

Report of the Acting Director of City and Environmental Services

**Monkgate Parking Changes**

**Summary**

1. This report summarises the response to a recent consultation and Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertisement regarding proposed changes to the parking layout on Monkgate.

**Recommendations**

2. That the Executive Member approves the scheme as proposed in Annex A

Reason: To enhance road safety by improving visibility for drivers emerging on to Monkgate.

**Background**

3. During consultation on the Monkgate Cycle Scheme (now implemented), some residents asked for parking to be prohibited close to the gated access between Nos. 40 and 42, and also at the Agar St. junction. In both cases, the desire was to improve visibility to the right and enable emerging drivers to see approaching cyclists without the need to pull forward partially into Monkgate. The space by the gated access is currently designated for use by Guest Houses and Houses in Multiple Occupancy (GMO) only, while the space by the Agar St junction is Residents' Only (RO).
4. The Interim Director considered a separate report on the parking issues in April 2015. The decision was to authorise consultation on removing the parking spaces immediately to the right of drivers emerging from the gated access and Agar Street, and also the creation of a compensatory GMO space on the opposite side of Monkgate.

The existing layout and proposed parking changes are shown in **Annex A**. Effectively, these changes would mean a net reduction of one RO space compared to the situation before the cycle scheme was introduced, because one additional parking space was created as part of the cycle scheme.

5. At a Director Decision Meeting of 22 September 2015, a further report was presented which summarised the feedback from the consultation on the proposed parking changes. The key results were:
  - Agar St change - 9 respondents supported the proposals, while 9 were opposed.
  - Gated access change - 7 respondents supported the proposals, while 4 were opposed.
6. Having considered the issues and consultation results, the Acting Director agreed to the report's recommendations (i.e. that a TRO should be advertised covering the removal of the two parking spaces on the south side of Monkgate, along with the conversion of an existing RO space on the north side to make it GMO, all as shown in Annex A).

When consulting with residents on the TRO, the Acting Director agreed that an additional proposal to install cycle parking stands in the two areas currently covered by the parking spaces in question should be put forward. As well as preventing any vehicles from being parked there, the cycle stands would also provide a useful facility, and would be carefully positioned to avoid any significant impact on the sight lines for emerging drivers.

In addition, it was also agreed that a parking survey should be carried out to assess the current usage levels of the existing parking bays.

## **Consultation/ TRO Advertisement**

7. A consultation exercise was carried out with Ward Councillors, external organisations, and local residents alongside the formal advertisement of the TRO.

The responses received, along with Officer comments, appear in **Annex B**. The key results are summarised below:

- In total, 105 properties were sent the consultation documents, including 24 to Agar St and Orchard Court. Of the 4 responses received from the residents of Agar St and Orchard Court, 2 were in favour of the proposals and 2 were against. Of the 19 responses from other residents, 1 was in support of the TRO being made, whilst 18 were against. Of those opposed, 16 cited the reduction in number of parking spaces as the main reason.
- The ward councillors have raised no objections to the proposals
- The external organisations have raised no objections to the proposals
- The feedback included a small number of comments from residents questioning the need for additional cycle facilities.

## **Parking Survey**

8. This took place between 4 and 10 October 2015, with details of the parking being recorded three 3 times each day (early morning, midday, early evening). The detailed results are presented in **Annex C**, but the key findings are summarised below:

- The northern RO bay had a high level of occupancy, and on average was 85% full. The peak demand was on Sunday, when the bay was completely full on all three inspections.
- The southern RO bay had the highest level of occupancy, and on average was 90% full. The peak demand was on Sunday, when the bay was completely full on all three inspections. It was also full during most of the early morning inspections, and was very busy in the evenings.

The bay was also full when inspected around midday at the weekend, but usually had significant spare capacity at midday during the week.

- The GMO bay had a great deal of variation in its occupancy, often being completely full, but at other times being empty.

## **Options**

9. Based on the above information, there are considered to be 3 options available:
  - (i) Approve the parking proposals, as shown in Annex A.
  - (ii) Approve the parking proposals, as shown in Annex A, with the exception of creating the compensatory GMO space.
  - (iii) Do nothing.

In addition to these basic options, a decision is also needed on including the cycle stands if options (i) or (ii) are progressed.

## **Analysis**

10. Option (i).

Removal of the two parking spaces would undoubtedly achieve an improvement in visibility to the right for drivers wishing to emerge on to Monkgate. This would reduce the potential for conflict with traffic on Monkgate, and especially cyclists. The proposed scheme retains the existing provision of GMO space, and just reduces the RO capacity by one space compared to the situation before the cycle scheme was implemented.

It is considered important to retain the existing number of GMO spaces because, with only 5 GMO spaces currently provided, the loss of 1 space would represent a 20% reduction in capacity. The survey shows that these are currently all used at certain times. It is also worth noting that the parking survey took place in winter, and outside of school holidays, meaning that the guest houses were probably not experiencing their highest level of demand.

With 23 RO spaces available, the loss of 1 residents' space would only represent a 4.3% reduction in capacity. The survey shows that the current level of demand for residents parking is high, but at most times could accommodate the reduction in available space. The notable exception is on Sunday when the parking survey results show that the occupancy is already at 100%. However, there is an additional parking area available to Monkgate RO permit holders quite close by on Huntington Road. Hence the loss of 1 space on Monkgate is considered unlikely to cause significant additional problems for residents, and must be balanced against the road safety benefits that would be achieved.

11. Option (ii).

This would also achieve the desired improvement to driver visibility and road safety, whilst retaining the level of RO space which existed prior to the cycle scheme being implemented. However, this would have a significant impact on the GMO parking capacity, based on the percentage loss as discussed above.

12. Option (iii).

Doing nothing would not address the visibility issues that exist at both locations, but would have the advantage that it would leave the levels of both the GMO and RO parking at their current numbers.

13. Given that visibility for emerging drivers is severely restricted at both locations in question, and this has road safety risks, it is recommended that the proposed parking restrictions be approved. It is also recommended that the proposed cycle stands are installed in these areas to physically prevent anyone from parking in these areas.

On the question of retaining the current level of GMO parking provision, it is felt that this is necessary to avoid significant problems for the operation of the guest houses. Although this would result in a small reduction in the RO space available, there is additional RO space available on Huntington Road that could be used at peak times.

Hence option (i) is recommended.

## Council Plan

14. The links to the priorities in the Council plan are:

- **A Council that listens to residents** –since the idea of visibility improvements came from residents' suggestions, the implementation of the proposals would show how the Council is working in partnership with local communities to solve local problems. The provision of better road safety conditions on Monkgate, and particularly for cyclists, would also show how Council the council is listening and responding to the concerns of road users.

## Implications

15. This report has the following implications

- **Financial** – Both options (i) and (ii) could be implemented for approximately £5000 and there is sufficient funding available within the 15/16 Capital Programme allocation. The Finance Manager has been consulted and has no issues to raise.
- **Human Resources (HR)** - None
- **Equalities** – None
- **Legal** – The City of York Council, as Highways Authority, has powers under the Highways Act 1980 and associated Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 to implement the measures proposed.
- **Crime and Disorder** – None
- **Information Technology (IT)** – None
- **Property** – None
- **Other** – None

## Risk Management

16. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified and described in the following points, and set out in the table below

- Health and safety – the risk associated with this is in connection with the road safety implications of the final layout, and has been assessed at 2.
- Authority reputation – this risk is in connection with local media coverage and public perception of the Council not undertaking a project that has been consulted upon and is assessed at 6.

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Health and safety	Insignificant	Unlikely	2
Organisation/ Reputation	Moderate	Minor	6

Together these produce a risk score of 6, which being in the 6-10 category means that the risks have been assessed as being "Low". This level of risk requires regular monitoring.

## Contact Details

**Author:**

**Tom Blair**

Tel: (01904 553461)

Transport Projects

**Chief Officer:**

**Neil Ferris**

Acting Director

City and Environmental Services

**Report**

**Approved**



**Date** 18/01/2016

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

There are no specialist implications

**Ward Affected:** Guildhall

**Background Papers:**

“Monkgate Cycle Route” - Report to Director Decision Session meeting on 22 April 2015

“Monkgate Parking Changes” - Report to Director Decision Session meeting on 22 September 2015

### **Annexes**

**Annex A** Existing and Proposed Parking Change Layouts.

**Annex B** Consultation Responses.

**Annex C** Parking Survey Results.