

# **Decision Session – Executive Member for Transport**

19 October 2021

Report of the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning

## Residents' Parking – Petition by residents of Kexby Avenue and Arnside Place

#### **Summary**

- Following consultation on ResPark carried out in February 2021, a report was take to the Executive Member for Transport in June. Arnside Place is a Private Street and was not included in that consultation. Given the level and nature of responses at that time the proposals for Kexby Avenue and 13-57 Thief Lane (odd) were not taken forward in the scheme now implemented on streets nearby.
- 2. Since that decision, we have received a petition, organised by a resident, which was copied to the Executive Member and which requested a review of the decision not to include Kexby Avenue and 13-57 Thief Lane. This report considers that petition and responses to a recent follow-up consultation and ballot conducted by officers.

#### Recommendation

- 3. The Executive Member is asked to:
  - a. Approve the drafting of a further Order to extend the R39B Residents' Priority Parking Zone to include properties in Kexby Avenue.
    - Reason: This recommendation is supported by the majority of people from Kexby Avenue who signed the petition were in favour and is supported by the outcome of the further consultation.
  - b. To not include 13-57 Thief Lane within the R39B Residents Priority Parking Zone.

Reason: This was not contained within the petition. The response to the consultation is low with four responses, 3 in support and 1 against from 23 properties.

c. To consider the case for including Arnside Place within the R39B Resident's Priority Parking Zone.

Reason: This is finely balanced as half of the 10 properties signed the petition, but there were only two responses to the council led consultation. If Arnside Place was added to the ResPark scheme residents would be able to purchase a permit and park within the zone. But the zone would not cover Arnside Place as it is a private street. So equally residents from the Zone could also park in Arnside Place.

#### **Background**

- 4. A report on the outcome of consultation on ResPark was take to the Executive Member for Transport in June. Given the level and nature of responses at that time the proposals for Kexby Avenue and 13-57 Thief Lane (odd) have not been taken forward. Arnside Place is a Private Street off Kexby Avenue and was not included in that original consultation. The rest of the scheme has now been implemented.
- 5. We received a petition, on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2021, organised by a resident: the header of which is copied at ANNEX A. There are 47 properties in Kexby Avenue of which 35 had signed the petition. The canvasing also covered Arnside Place. There are 10 properties here of which 5 have signed the petition.
- 6. The scheme that has now been implemented includes Green Dykes Lane and Devon Place. We have given it reference R39B and it operates from Monday to Friday; 9am to 5pm.
- 7. If Kexby Avenue was to be included in the ResPark scheme, that zone (R39B) would be extended. If Kexby Avenue is included it raises a question about Arnside Place.
- 8. It should be understood that a highway authority is not in a position to introduce parking controls requiring a permit within a Private Street. If Arnside Place is included in the ResPark scheme then permits would be valid in Kexby Avenue although there would not be any ResPark controls within Arnside Place itself.

9. If 13-57 Thief Lane (odd) is included in the ResPark scheme then all permits would be valid in Kexby Avenue and any marked bays along Thief Lane.

#### Consultation, Responses and Proposals

- 10. The proposed extension to R39B would include Kexby Avenue, Arnside Place and (for completeness) 13 57 (odds) Thief Lane. To further inform discussions we carried out a letter drop with ballot paper (with a Freepost envelope) to those properties. The consultation documents are copied in ANNEX B. The main features of this area are detached, semi-detached and short terraces of houses. Many for these have some off-street parking. There is a proportion of Student Houses and HMOs. There were eighty properties in all.
- 11. There have been 34 returns to date (7<sup>th</sup> October 2021).
- 12. There are 47 properties in Kexby Avenue. We have received 27 responses, 21 of which are in support with 7 against. The support was distributed along the street with the bulk of objections from the section between the bend and Green Dykes Lane. This distribution very much mirrors the response to the consultation earlier this year. In this case, however, the level of response has risen significantly doubled. The level of support have risen from 4 to 21; objections rising from 4 to 7. Given this, and the driving petition, which contained signatures from 35 of the properties, it is considered that the introduction of ResPark on Kexby Avenue will bring benefits to the majority of residents.
- 13. There are 10 properties in Arnside Place. We have received two response to date, both supporting the proposal. Again, given that the driving petition contained signatures from 5 of the (ten) properties, it is therefore a finely balanced decision if Arnside Place should be included in this extension and the process of a public discussion may help determine that decision. As set out above, there would not be any ResPark controls within Arnside Place itself. Arnside Place would be included in the ResPark scheme and permits would be valid in Kexby Avenue.
- 14. There are 23 properties in this section of Thief Lane. We have received 4 responses, 3 of which are in support with 1 against. Again this very much mirrors the response to the consultation earlier this year. Given that the driving petition did not request change on this section of Thief Lane and the limited responses it is not considered sufficient evidence

to change the original decision of June this year. Although increasing the level of residents parking in neighbouring streets may increase the parking pressure on this section of Thief Lane.

15. As with any parking scheme that affords priority to residents the existing level of parking by non-residents will either transfer to other modes or times or will displace to other locations (on street or off street). The original agreement with The University of York includes monitoring of these effects

#### **Council Plan**

- 16. This report is supportive of the following priorities in the Council Plan which focuses on key outcomes that include:
  - Good health and wellbeing
  - Getting around sustainably and
  - A greener and cleaner City of York Council safe communities and culture for all.

www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/2132/council-plan-2019-to-2023

### **Implications**

- 17. The following are the identified implications.
  - Financial The consultation process and implementation of any agreed set of schemes will be funded from funds deposited by the University of York under a Section 106 agreement. The initial subsidy will be funded in the same way.
  - Human Resources The extended parking zone will require staff resources (shortly utilising an online self-service system and virtual permits) by the back office and CEO staff. The management and monitoring will be a Traffic Management function.
  - Equalities As set out in the Equalities Impact Assessment Documentation an ANNEX C.
  - Legal The decisions will require changes in the parking Traffic Regulation Orders and sealing.
  - Crime and Disorder None
  - Information Technology (IT) There is an existing ICT system in place. A new ICT system for parking covering penalty charge notices and permits has been rolled out. Some initial teething issues are being resolved with the aim of improving the customer experience.
  - **Property** None

• Risk Management – The proposed extension to the existing Residents' parking provision will be something that most residents/customers will welcome but may disadvantaged some people who may have objected to the draft proposal. These objections have been reviewed and reported herein.

Co	ntac	t De	tai	le:
CU	IIIAL	LDE	:Lai	15.

Author:	Chief Office	er Responsible	for the report:
Ken Hay Traffic Projects Officer Transport	James Gilchrist Director Environment, Transport & Planning		
Transport Tel No. 2474	Report Approved	√ Date	07/10/2021
Ward Affected: Fishergate			AII

For further information please contact the author of the report.