by those that attend the church is contributing to the problems.</p> <p>Increased vehicle speeds are unlikely.</p>
Osboldwick Lane	<p>Safety will not be improved, as there haven't been any accidents.</p> <p>The proposals will damage the viability of the local businesses.</p> <p>The yellow lines will be unsightly and not in keeping with the area.</p>	See comments above.
Osboldwick Lane	<p>The proposals will move the parking to outside other residents properties and cause parking on verges.</p> <p>The proposals will damage the viability of the local businesses.</p>	See comments above.
<p>Recommendation Implement a reduced set of restrictions as shown on the attached plan.</p>		

Item 8 – Malton Road

Proposal for the removal of a length of no waiting at any time restrictions put forward following request from local business.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Malton Road	This will provide a car park for the garage and will be an eyesore. If the proposal goes ahead could they be reduced by about 8m opposite the driveway to allow easier access?	Noted.
Huntington Parish Council	Very concerned about the proposal due to the previous parking problems. The Parish council would be very reluctant to support any variation of the restrictions.	Noted.
Malton Road	The removal of the restrictions will result in the return of the previous problems.	Noted.
Malton Road	As above.	Noted.
Malton Road	As above.	Noted.
Malton Road	The garage has consistently abused this site and ignored the restrictions. The parked vehicles create a cluttered overdeveloped appearance in the green belt. In addition the parking creates a safety problem at the roundabout due to reduced visibility.	Noted.
Recommendation Take no further action.		

Item 9 – Greencliffe Drive

Proposal for removal of residents parking bays put forward following complaints from local residents regarding difficulties accessing their properties due to parked vehicles.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Greencliffe Drive	The residents parking bays are needed by residents of Greencliffe Drive and Water End and their visitors. Suggests widening the access to the properties that will benefit from the removal of the bays instead.	The parking bays may be well used, but when occupied they do make entry and exit from the adjacent driveways which have been in place for many years. Whilst widening the driveway would improve access this is likely to cost in the region of £500 to £1000 per driveway. As well as not having a duty to provide parking there are no funds available for this work.

Greencliffe Drive	As above.	See comments above.
Clifton Green	As above.	See comments above.
Water End	The residents parking bays are needed by residents of Greencliffe Drive and Water End and their visitors.	See comments above.
Water End	The residents parking bays are needed by residents of Greencliffe Drive and Water End and their visitors. Will increase parking on the verges. No alternative parking provision is given.	See comments above.
Water End	The residents parking bays are needed by residents of Greencliffe Drive and Water End and their visitors.	See comments above.
Water End	The residents parking bays are needed by residents of Greencliffe Drive and Water End and their visitors. There is no need for the proposals and other simpler alternatives that would have less impact on residents.	See comments above.
Water End	Supports the proposals.	Noted
Greencliffe Dr	Supports the proposals.	Noted
Recommendation Removed the parking bays as advertised.		

Item 10 – Morritt Close

Proposal for a disabled parking space were put forward following a request, backed up with a letter from their doctor.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Morritt Close	Does not object to the proposals, but suggests that a more appropriate place would be in the turning area.	The turning head area although parked up should be left free for vehicles to manoeuvre and marking out a bay would not be appropriate.
Morritt Close	Would like two disabled parking spaces in the turning head rather than in the lay-by.	See comments above. In addition, the request and supporting doctors letter was for a single bay, hence the proposals put forward.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 11 – The Avenue

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward as part of a planning approval.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Assembly House	There is no problem with extended parking and is too far from the city centre to be of use. The restrictions will affect residents and their friends. Not all of the flats are occupied at present and this matter should wait until they are.	These proposals were put forward as part of the Planning approval and have been funded by the developer. Although there may be no problems at present once the area becomes known parking will increase. On the last visit to the area the turning head was completely parked up.
Assembly House	Supports the proposed restrictions in the narrow entry way to the area, but would like residents parking for the rest of the area.	This can be considered, but when the anticipated parking problems occur this legal process would have to be repeated.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 12 – Scarcroft Road

Proposal for a reduction in the maximum permitted stay for non-permit holders in a residents parking bay that is used by guesthouses.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Reverend Stoker	No church service lasts for only 30 minutes so the spaces would be unusable by anyone attending the church. Many who use the church are elderly and infirm and the Bishopthorpe Road car park is too far away.	The church related parking is on a first come first served basis and can't be reserved for the elderly and infirm, hence once the bay is full they would have no option but to use the Bishopthorpe Road car park. By reducing the maximum time limit for non-permit holders greater parking availability for the guest house permit holders will be achieved and because blue disabled badge holders are able to park unrestricted in on street parking bays those attending the church who have the greatest mobility difficulties will be more likely to get a space. There are also 60 minute parking availability in St. Benedict Road that can be used free of charge.
Dalton Terr.	As above.	See comments above.

Maple Ave.	As above.	See comments above.
Victoria Court	As above.	See comments above.
Cherry Hill House	As above.	See comments above.
Fenwick St.	As above.	See comments above.
Charlton St.	As above.	See comments above.
Bishopthorpe Rd.	Asks that the 60 minutes be retained as church services and other activities last longer than 30 minutes.	See comments above.
Nunmill St.	Asks for the 60 minutes not to be reduced.	See comments above.
Pulleyn Drive	The present parking limit is only just sufficient for services, events, weddings and funerals.	See comments above. A bride's car and Funeral cars are exempt for the existing restrictions.
Aldreth Grove	Sunday morning services take a full hour and other church events require more than 30 minutes.	See comments above.
Finsbury Avenue	Reducing the parking limit to 30 minutes is unfair and unjust. Attending church should be encouraged not prevented.	See comments above.
Jamieson Terrace	30 minutes is not enough time to attend a Sunday morning service, Evensong, church council meeting, wedding, funeral or community events and the Bishopthorpe Road car park is too far away.	See comments above. Bishopthorpe Road car park is approximately 150m from the church.
Green Lane	The present parking limit is only just sufficient for services, events, weddings and funerals. Easy access is also needed by church volunteers.	See comments above. Any loading or unloading of equipment by volunteers would still be permitted.
City Mills	As above.	See comments above.
St. Clement's Grove	The church should be treated differently to guesthouses and private residences. Church services and other events / community activities take longer than 30 minutes.	See comments above.
Dale Street	The present parking limit is only just sufficient for services. The parking bays tend to be used by the older section of the congregation who would otherwise be unable to attend.	See comments above.
South Bank Avenue	Churchgoers should not have to fight for parking space outside their church and should not be oppressed in favour of B&B guests who are here today and gone tomorrow.	See comments above.

Scarcroft Rd.	Potential customers have only two places they can park, one of which is the parking bay outside the church. The other is the car park, which is generally full. Because they tend to be major purchases customers generally need longer than 30 minutes. Reducing the time to 30 minutes will put further pressure on the business. Disputes that the bay is not available to guesthouses as there are 5 guesthouse vehicles in the bay at the time of writing.	There are also 60 minute parking availability in St. Benedict Road that can be used free of charge.
South Bank Avenue	Although they walk to the Church the parking availability is used by those who need to drive for health or disability reasons. In addition to wedding and funerals the church is used for other local community events.	See comments above.
Butcher Terrace	Services last at least 1 hour so 30 minutes is not long enough.	See comments above.
Nunthorpe Crescent	30 minutes parking seems very unfair when it means you can't park outside your own church.	See comments above.
South Bank Avenue	30 minutes is far too short as the services are at least an hour. There are also some who have special work to do in the church, such as the organist, who have to be considered.	See comments above.

Scarcroft Rd.	<p>Guesthouse owner supporting the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a business they are restricted to parking in a specific bay and would like the bay restricted to permit holders only. 2. There is sufficient parking in the area for shoppers who can pay 20p per hour, as can those attending the church as well. 3. Frequently have to report vehicles exceeding their stay and also have to pay for parking in the nearby car park for their new arrivals and then get them to relocate their cars once a space becomes available. This is inconvenient for them and their guests and doesn't present a good impression on the city parking situation. 4. Tourism benefits the city and local community, but guests will not want come if they cannot park their vehicles conveniently. Understands their isn't a guarantee of a space, but with very expensive permits they should be given a fighting chance. 5. Pay £900 per year for their permits and feels others are taking an unfair advantage. They are careful to restrict their visitors to the bay so that they do not interfere with residents parking. 6. Sunday morning arrivals are impossible because of those attending church. They do not seem prepared to pay just 20p for an hour in church. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There are also approximately 4 guesthouse spaces available for R36 permit holders in St. Benedict Road.</p>
<p>Recommendation Implement the restrictions as proposed.</p>		

Item 13 – Ouseburn Avenue

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic at the junction.

Name and Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Boro'bridge Road	The parking that takes place is by other residents and those who work at nearby businesses. The proposals will prevent the objector from parking outside their property.	The proposed restrictions are for only approximately 10m from the Boroughbridge Road junction and are in line with the Highway Code guidance.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 14 – Marlborough Grove

Proposal for a reduction in the length of a residents parking bay following complaints about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of large vehicles.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Marlborough Grove	Parking availability is limited and these bays are often used. The local shops rely on the 60 minute parking.	There is no scope to relocate the residents parking bays elsewhere in the street. However, the amount of parking bay put forward for removal can be reduced and still allow for improved access. The loss of parking bays would be 2 spaces. Additional parking has been investigated at the other end of the road, however the existing parking bay is 10m long and if it were moved to the other side of the road it would only increase to around 14m which is not long enough to accommodate an extra vehicle, hence this option has not been taken forward.
Marlborough Grove	Parking availability is limited and these bays are often used. Visitors and customers to the local shops rely on the 60 minute parking.	See comments above.
Marlborough Grove	The existing parking provision is already barely adequate.	See comments above.
Fishergate	Businesses rely on the 60 minute Parking provision these bays provide and the removal of these spaces will jeopardise their business.	See comments above.

Marlborough Wharf	There are already insufficient spaces available for residents, visitors and customers. More spaces are needed not less. The new development is almost complete so will not generate further heavy traffic and removal vans.	See comments above.
Marlborough Grove	There is insufficient parking for residents at the moment. No alternative proposals have been put forward. There is no reason why they should be removed.	See comments above.
Marlborough Villas	They have no roadway in front of their house and already have to walk some distance to park their car. The proposals will reduce parking making it more difficult to find a parking space.	See comments above.
Marlborough Wharf	Supports the proposal.	Comments noted.
Recommendation Reduce the proposed removal of parking bays from 13m to 9m.		

Item 15 – Station Road, Upper Poppleton

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the visibility at the junction and obstructing the crossing point used by those with mobility problems or pushchairs.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Westfield Lane	Wants to keep the rural aspect of Poppleton and yellow lines will spoil the appearance. This is the first step towards introducing parking charges. The yellow lines could contribute to the closure of the post office. The proposals have not been sufficiently advertised. The disabled need to be able to park as close as possible to the post office.	Yellow lines are the only practical way of preventing parking. There are no plans to introduce parking charges. The proposals are for a short length to keep the junction clear. The advertising has been more extensive than legally required. There won't be any yellow lines directly outside the post office.

<p>Upper Poppleton Parish Council</p>	<p>Very much opposed to the introduction of yellow lines in the village as they are not in keeping with the area and do not consider there to be a problem at this location.</p>	<p>Yellow lines are the only practical way to tackle parking problems and are regularly used in villages.</p> <p>From site visits made there is extensive parking taking place from time to time in the area, which does restrict the free flow of traffic. Whilst long term obstruction of the tactile crossing point is unlikely, as it is close to the corner, it has been reported as a problem and will be quite frustrating for those using a wheelchair or pushing a child buggy.</p> <p>Since the close of the objection period Councillor Bradley has sent in several requests from local residents regarding the parking problems outside the post office.</p> <p>Whilst sympathetic to the views of the Parish Council yellow lines are a valuable tool for traffic management purposes. Because the Village is in a conservation area narrow 50mm pale yellow lines can be used to minimise the visual impact. In addition, because of a change in regulations no signing would be needed for the double yellow lines. The length of lines put forward is quite minimal and should achieve the desired result of preventing parking close to the junction and across the dropped crossing point. Having had several additional requests for restrictions in this area in the past few weeks, the matter has been looked at again and it is felt that a shorter set of restrictions could be implemented.</p>
---------------------------------------	--	--

<p>Upper Poppleton Post Office, Station Road</p>	<p>The basis of the objection is put forward in twelve points:</p> <p>A – already illegal to park at a junction.</p> <p>B – customer levels have fallen over the last 2 years due to changes in pension payments and the opening of a nearby convenience store.</p> <p>C – business customers deposit large mounts of money and need to be able to park close by.</p> <p>D – many customers have large bulky parcels.</p> <p>E – the accidents they are aware of in the area have not been outside the post office.</p> <p>F – high proportion of customers are elderly and use their cars.</p> <p>G – they have no plans to expand their business.</p> <p>H – their opening hours are outside the peak hours.</p> <p>I – The council have extended a bus service through the village that virtually no one uses.</p> <p>J – friends and family will not be able to park when visiting.</p> <p>K – no evidence that existing restrictions are being enforced so these would also be ignored.</p> <p>L – the parking outside the White Horse pub is used by commuters using the station.</p> <p>An alternative suggestion of reducing the proposals to terminate at the end of the disabled crossing point and reduce the length in Black Dyke Lane to 6m is put forward.</p>	<p>A - this is the highway code and cannot be enforced by the council's parking attendants.</p> <p>B – noted, but the proposals are aimed at improving pedestrian access in the area.</p> <p>C – the proposed restrictions are just proposed at the junction.</p> <p>D – loading and unloading would not be prohibited.</p> <p>E – noted.</p> <p>F – the proposals will aid pedestrian access for those less mobile.</p> <p>G – noted.</p> <p>H – noted.</p> <p>I – noted.</p> <p>J - the proposed restrictions are just proposed at the junction.</p> <p>K – if implemented the restrictions would be included in a parking attendants rounds.</p> <p>L – noted.</p> <p>This suggestion can be accommodated.</p>
--	--	---

Recommendation
As the introduction of these yellow lines would be the first in Poppleton and they are not supported by the Parish Council, Members views on this matter are requested. If Members are minded to approve the introduction of yellow lines then a reduced set of restrictions are put forward for consideration using the pale yellow 50mm lines option.

Item 16 – Heworth Place

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic and visibility at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Heworth Road	The proposals will cause additional difficulties and move the problems elsewhere.	The proposals are only at the junction of Heworth Road and Heworth Place and are in line with the Highway Code.
Heworth Road	Objects to the proposals because they need to be able to park near to their property for business reasons.	See comments above.
Heworth Road	Unable to park on Heworth Road outside 8am to 6pm and Heworth Place is the only place left to park.	See comments above.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 17 – Hunt Court

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaint from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the access.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Hunt Court	The proposed restrictions are unnecessary as there are no obstruction problems.	The request for action and investigation came in many months ago and since then no further problems have been reported. Hence, this may have been an isolated problem.
Main Avenue	As landlord of the above property supports the objections made.	See comments above.
Recommendation Take no further action.		

Item 18 – St. Paul’s Square

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following request by elected Members concerned about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
St Paul’s Sq.	<p>Disagrees that there is a serious hazard that these proposals would tackle.</p> <p>The occasional obstructions are for short periods of time.</p> <p>Parking in the area is already at a high premium without the proposed restrictions.</p>	<p>This matter was raised during a site visit by elected Members to view proposals for a school safety zone. Whilst the parking does cause some obstruction problems from time to time this street is not a through route, hence any difficulties only affect residents. As the introduction of waiting restrictions will reduce parking availability at all times for residents it is suggested that the proposals be cut back to the length of proposed restrictions on the inside corner of the square.</p>
St Paul’s Sq.	<p>Approves of the proposals on the inside corner of the square.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
St Paul’s Sq.	<p>Parking in the area is already at a high premium without the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>The occasional obstructions are for short periods of time.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
St. Paul’s Sq.	<p>The existing restrictions are ineffective through lack of enforcement.</p> <p>Parking in the area is already at a high premium with no chance of off street parking being provided.</p> <p>Approves of the proposals on the inside corner of the square.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
St. Paul’s Sq.	<p>Will cause additional evening parking problems due to loss of spaces. Suggests the following: As proposed on the inside corner of the square. Reduce the proposals in the cul-de-sac to 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday. Remove the 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday from the side of the square in Watson Terrace.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>

St Paul's Sq.	The proposals will result in fewer parking spaces, which will cause additional problems especially as the surrounding streets are also congested. Will also affect the access to the nursery and impair the quality of life for those who live in the area.	See comments above.
St Paul's Sq.	Disagrees with the proposals because they will have a negative impact on parking and will have an intrusive effect on the environment. The removal of parking may lead to an increase in vehicle speeds and adversely affect safety. The obstructions are only for a short length of time.	See comments above.
St Paul's Sq.	Supports the comments made by the St. Paul's Square Residents Association. But, does also support the proposed yellow lines on the inside corner of the square as vehicles that park there do cause an obstruction on occasions.	See comments above.
St Paul's Sq	The proposals will make the current situation worse.	See comments above.
St Paul's Sq	Objects to the proposals on the grounds that it will create safety issues for residents, visitors and pupils at the Nursery due to increased congestion and vehicle speeds. In addition, the loss of parking will be inconvenient to residents.	See comments above.
St Paul's Sq	Objects because of the loss of parking in the area and if vehicles are parked away from their properties they will be more liable to theft. The congestion problems are only for short periods of time.	See comments above.
St Paul's Sq	Decreasing parking will increase congestion. The current system works smoothly and any change will cause problems.	See comments above.

St Paul's Sq	Parking is already very limited and a decrease in parking could result in more traffic movement in front of the nursery. The congestion is only for brief periods when parents drop off children. The double yellow lines opposite the Nursery would be beneficial in allowing larger vehicles to manoeuvre easier and making it easier for children to cross the road.	See comments above.
--------------	---	---------------------

Recommendation
Implement the proposed restrictions on the inside corner of the square opposite the houses and take no further action on the rest of the proposals.

Item 19 – Clifton

Proposal to allow guesthouse visitors to park in the residents parking bays using a permit.

Name and Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Clifton	An increasing number of buildings are being converted to apartments, which is increasing parking demand. The prospect of the spaces being occupied all weekend by guesthouse customers is not an acceptable situation for residents. They have no off street parking availability and having to park in neighbouring streets when unloading articles is unacceptable.	The parking bays in question are also Pay and Display and there is often spare parking capacity. The balance between residential and business needs is often disputed from one point of view or another, but in this case there would appear to be scope for amending the restrictions in favour of the guesthouses.
Clifton	It is difficult to have deliveries made because the parking spaces are so often taken up. Friends mobility problems mean that they need to park close to their house. There is no hotel or guesthouse in the immediate vicinity. Hotel guests may leave their vehicles for extended periods of time while visiting York.	See comments above.
Burton Stone Lane	Parking demand is already very high in R34 and this proposal will not improve the situation.	Whilst parking demand may be high in some areas of R34 the bays on Clifton do have some spare capacity.

Recommendation
Implement the proposals as advertised.

Item 20 – Railway Terrace

Proposal for a disabled parking space were put forward following a request, backed up with a letter from their doctor.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Railway Terrace	Although sympathetic the proposal will add to the parking pressure caused by increased car ownership and commuter parking and there is a need for disabled parking elsewhere in the street.	Due to a misunderstanding with house numbers these proposals were advertised in the wrong part of the street.
Recommendation The proposals are being re-advertised in the correct location as part of some other Traffic Regulation Order work.		

Item 21 – Chapter House Street

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from the Minster authorities about parked vehicles obstructing the access to and from the Minster by large vehicles.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
The National Trust North East Office Scots Gap Morpeth	The visual impact of the yellow lines will not be in keeping with this historically sensitive part of the city.	The yellow lines would be a continuation of the lines in College street and can be cut back from the 17m put forward to 10m which should keep the road clear as parking beyond this point would effectively block the road.
Recommendation Implement a reduced set of restrictions as shown on the attached plan.		

Item 22 – Garfield Terrace

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow for large vehicles negotiating the corner.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Garfield Terrace	Any yellow lines placed near their business will damage their turnover. Would like long term parking prohibited close by to benefit their customers.	Parking near this corner can cause obstruction difficulties for large vehicles and as this is a main route to and from the city centre the free flow of traffic is important. There are no further plans to limit long term parking in this area.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 23 – Bishopthorpe Road

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the visibility at the pedestrian island.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Bishopthorpe Road	<p>Their vehicle does not cause an obstruction parked half on and half off the road.</p> <p>Want to be able to park outside their property.</p> <p>Difficult to get the vehicle on their drive and exit is difficult due to bus shelter obstructing view.</p> <p>Their vehicles do not obstruct the view of the crossing.</p>	<p>This matter was raised due to visibility concerns for pedestrians using the island to cross the road. High sided vehicles parked in this location do reduce visibility. The length of restrictions put forward covers the 8m (approx) gap between the end of the existing lines and then extended to cover the driveways to numbers 107 and 109 Bishopthorpe Road making 15m in total. If a reduced set of restrictions of just 5m were put in the resident at number 107 would still be able to park on the road, but obstruct their own driveway. This does, however, run the risk of other drivers obstructing their driveway.</p>
Recommendation Implement a reduced set of restrictions as shown on the attached plan.		

Item 24 – Government House Road

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Government House Road	<p>Supports the proposals, but would like additional restrictions to prevent the problems moving down to opposite No.1.</p>	<p>If parking problems move further into Government House Road then this matter can be considered at a later date.</p>
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised and review at a later date if additional problem are raised.		

Item 25 – Elliot Court

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic and visibility at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Fenwick Court Management Co. Ltd	Supports the proposals, but would like a consistent set of restrictions along the south side of the road to prevent vehicles being on the wrong side of the road.	Noted, if further problems occur this matter can be reinvestigated.
Fulford Parish Council	Supports the proposals.	Noted
Recommendation This matter has been resolved.		

Item 26 – Lavington Terrace

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from a local resident about parked vehicles obstructing the junction, particularly for larger vehicles, which then damage the adjacent property.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Lavington Terrace	Considers the length of restriction to be excessive. It reduces parking availability and will encourage faster vehicle speeds along the back lane making it more dangerous for small children.	This is a wide back lane that can accommodate some parking, but as parking is at a premium in the area if vehicles are close left to the junction obstruction and damage to property problems can occur.
Lavington Terrace	Does not consider there to be a problem and is not aware of any accidents during all the years they have lived there. Vehicle flows are very low apart from the start and end of the working day and is only by residents as it is not a through route.	See above comments.
Lavington Terrace	Supports the proposals as they have had damage to their property and the gas pipe that feeds their property due to a vehicle having to negotiate the junction when a vehicle was parked closed to the junction.	See above comments.
Recommendation Implement the proposals as advertised.		

Item 27 – Mount Vale Drive

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic and visibility at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Mount Vale Drive	The proposals will move the parking to outside their property.	Parking is likely to relocate, but the proposals have been put forward following concerns about parking close to the junction obstructing the free flow of traffic and visibility. However, a reduced length of restriction should also be effective.
Recommendation Implement a reduced set of restrictions as shown on the attached plan.		

Item 28 – Beech Grove / Chestnut Grove

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the crossing point for those with mobility difficulties or pushchairs.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Chestnut Grove	Has lived in the area for a number of years and does not consider there to be a problem and the proposals will prevent their visitors parking outside their property.	The extension of the yellow lines was requested in order to prevent the dropped kerbs for pedestrians to cross the road being obstructed. The lines were then extended to cover the driveways to the adjacent properties. Bearing in mind the proximity to the shopping area it is suggested that a white bar marking may be a successful deterrent in this instance.
Chestnut Grove	As above.	See comments above.
Recommendation Take no action regarding the yellow lines and place a white bar marking at the pedestrian crossing point.		

Item 29 – Bramble Dene / Moorcroft Road

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the visibility at the junction.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Moorcroft Road	<p>They have 3 cars and only space for two to park off street.</p> <p>The lines will force existing residents and visitors to the surgery to park further away.</p> <p>The proposals will only really affect residents as other drivers will take the view that they are only going to be a few minutes and park on the yellow lines anyway. In addition, blue badge holders will still be able to park on the yellow lines.</p>	<p>This issue has been raised a number of times, hence the proposals put forward. On reflection, however, it is suggested that the proposed restrictions could be reduced in length slightly on the shops side of Bramble Dene to just cover the driveway.</p>
Recommendation Implement a reduced set of proposals as shown on the attached plan.		

Item 30 – Royal Chase

Proposal for no waiting at any time put forward following complaints from local residents about parked vehicles obstructing the free flow of traffic.

Address	Representation	Officers Comments
Royal Chase	<p>Live next door to the Pub and the only time there are problems is during large race meetings. The proposals are excessive and will adversely affect residents who have tradesmen and visitors calling.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Royal Chase	<p>Supports the proposals.</p> <p>They live close to the pub and are most affected by the overflow parking which causes double parking, obstruction and noise during the pub opening hours.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Recommendation Implement the restrictions as advertised.		