



**Notice of a public  
Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport**

**To:** Councillor D'Agorne (Executive Member)  
**Date:** Monday, 26 September 2022  
**Time:** 10.00 am  
**Venue:** The King Richard III Room (GO49) - West Offices

**AGENDA**

**Notice to Members – Post Decision Calling In:**

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item\* on this agenda, notice must be given to Democracy Services by **5:00 pm** on **Wednesday 28 September 2022**.

\*With the exception of matters that have been the subject of a previous call in, require Full Council approval or are urgent which are not subject to the call-in provisions. Any called in items will be considered by the Customer and Corporate Services Scrutiny Management Committee.

Written representations in respect of items on this agenda should be submitted to Democratic Services by **5.00pm on Thursday 22 September 2022**.

**1. Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, Members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest or other registerable interest they might have in respect of business on this agenda, if they have not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests.

**2. Minutes**

(Pages 1 - 8)

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2022.

### 3. **Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. Members of the public may speak on agenda items or on matters within the remit of the committee.

Please note that our registration deadlines are set as 2 working days before the meeting, in order to facilitate the management of public participation at our meetings. The deadline for registering at this meeting is 5:00pm on Thursday 22 September 2022.

To register to speak please visit [www.york.gov.uk/AttendCouncilMeetings](http://www.york.gov.uk/AttendCouncilMeetings) to fill in an online registration form. If you have any questions about the registration form or the meeting, please contact Democratic Services. Contact details can be found at the foot of this agenda.

#### Webcasting of Public Meetings

Please note that, subject to available resources, this meeting will be webcast including any registered public speakers who have given their permission. The meeting can be viewed live and on demand at [www.york.gov.uk/webcasts](http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts).

During coronavirus, we made some changes to how we ran council meetings, including facilitating remote participation by public speakers. See our updates ([www.york.gov.uk/COVIDDemocracy](http://www.york.gov.uk/COVIDDemocracy)) for more information on meetings and decisions.

### 4. **Consideration of representations received to the advertised R70 extended Residents Priority Parking Area to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace** (Pages 9 - 36)

To consider the formal representations received to the legal Traffic Regulation Order, advertised on the 20th of May 2022, to implement an extension to the previously approved R70 residents' priority parking scheme to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace and determine what action is appropriate.

### 5. **Acknowledgement of Petitions** (Pages 37 - 66)

The purpose of this paper is to acknowledge and address a number of

petitions that have been submitted to Highways and Transport.

## 6. Urgent Business

Any other business which the Executive Member considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

### Democracy Officer:

Robert Flintoft

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 555704
- Email – [Robert.flintoft@york.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.flintoft@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak;
- Business of the meeting;
- Any special arrangements;
- Copies of reports and;
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

**This information can be provided in your own language.**

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

 (01904) 551550



City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

Meeting	Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport
Date	19 July 2022
Present	Councillors D'Agorne

**12. Declarations of Interest (10:00)**

The Executive Member was asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests that he might have had in respect of business on the agenda. He confirmed he had none.

**13. Minutes (10:01)**

Resolved: That the minutes of the Decision Session of the Executive Member for Transport held on 21 June 2022 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

**14. Public Participation (10:02)**

It was reported that there had been seven registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Councillor Vassie raised his concern that the Heslington to Wheldrake and Elvington cycle path would not be completed. He highlighted public and government support for the scheme and requested that instead of reallocating funding that the Executive Member agree to use the funding available to purchase land to make the routes creation possible once funding could be secured or to postpone the use of the funding until more could be secured.

Councillor Melly noted that she felt the size of the agenda at over 500 pages was not accessible to residents. She also enquired why there were no updates on the Acomb Road Active Travel scheme and why feasibility reports were not included for the Bootham Active Travel scheme or Heslington to Wheldrake.

She also asked how many active travel schemes had been delivered.

James Goodman lives in Wheldrake and stated that residents in the village didn't want the cycle path to be dropped. He noted that there was no active travel routes into York from the village and if York is to be the home of Active Travel England then the Council should be seeking to deliver these schemes even if they cost more than initially expected.

Rob Ainsley representing the York Cycle Campaign highlighted the need for a reduction in carbon emissions. He stated that the Council had a terrible record of delivery of Active Travel schemes. He asked why the Council could delivery the duelling of the outer ring road but could not afford a cycle route between Heslington to Wheldrake and stated that there should be workable options for delivery but no feasibility report was included in the report.

Roger Pierce representing Walk York noted that he felt the Council collected too much data and used too little evidence. He raised concern that there were too few pedestrian schemes in the Active Travel programme. He asked why higher curbs were being installed in the city centre and enquired about whether a city centre consultancy group could be established to assist in decision making.

Tom Franklin noted as a Clifton Parish Councillor that residents had explained to them that they would not be sending children to Manor School without the A1237 crossing being completed. He noted that he felt the Council was not following its own priority list and was only taking motorists into account and hid behind being unable to meet LTPN120. He thanked the Executive Member for pushing for the delivery of schemes.

Councillor Smalley asked that A1237 crossing scheme be delivered. He noted that 322 residents had signed a quickly organised petition showing local support for a safer crossing. He highlighted that while the current crossing is dangerous it hasn't yet had many accidents and therefore was concerned seeking safety funding to deliver the scheme would not be successful.

**15. Active Travel Programme (10:26)**

Officers introduced the report into the Active Travel Programme and highlighted the progress with a number of schemes such as Navigation Road. It was confirmed that some schemes officers considered were unable to be delivered with the current budget for the program, confirming that some schemes costs had been underestimated and therefore bid funding was insufficient to deliver these schemes. Consequently it was noted that it was recommended that some funding be reallocated to deliverable schemes.

The Executive Member discussed the City Centre Cycle Parking improvements scheme with Officers and approved the scheme but wished to note the decision was also taking into account other work within the city centre. The trial of a last mile freight hub was discussed as well as the need for more cycle parking close to the footstreets. More secure cycle parking was also discussed as a way of encouraging residents to feel safer about parking bikes in the city.

The Executive Member approved the undertaking of feasibility work for the two People Streets schemes at Clifton Green Primary School and Badger Hill Primary School. He also acknowledged the feasibility work undertaken in relation to Ostman Road and noted the significant cost associated with each of the options in the report. The Executive Member stated that he would like consultation with stakeholders and ward councillors to be undertaken on the different options outlined in the report. He noted that as he was of a mind not reallocate funds from other schemes he didn't wish for funding to be spent on design work until a preferred option was agreed. He did support including Ostman Road in a future funding bid for Active Travel funding to deliver the scheme.

Officers confirmed that the changes to Navigation Road to improve cycling provisions had had a positive response from cyclists and pedestrians and therefore would recommend the changes be made permanent. Some objections from motorists had been received and were considered, it was confirmed that the provisional changes had not had a significantly negative impact on the road network and therefore the Executive Member agreed to make the changes permanent.

A small scheme on City Centre Bridges to add signage to encourage safer passing of cyclists was approved. The Executive Member noted that he was pleased that the police had an interest in addressing close passing. A no overtaking sign was noted as having been considered and rejected and it was noted that changes to the speed limit was also discussed but Officers deemed that changes to the speed limit should be kept as part of wider schemes.

Officers confirmed that crossing on the A1237 was not a pleasant or safe crossing for cyclists however, there was insufficient funds to deliver an improved crossing. Consultants for the Council it was confirmed had been unable to identify a step forward. It was discussed whether funding could be secured for improvements to be undertaken as part of a safety scheme, however, the low accident record at the crossing could affect funding. A new bridge crossing was discussed and officers confirmed that legal services had raised concerns that this would affect the duelling of the outer ring road project. The Executive Member requested that instead of reassigning the funds assigned to the scheme that they be used to explore the feasibility of a new bridge.

The Wheldrake to Heslington active travel scheme was discussed, Officers confirmed that following a feasibility study for Elvington to Heslington it was confirmed that the cost deliver the scheme was outside the current budget. Therefore they recommended that the budget be reallocated. The Executive Member noted that he was not currently willing to reallocate funds and would like to explore using the current funding available for things such as purchasing land required for a route. He asked that officers work with the Department for Transport, Sustrans, and Active Travel England on whether a smaller less expensive scheme could be delivered.

Resolved:

- i. Approved the Project Outline for the 'City Centre Cycle Parking Improvements' scheme attached in Annex 1.

Proceed to undertake Feasibility work to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation.



Reason: To provide clarity on the objectives and scope of the proposed scheme.

- ii. Approved the Project Outline for the 'People Streets at Clifton Green Primary School' scheme attached in Annex 2.

Proceed to undertake Feasibility work to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation.

Reason: To provide clarity on the objectives and scope of the proposed scheme.

- iii. Approved the Project Outline for the 'People Streets at Badger Hill Primary School' scheme attached in Annex 3.

Proceed to undertake Feasibility work to understand costs, timescales, outline designs and consultation feedback to inform a further decision prior to implementation.

Reason: To provide clarity on the objectives and scope of the proposed scheme.

- iv. Agreed to make the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order relating to Navigation Road cycle scheme permanent.

Reason: To successfully conclude the Navigation Road trial scheme.

- v. Confirmed that the proposals presented for the City Centre Bridges scheme align with the approved Project Outline, and decide to proceed with consultation, detailed design and implementation.

Reason: To support progress towards implementation of a solution.

- vi. That officers work with the Department for Transport and Sustrans to use the existing funding to explore

the feasibility of a new bridge for pedestrians and cyclists on the A1237.

For officers to consider whether in the longer term if active travel provision could be considered as part of the Outer Ring Road works.

For officers to explore shorter term options to improve safety are to be explored through the separate Safety Scheme Review process within the Transport Capital Programme.

Reason: To consider options to create a safe crossing on the A1237.

- vii. That officers explore with the Department for Transport, Sustrans, and Active Travel England the possibility of undertaking feasibility work for a smaller active travel scheme between Wheldrake and Heslington.

Reason: To consider options for an affordable scheme to be undertaken.

- viii. Noted the outcome of the feasibility work for the 'People Streets at Ostman Road' scheme laid out in section 125 and decide to seek further funding before proceeding to implementation. Seek Active Travel grant funding support at the next round of bidding.

However, do not progress with detailed design work on Design Option 1 presented within Annex 8, instead seek the views of Ward Councillors and stakeholders.

Reason: Feasibility work indicates that whilst a practically achievable scheme has been identified, there is currently insufficient budget to deliver the scheme.

## **16. Micromobility trial update (11:54)**

The Department for Transport has now extended the e-scooter and e-bike trial until 31 May 2024 and therefore the Council can choose to extend its current trial. The Executive Member

thanked the Councils partner Tier in delivering e-scooters and e-bikes in the city and for working with the Council and residents to deliver a successful trial and agreed to continue the trial.

Resolved:

- i. Agreed to continue with the e-scooter and e-bike trial in line with the Department for Transport (“DfT”) guidance in York until 31<sup>st</sup> May 2024 and continue contribution of officer time in kind and to delegate authority to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning in consultation with the Director of Governance and the Chief Finance Officer to explore and extend the current arrangements for the existing operator, if viable. If market engagement and re-procurement is required, a further paper will be brought to a future Executive Member Decision Session to approve arrangements;

Reason: To further explore environmental and carbon reduction benefits of shared asset schemes and zero emission micromobility (e-bikes and e-scooters);

#### **17. Directorate of Place 2022/23 Transport Capital Programme – Consolidated Report (12:01)**

The Executive Member considered the report and Officers confirmed that the Active Travel Programme was not included due to breakdown provided in item four of the agenda pack and would therefore be included as usual in future reports. The Executive Member agreed to note the amendments to the 2022/23 Directorate of Place Transport Capital Programme budget, subject to approval by the Executive.

Resolved:

- i. Approved the carryover schemes and adjustments set out in the report and annexes;
- ii. Noted the amendments to the 2022/23 Directorate of Place Transport Capital Programme budget, subject to approval by the Executive.

Reason: To implement the council's transport strategy identified in York's third Local Transport Plan and the Council Priorities, and deliver schemes identified in the council's Transport Programme, including the Active Travel Programme.

Cllr A D'Agorne, Executive Member for Transport  
[The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 12.05 pm].



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

**26 September 2022**

Report to the Corporate Director of Economy and Place Directorate

### **Consideration of representations received to the advertised R70 extended Residents Priority Parking Scheme to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace.**

#### **Summary**

1. To consider the formal representations received to the legal Traffic Regulation Order, advertised on the 20<sup>th</sup> of May 2022, to implement an extension to the previously approved R70 residents' priority parking scheme to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace and determine what action is appropriate.

#### **Recommendation**

2.

It is recommended that approval be given to implement an extension to the previously approved R70 residents parking scheme to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace. This would extend the previously approved scheme boundary which currently includes Kilburn Road, Alma Terrace and Alma Grove. The extension would be implemented as advertised which would be operational under entry zone signs enforceable 24hours a day 7 days a week. Details outlined in Option One with the recommended R70 extended boundary plan provided as Annex G.

It is also recommended to implement the advertised limited waiting bays located on Carey Street, these are to be operational between 8am – 5pm each day providing unrestricted parking for a maximum of 90 minutes, no return within 60 minutes. A residents parking permit would be required outside of the specified hours. Proposals shown in C1.

**Reason:** To provide the improved parking provision for residents of the whole area, in line with the comments received when advertising a reduced area for R70 and the limited objections submitted to the advertised proposals to extend the scheme to include the wider area.

## Background

3. We originally consulted on a large area to extend R20 in March 2021, the results of which were considered at a Decision Session on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2021. During this it was resolved to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Residents Priority Parking for Kilburn Road, Alma Terrace and Alma Grove only. This was in reflection of the percentage results. It was also requested that a new scheme should be considered to include the permitted streets to be advertised as a new separate residents parking area, to be known as R70.
4. An amendment to the legal Traffic Regulation Order to implement the Residents Priority parking scheme, to be known as R70, was advertised on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2022. During which extensive objections were received to the implementation of a reduced area which included Kilburn Road, Alma Terrace and Alma Grove only. The representations were considered at a Public Decision Session on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The full report can be seen on the following link under item 60:  
<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=738&MId=12736>  
During this meeting the Executive Member resolved to:
  - Implement the advertised R70 scheme for Kilburn Road, Alma Grove, and Alma Terrace.
  - Advertisement for the inclusion of Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace within the R70 residents parking area be implemented.
5. As such the legal order to extend the approved R70 residents parking area was advertised on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2022 asking for all representations to be received by 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022. Within the legal advertisement we also advertised 2 x limited waiting parking bays on Carey Street to accommodate local business requirements, these could also assist some trades and visitor vehicles without the need to obtain a permit. The bays would accommodate approximately 4 vehicles and be restricted between 8am – 5pm each day providing parking for up to 90minutes with no return within 60 minutes for non-permit holders. Outside of these hours a residents parking permit would be required to utilise the bays.

## Legal advertisement

6. The proposals to extend the R70 scheme boundary were advertised in the usual manner of notices placed on street, in the local press, to the statutory consultees and delivered to the adjacent properties who would be included within the advertised extended area.
7. During the advertisement period we received 11 objections and a further 16 representations in support of the scheme from the proposed extended area. All representations can be seen in full within Annex D and E along with photographs supplied to highlight the current obstructive parking taking place close to junctions included as Annex F.
8. The majority of the objections received related to the cost of permits and residents do not believe they should have to pay to park outside their own property. The only way to give priority to residents over non-residents on an adopted highway is to introduce restrictions, this comes with a cost to administer and enforce, as such all schemes must be resident driven in order to proceed so that the pros and cons can be considered by each household. Further comments were received relating to the overall process and the staggered approach to implementation. This was originally due to percentage returns from the original consultation; however, residents were concerned when the whole area was not being considered for restrictions which has led to the staggered advertisement for the R70 boundary after previous representations were considered at a public decision session. One objection was received from a local business relating to the removal of parking for staff and clients. Limited waiting bays are already in place on Fulford Road to accommodate local businesses and further limited waiting bays are proposed within the proposal.
9. **Carey Street limited waiting bays** One comment was received from a local business asking for the time restriction to be increased from 90 minutes to 3 hours due to the regular custom received, this would be difficult to enforce and lead to misuse of the limited waiting area which is being recommended to help keep an area clear for customers and guests. Any visitor with a blue badge can park within any part of the proposed restricted area without the need for a permit.

A further comment was received from a resident requesting that the bays are restricted for both Residents Parking Permit holders and 90minutes for non-permit holders due to the number of bays which are being

proposed. Due to parking pressures within terraced areas this may lead to the bays being occupied full time by permit holders leading to no limited parking available for customers etc. it is recommended that the spaces are restricted between 8am – 5pm each day with a limited waiting time of 90 minutes; meaning that R70 resident parking permit holders would be permitted to park from 3.30pm until 9.30am the following day.

**10 Options for consideration:**

**Option 1 (Recommended Option)**

- a) Implement an extension of the R70 Residents' Priority Parking scheme, as per boundary annotated in Annex G which includes Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace, to operate 24hours Monday to Sunday. Entry signs will be placed at the entrances and exits to the restricted area to inform drivers of the scheme boundary. Further ad hoc repeater signs will also be erected on existing street furniture where appropriate.
- b) It is also recommended to implement the advertised limited waiting parking bays on Caret Street to be operational between 8am – 5pm each day providing unrestricted parking for a maximum of 90minutes, no return within 60 minutes. A residents parking permit would be required outside of the specified hours. Proposals shown in Annex C1.

**13 Option 2:**

- a) Implement an extension of the R70 Residents' Priority Parking scheme, as per boundary annotated in Annex G, to operate 24hours Monday to Sunday. Entry signs will be placed at the entrances and exits to the restricted area to inform drivers of the scheme boundary. Further ad hoc repeater signs will also be erected on existing street furniture where appropriate.
- b) Amend the advertised limited waiting bays on Carey Street to be restricted for R70 residents parking permit holders or 90 minutes limited waiting for non-permit holders at all times.

This is not the recommended option as it will not ensure that visitor / customer parking is available during the working day for local businesses. Restricting the bays can also assist with short time parking for trades and



guests without the need for residents to obtain temporary permits.

#### 14 **Option 3:**

No further action to be taken.

This is not the recommended option because it is not in line with the council's objectives as stated in the Local Transport Plan and does not respond to the clearly expressed preference of some residents who have stated the need for resident parking restrictions in their area.

#### 16 **Council Plan**

The implementation of resident parking contributes to the Council plan actions:

- Getting Around Sustainably;
- Safe Communities and Culture for All;
- Open and Effective Council;

#### 17 **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. 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 workload. New zones/areas also impact on the Business Support Administrative services, Customer 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 – Positive impact for residents who should be able to park closer to their dwelling but potential negative impact for other car users who will not be able to park on these streets any longer without a permit;
- Disability – Neutral as Blue Badge holders who live locally can apply to have a bay provided outside their homes if they meet the requirements. Blue Badge holders can park in Residents' Parking areas foc;
- Gender – Neutral;
- Gender reassignment – Neutral;
- Marriage and civil partnership– Neutral;
- Pregnancy and maternity - Positive impact for residents who should be able to park closer to their dwelling but potential negative impact for other car users who will not be able to park on these streets any longer without a permit;
- Race – Neutral;
- Religion and belief – Neutral;
- Sexual orientation – Neutral;
- Other socio-economic groups including:
  - Carer - Neutral (see Disability);
  - 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 – Residents can apply online for their resident parking permit.

If residents are unable to apply online, they are advised to contact CYC customer service team on 01904 551309 for assistance.

Alternatively, all of York libraries have free access to the internet for library members. Library staff may also be able to help residents if they need a little support while working their way through the form.

**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:**

Annemarie Howarth  
Traffic Project Officer  
Transport  
Tel: (01904) 551337

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

James Gilchrist  
Director for Environment, Transport and  
Planning

**Date:** 18<sup>th</sup> August 2022 Approved X

**Wards Affected: Fishergate**

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

## Annexes:

**Annex A:** Letter delivered to advertised extended R70 residents

**Annex B:** Legal Notice of Proposals

**Annex C:** Advertised extended scheme including

**Annex C1:** Advertised Carey Street Limited Waiting Bays

**Annex D:** Objections received to the advertisement

**Annex E:** Support received to the proposals

**Annex F:** Supporting documentation relating to current obstructions

**Annex G:** Proposed extended R70 boundary



Directorate of Economy & Place

West Offices, Station Rise  
York  
YO1 6GA

Email: [highway.regulation@york.gov.uk](mailto:highway.regulation@york.gov.uk)

Date: w/c 16<sup>th</sup> May 2022

Dear Resident

**Proposed Residents' Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark) R70 extension to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace**

You may remember we wrote to you when we last initiated the legal procedure in January 2022. At this time we advertised a proposal to introduce a new resident's priority parking scheme on Kilburn Road and Alma Terrace/Alma Grove only.

We subsequently received several representations in objection to the advertised proposal. As such all representations received were presented in a report to the Executive Member for Transport (Cllr A D'Agorne) on the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2022 at a Public Decision Session. The full report can be seen on the following link under item 60:

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=738&MIId=12736>

The Executive Member resolved to:

- Implement the advertised R70 scheme for Kilburn Road, Alma Grove, and Alma Terrace;
- Advertisement for the inclusion of Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace within the R70 residents parking area be implemented.

Reason: To provide the improved parking provision for residents of Kilburn Road, Alma Grove, and Alma Terrace, in line with the majority preferences

received within the consultation and limited objections submitted to the advertised proposals from the nearby area. As well as allowing consultation to take place with the wider area regarding inclusion into the R70 scheme.

As such we are now advertising an amendment to the approved scheme to include your area. If implemented you would be included within the R70 boundary. Please see the attached plan for the boundary outline.

Notices will be placed on street and the amended proposal will be advertised in 'The Press' on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2022.

I have attached a copy of the legal notice of proposals for your information. This includes the advertisement of limited waiting bays on Carey Street to assist with local amenities and visitors/tradespeople if required. If you wish to make representation to the proposal, in support or against, please write with details by email to [highway.regulation@york.gov.uk](mailto:highway.regulation@york.gov.uk) or to the Director of Place at the above West Offices address, no later than the 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

If no objections are received, we will implement the scheme as advertised for the extended area (in addition to Alma Terrace/Alma Grove) and advise residents further on the implementation date and how to obtain permits. However should objections be received we will need to report these back to a Public Decision Session where all representations, in support and against the proposal, will be included for the consideration of the Executive Member for Transport, if this is the case we will write to you all again with details of this meeting.

Please contact me on:

- 01904 551337 or
- email: [highway.regulation@york.gov.uk](mailto:highway.regulation@york.gov.uk) if you require any additional information or clarification.

Yours faithfully

*A Howarth*

Annemarie Howarth

Traffic Projects Officer

Traffic Management

**CITY OF YORK COUNCIL**  
**NOTICE OF PROPOSALS**  
**THE YORK PARKING, STOPPING AND WAITING (AMENDMENT) (NO 14/54)**  
**TRAFFIC ORDER 2022**

Notice is hereby given that City of York Council, in exercise of powers under Sections 1, 2, 4, 32, 35, 45, 46, 53 and Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984 ("the Act") and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Schedule 9 of the Act, proposes to make an Order which will have the effect of:

1. Introducing a Residents' Priority Parking Zone (Zone) for all classes of Residents' Priority Permit Holders comprising of Ambrose Street, Carey Street, Frances Street and Wenlock Terrace, York the said Zone to be identified as Zone 70, that Zone to include all properties adjacent to and having direct private access to the said road.
2. Designating the existing unrestricted lengths of Ambrose Street, Carey Street, Frances Street and Wenlock Terrace, York within the proposed Zone described in paragraph 1 as a Residents' Priority Parking Zone for use only by Zone R70 'Permit Holders' thereby providing unlimited parking for Permit Holders, the said lengths being identifiable by the placement of upright traffic signs at the Area 'entry' and 'exit' points (as opposed to the placement of Residents' Parking signs and road markings adjacent to the kerb).
3. Introducing Monday-Sunday 8am till 5pm Parking Places, providing a limited parking period of 90 minutes with a 60 minutes 'No Return' period, on Carey Street, on its:
  - (i) west side, between points 8 metres (terminal point of existing 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions) and 16 metres south from the projected southern kerblines of Alma Terrace,
  - (ii) east side, between points 8 metres (terminal point of existing 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions) and 22 metres south from the projected southern kerblines of Alma Terrace,


A copy of the draft Order, Statement of Reasons for making it and relevant maps can be inspected at the Reception, West Offices, Station Rise, York, during normal business hours. Objections or other representations specifying reasons for the objection or representation should be sent to me in writing to arrive no later than 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022.




Dated: 20<sup>th</sup> May 2022

Director of Place  
Network Management, West Offices, Station Rise, York, YO1 6GA  
Email: [highway.regulation@york.gov.uk](mailto:highway.regulation@york.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank






-  Existing approved R70 ResPark Area
-  Advertised area to become part of R70 ResPark zone
-  Proposed limited waiting 8am - 5pm parking bays to accommodate approx 4 vehicles




**Extended R70 residents parking area to be advertised**

SCALE	1 : 2000
DATE	May 2022
DRAWING No.	
DRAWN BY	
+ Crown copyright. All rights reserved Licence No. 2003	

This page is intentionally left blank



 <p>CITY OF <b>YORK</b> COUNCIL</p>	<p><b>Proposed limited waiting bays within R70</b></p>	SCALE	1 : 500
		DRAWING No.	
		DRAWN BY	
		<p>+ Crown copyright. All rights reserved Licence No. 2003</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Objections and comments received to the advertised extended R70  
Residents Parking Scheme**

**6 x objections relating to the cost of permits**

I am writing on behalf of \_ resident of ... Ambrose Street, York, in the area expected to be included in the extension of resident parking scheme R70 if it is approved. \_ is a vulnerable adult who relies on his car for essential day to day tasks, and to get to e.g. medical appointments. I am writing on his behalf as he is not able to respond himself.

He is objecting to the proposal on two grounds, affordability and effectiveness. Firstly Joe is living on benefits. Even with the discount because of this, the cost of the permit will still significantly affect his budget. Not having a car is not an option, so he will be forced to pay for the permit and make cuts to his already low living standards to compensate.

Secondly the proposed scheme is not solving an actual problem. It can sometimes be tricky to find a car parking space in the evening, but it has always been possible to find one in the area. Assuming that the scheme will be enforced only during working hours as originally proposed, the scheme does not even alleviate that problem. It is currently much easier to find a spot during the proposed hours than outside them. The scheme rewards those who drive to work every day, and penalises those who opt to commute in more environmentally friendly ways, leaving the car at home.

In summary, the scheme is too expensive without significant benefit to the environment or local residents.

I am writing to you as a homeowner on Ambrose Street, YO104DT, about the proposed extension of the R70 parking scheme.

We have recently started to let the house on Airbnb as a holiday let and are unsure of the impact that a residents parking permit will have on both our guests staying at the house and myself when I am there to clean and for maintenance etc.

I am therefore against the proposal, as it has never been an issue to find a parking space in all the time we have lived there.

Please can you get back to me with more details; of the impact it will have on my business and personal use of the parking spaces on my street.

I am just writing to object against the proposed Research scheme on Ambrose Street earlier this year I also objected against the scheme. I am happy with the current parking scheme and with the current rise in petrol fuel food etc I struggling to make ends meet and do not need another expense.

We would like to oppose the proposal to extend the parking scheme to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace. The reason is that we don't think it will improve the parking provision for our street and will make the situation worse for everyone with a car.

I am against the above proposal my reasons been I object to been charged for parking in the street for which I have been a resident for 38 years, also I believe you would still not be able to guarantee me a parking space outside my own home or possible in my own street due to the amount of cars out weighing the spaces available.

I am writing to object to the proposed parking scheme on Ambrose Street Fulford York. Not only do I think its unfair to pay to park outside my own home I think the prices are extortionate can you explain to me how you come up with these prices and why is there such a jump from one car to two. Can I also be guaranteed a space if I pay for a permit? I am also flabbergasted by the timing with all the price hikes at the moment can you justify this at the present time. I can understand restrictions on major roads but not on side roads. Can you also tell me where the money goes from the permits? Please can you send my reply ASAP and confirmation you got my objection.

### **2 x comments relating to the proposed time restriction for the limited waiting parking bays on Carey Street**

I have been thinking about the waiting bays that you mentioned that are greatly appreciated but I just don't think 90 minutes is enough.

A lot of my customers like I explained are not very mobile or are elderly, struggle with mental health or the main issue is loneliness. Many customers use my cafe as a hub where they have company most of the day and meet new people or have met friends here where they all meet regularly.

I honestly feel that 3 hours would be more accommodating for the more elderly customers and for my business needs.

Is it necessary to reserve four bays for trades people in Carey Street? This seems a large number of spaces for the one business trading in Carey Street, given the enormous pressure on parking places; it will not help with trades people attending premises in the other streets; would it be possible to designate these bays as available for visitors for up to 90 minutes *or for ResPark permit holders?*

I realise that I did not make myself clear in my third question. I was suggesting that vehicles with resident permits would be able to park in the 90 minute bays for as long as the residents/owners wished, but that other vehicles would be restricted to 90 minutes. This is a restriction which I have seen introduced elsewhere.

### **1 x objection from a local business**

We have major concerns for Staff and clients parking. The parking has been a big problem while builders have been constructing the new student accommodation. No where for clients or staff to park.

We have a forecourt for two vehicles, but we-have five staff plus clients.

The council have placed two wooden blocks in pavement, which stops us getting on the forecourt.

We have now been informed that we will have to have permits or pay a yearly fee. It has been so hard keeping business open. Can you please look into this matter.

**2 x comments relating to the ResPark process and extending the proposed R70 area as a whole**

As the R70 area has already been agreed, this objection concerns the process rather than the terms of the proposed extension.

Parking pressure on areas surrounding the existing 'decided' R70 zone will be exacerbated unless all the above subject streets are included.

However, it is unethical to extend the resident parking scheme incrementally in this way: the new extended area residents need to acquiesce to the extension to avoid the additional pressure resulting from designation of Alma Street etc as a resident parking area.

My principal objection is to resident parking zones generally, where property ownership/tenancy confers private rights on a public asset. This further erodes civil liberties.

More investigation into the reason for original pressure should have been made - perhaps revealing that a more imaginative solution could be found. For example, in London, commuter and shopper pressure on some local streets has been relieved by applying resident parking restrictions for only one mid-morning hour every weekday.

In summary:

- I object to the principle of resident parking zones.
- I object to a poorly-conceived process that forces incremental acquiescence to a bad idea.

Firstly, in the previous letter which excluded Ambrose Street from the scheme I believe there was sufficient agreement to put the restrictions in place and am pleased that this is now being re-considered, although disappointed that this is the way to deal with it.

Secondly with all the new student accommodation being built on Fulford Road coupled with the rise in AirBnB type housing in the area, parking is and will continue to be more challenging and this change will support residents being able to park.

Thirdly, when the scheme comes into force surrounding Ambrose Street and Ambrose Street not being included will make parking an even greater challenge and unfair as other streets take advantage of the schemes lack of application close by, especially as they are connected via Carey Street.

I look forward with interest to the results reached.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Support received to the advertised extended R70 Respark scheme**

\* responses annotated in red \*

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed residents' priority parking scheme R70 extension.

I wanted to declare that **I am in support of the extension of priority parking on Ambrose Street.**

Please let me know if you require any further information from me.

I am writing in support of the plans regarding the ResPark R70 extension to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace. As a home owner and resident of Ambrose Street, I frequently have trouble finding a parking spot at present.

Thank you for your most welcome letter and copies of legal proposals for the Residents Priority Parking Scheme.

Particularly welcome is the extension of the R70 Scheme to include Holly Terrace, Ambrose Street and Frances Street, since this will affect us.

It appears that there is an undisclosed number of Air BNB houses in this area and also an undisclosed number of Multiple Occupation Houses with several cars owned by single households. These streets are also used by visitors to York, who park in the streets and then walk into the town.

Similarly, dog walkers park in the streets to use the Riverside and Millennium Fields.

We will be very grateful if this scheme goes ahead!

Please take this email as my formal support for the inclusion of Frances Street.

I am writing to give my support for including Ambrose St (where I live) as part of the R70 scheme. I have been in contact before about the necessity of doing this so that our area is not negatively impacted by the implementation of R70 in the neighbouring streets that voted for it.

I did initially vote for it and am in favour. I attribute the voting turnout/result on our streets to the amount of student housing and AirBnBs. Longterm tenants and residents on these streets need R70 in order to park at our homes (especially if neighbouring streets implement it), and I am glad the council is extending this possibility to us.

In future, to avoid unnecessary issues arising it would be welcome if areas were considered on the whole (and voting calculated accordingly) rather than street by street.

**The area was originally considered as a whole, however the required response rate was not met.**

We are delighted that the residents parking scheme is being considered.

This will make a huge difference for people living and maintaining the properties.

Last week I had a carpet fitted, as there were no available parking spaces in the street, the carpet fitters had to block the road whilst they unloaded the new carpets, underlay etc.

The street was blocked for about 5 minutes for this and caused a bit of chaos to people trying to drive down the street.

Hopefully this will eliminate this problem which is almost a daily occurrence.

The proposal to extend R70 to Ambrose Street, etc., Has my full support.

I wish to give my support for the proposed extension to the R70 parking scheme to include Wenlock Terrace.

I have been a resident of Wenlock Terrace for over 15 years and believe that it is only fair that everyone is included in the scheme.

Parking round here is a great stress and the decision of April's meeting to give the wealthy residents priority parking it only adds to the stress. Especially when the results of the April meeting was announced in the March newsletter.

I am currently reluctant to use my car because I worry about not being able to park when I return home and should the scheme go ahead without the extension to include Wenlock Terrace, life round here is going to be difficult and even more stressful.

I would also like to add the following points of view...

A good 75% of the residents on these streets will have graduated and moved out of the area before the scheme is implemented and I feel that should be noted if you are looking for a certain percentage of support.

Whilst I fully support our student population I feel asking students to vote for a scheme that will restrict parking for future students (the new accommodation at the end of the street) 6 months after they have left the area gives a rather unfair result for the long term residents who will still be living here.

Owners of the rental properties and air b& b's on these streets will not want permit parking but it is not them that live here.

I am contacting you regarding the 'Proposed Resident's Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark) R70 extension to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace'.

In your recent letter you asked if there are any comments for or against this proposal to email. I would like to voice my support for the inclusion of Wenlock Terrace.

Currently it is very rare that I am able to park on my street (Wenlock Terrace), normally having to seek other streets nearby such as Alma Terrace. I know that many people chose to park on these streets and travel into York, thus limiting the amount of space for residents. If my surrounding streets are included in a permit, but Wenlock Terrace was not, that would push all the 'extra' cars that normally park on the now restricted streets to park on Wenlock Terrace making an already difficult street even harder to find a space. If I am unable to park on my street and the surrounding roads are permitted, I do not know where I will be able to park in close vicinity of my flat (i.e. closest I can think of would be beyond Iceland/Aldi. So my car would be at least a 15 minute walk from my property - something that is not ideal for the security of my car).

In conclusion, should the R70 permitting go ahead as is planned I would be in support of including Wenlock Terrace.

As a resident of Carey Street, I would like to add my **support** for the proposed extension to the R70 scheme.

Hopefully, the implementation of the ResPark scheme for the whole area can be completed before the new students arrive at the new student accommodation block adjacent to Fulford Police station

As a long term resident of Wenlock Terrace I definitely approve of the extended R70 residents parking area to include my street as parking can be so difficult on a day to day basis.

I am writing further to the letter from Annemarie Howarth dated w/c 16th May in support of the extension to the R70 scheme.

This is to confirm that as residents of Holly Terrace (YO10 4DS) we are strongly in favour of the extension to RESPARK R 70.

Parking in this area is now extremely difficult, mainly due to non-residents.

Please ensure that Holly Terrace residents are all issued the correct permits, given that we have no vehicle street frontage - but we all have vehicles!.

I am writing on behalf of the residents of Holly Terrace to ask for your support in extending the ResPark R70 scheme.

We welcome the proposal in the letter from the council dated 16th May 2022 to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace. In recent years these streets have become populated by an undisclosed number of multiple occupation houses and an equally undisclosed number of Air bnb houses.

A more pressing problem is that the streets have become increasingly overrun by visitors to the city as a zone of free parking, a facility also avidly seized upon by dog walkers and anglers for free access to recreational use of the Ouse Riverbank.

I enclose some photographs of the chaotic and inconsiderate parking by some recent visitors. **(these have been included in a separate annex)**

As a result car parking for residents have become increasingly difficult, as shown in the attached photographs.

We will look forward to your support in the successful adoption of the extended ResPark R70 scheme to include all streets mentioned in the letter from the Council in May.

We are writing in support of the proposed extension to the resident parking scheme to cover Ambrose Street.

We believe that with the introduction of the parking scheme to Alma Grove and Alma Terrace, this would create significant pressures on the ability to park on any street which was not also included in the scheme extension.

Already, as residents of Ambrose Street, we are finding it increasingly difficult to park on our road, particularly with the increasing propensity of AirBNB and student rentals, which tend to have multiple cars per household. This situation would be made even worse by the opening of the new student accommodation which is being built over the road at Frederick House.

Thank you for sending us details of the proposed extension of the R70 parking scheme. We are in favour of the introduction of a ResPark scheme for residents in Holly Terrace and neighbouring streets. The current unrestricted parking means that sometimes we can find a space only a long way from our home and, on a few occasions,


there has not been a single space available anywhere within the proposed scheme. we find this a nuisance, particularly when we have luggage to unload from our car, and it must be even more difficult for older people and those with mobility issues. we therefore would welcome the introduction of a ResPark scheme. However we have the following questions:

1. Please will you confirm that residents of Holly Terrace will be included in the scheme? The draft Traffic Order which accompanied your letter lists Ambrose St, Carey St, Frances St and Wenlock Terr, but does not mention Holly Terrace; will you add Holly Terrace to the order to make it absolutely clear that Holly Terrace residents are covered by the scheme and able to purchase parking permits?  
**Please see the attached plan which outlines all properties included within the proposed scheme. Residents of Holly Terrace would be permitted to purchase permits to park within the area. The street is not listed on the notice as there are no controls to be implemented as there is no carriageway to the front of your properties, however you do have access to the area so able to utilise the residents parking scheme.**
2. Will builders working on homes and businesses within the scheme and other visitors be able to use “day tickets” to be provided by residents? We already face frequent problems from trades people parking in the back lanes and restricting access for residents and emergency vehicles; if no provision is made for legal parking for trades people and visitors this problem will continue and is likely to get worse. **Builders permits can be issued to enable trades vehicles to park within the scheme boundary, these are currently £3.40 per day. Please see the following link for further details: <https://www.york.gov.uk/parking-permits-1/daily-property-parking-permits/4>**

**Current obstructive parking**



This page is intentionally left blank



**Proposed extended R70 residents parking scheme boundary**

SCALE	1 : 2800
DATE	07/2022
DRAWING No.	
DRAWN BY	
	+ Crown copyright. All rights reserved Licence No. 2003

This page is intentionally left blank





---

**Decision session**

**26 September 2022**

**Executive Member for Transport**

Report of the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning

**Acknowledgement of Petitions**

**Summary**

1. The purpose of this paper is to acknowledge and address a number of petitions that have been submitted to Highways and Transport.
2. The petitions are as follows:
  - Speed calming measures on New Lane, Holgate;
  - Thirkleby Way / Farndale Avenue Highway condition;
  - Survey petition of residents on Westerdale Court, Rosslyn Street, Grove View and Compton Street regarding residents parking;
  - Residents of Stockton on the Forest and Hopgrove seeking a new footpath and road safety improvements in their area;
  - Petition for Road Resurfacing of the Village' Earswick and the Cul-de-Sacs of Shilton Garth Close and Stabler's Walk;
  - Residents of Huntington Road area, seeking consultation on the introduction of a ResPark zone in their street
  - Residents of Dodsworth Avenue, seeking consultation on the introduction of a ResPark zone in their street;
  - Residents of Harcourt street area asking the council to investigate options to create a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in their area;
3. The progress in terms of work on each petition varies depending on what has already been in train and what has been initiated in response to the petition.

## Recommendations

4. The Executive Member is asked to note the receipt of the petitions and to review the recommendations against each petition below:

**(i) Speed calming measures on New Lane, Holgate**

**The Executive Member to note progress on speed management**

To note progress on the speed management scheme, which is moving into consultation on options. To note a decision on the implementation of the option will be brought to an Executive Member for Transport decision session later this year.

**(ii) Thirkleby Way / Farndale Avenue Highway condition**

To note that due to the condition and the priority of an intervention no action will be taken in terms of the scheduled highway maintenance programme at this stage. A discussion will be had with the Ward Councillors to consider resolution, through Ward funding, if possible. The condition will be subject to the annual highway maintenance review and if the circumstances change an intervention will be appropriately prioritised;

**(iii) Petition from Compton Street, Grove View & Rosslyn Street Residents for Residents Parking scheme in their area**

Approve the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list and consider the extent of the potential consultation area when it reaches the top of the list.

**(iv) Residents of Stockton on the Forest and Hopgrove seeking a new footpath and road safety improvements in their area**

To note that engagement will be undertaken with Ward Councillors to scope out the detail of the request and look to work into the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure plan and the safety elements in the Transport capital programme in 2023/2024.

**(v) Petition for Road Resurfacing of the Village' Earswick and the Cul-de-Sacs of Shilton Garth Close and Stabler's Walk**

To note that due to the condition and the priority of an intervention no action will be taken in terms of the scheduled highway

maintenance programme at this stage. A discussion will be had with the Ward Councillors to consider resolution, through Ward funding, if possible. The condition will be subject to the annual highway maintenance review and if the circumstances change an intervention will be appropriately prioritised;

**(vi) Petition from Huntington Road Area Residents**

Approve the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list and consider the extent of the potential consultation area when it reaches the top of the list.

**(vii) Petition from Dodsworth Avenue Residents**

Approve the addition of this area to the residents parking waiting list and consider the extent of the potential consultation area when it reaches the top of the list.

**(viii) Residents of Harcourt street area asking the council to investigate options to create a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in their area**

To approve the approach to engage with Ward Councillors to discuss options to fund an initial options development piece. To approve the development of an approach to the delivery of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods to be brought back to a decision session next calendar year.

**Reason:**

To respond to residents' concerns and implement, if possible, the appropriate measure.

**Background**

5. A number of petitions have been submitted to the Council within the scope of the portfolio of the Executive Member of Transport since the full council meeting in April. A summary of each petition is shown in **Annex A**. In some cases there is ongoing or related work and this is referred to in the report.
6. Some of the petitions are requests related to maintenance of the Highway. The prioritisation of Highway Maintenance is subject to an annual condition

survey and along with other factors provide a ranking for each street in terms of intervention. The highest ranked streets are then prioritised for the limited funding available for Highway maintenance. It is possible that maintenance hasn't been undertaken on a particular street because it does not rank high enough. There is a risk that initial analysis of the petition leads to the same conclusion that the street is not high enough priority for an intervention, however, in each case there will be a commitment to discuss further with Ward councillors.

7. Requests for resident parking have increased in the last 2-3 years. 14 requests have been taken to a conclusion and 3 further areas awaiting to be implemented in the coming months. This increase in demand has resulted in a reduction in the waiting list for investigating new requests. The process and likely timescales for investigating and implementing a scheme is also outlined on the waiting list in **Annex B**. Each request will be investigated in the order the request was made, except in unusual circumstances or where 2 or more requests are adjacent to one another and can be taken forward as one.
8. In addition, depending on circumstances at the time, the extent of the consultation area may be extended beyond the area the petition came from. However, if this is done we would still respect the majority view of residents in the extended area before recommending to take a scheme forward or not for those residents.

### **Speed Calming measures on New Lane, Acomb**

9. The petition was for "Speed calming measures" on New Lane in Acomb. **Annex C** shows the location. A speed management scheme is already existing on the Transport capital programme for 22/23 for New Lane in Acomb. The evidence has been pulled together to look at the feasibility of various options and the initial recommendation is a signage solution. However, given the strength of feeling expressed in the petition, as the work enters design (which includes consultation), a number of options will be presented for comment.
10. The consultation be brought forward to ensure that the petition is taken into consideration along with further comments on the design from Ward Councillors and residents. The options will then be brought back to the Executive Member Decision Session later this year for decision.

### **Thirkleby Way / Farndale Avenue Highway condition**

11. The petition requests that the Council addresses the condition of Thirkleby Way/Farndale Avenue in Osbaldwick because of concerns around safety. **Annex D (I and ii)** shows the area in question.
12. The annual condition survey in 2021 and 2022 has graded the carriageway as 3 (Midlife) and was ranked 194<sup>th</sup> in the unclassified bituminous network. Unfortunately the ranking was insufficient to be included into this year's programme.
13. Further discussion will be had with Ward councillors to identify any further evidence for consideration in prioritisation and whether a scheme can be achieved through Ward funding.

### **Residents of Stockton on the Forest and Hopgrove seeking a new footpath and of road safety improvements in their area**

14. Residents have brought forward a petition seeking to have a new footpath and road safety improvements implemented in their area. It is proposed that these are considered as part of the development of the Local Cycling and Walking infrastructure plan (LCWIP) and as a potential safety scheme in the 2023/2024 Transport capital programme. The LCWIP is currently in development and it is expected that a draft will be ready in the Spring of 2023.

### **Petition from Compton Street, Grove View & Rosslyn Street Residents**

15. There are 16 responses within the petition requesting that the streets becomes residents parking zone. **Annex E** is a plan showing the location and existing residents parking zones. It is suggested that consideration be given to expanding an existing residents parking zone to include these streets when consultation takes place. We currently have 6 areas on the waiting list (including this area) and this area is currently fourth on the waiting list

### **Petition from Huntington Road Area Residents**

16. There are 26 signatures on the petition requesting that Ashville Street, Kitchener Street and Oakville Street become residents parking zone. **Annex F** is a plan showing the location and existing residents parking zones. We currently have 6 areas on the waiting list (including this area) and this area is currently fifth on the waiting list.

## **Petition from Dodsworth Avenue Residents**

17. There are 29 signatures on the petition requesting that the streets becomes residents parking zone. **Annex G** is a plan showing the location and existing residents parking zones. It is suggested that consideration be given to expanding an existing residents parking zone to include Dodsworth Avenue plus any others in the immediate area if thought appropriate when consultation takes place. We currently have 6 areas on the waiting list (including this area) and this area is currently sixth on the waiting list.

## **Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN)**

### **Closure of Harcourt street to create a Low Traffic Neighbourhood**

18. There are 21 signatures on this petition. The petition asks the Council to investigate options to close Harcourt Street to create a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN). The area is shown in **Annex H**.
19. In June 2020 the Executive Member for Transport approved a trial of a LTN in the Groves. At the successful conclusion of the trial the LTN was made permanent at a meeting of the Executive in January 2022.
20. Although the development of the proposals for an LTN in the Groves was more complex than the proposed, it is still anticipated that the development of options will be an undertaking that will be beyond the capacity within the Highways regulations team. It is therefore proposed a route to funding project management capacity is discussed with Ward Councillors and once in place the work is properly scoped and the impacts on the neighbouring streets are considered.
21. More widely, a report will be brought to an Executive Member decision session in the next calendar year to discuss an approach to this type of scheme.

## **Council Plan**

22. 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.

## **Implications**

### **Financial**

23. There are no immediate financial implications associated with any of the proposed responses to the petitions. It is anticipated that where resources may be required these will be met from existing budget allocations.

### **Human Resources (HR)**

24. There are no implications around the decisions in this report.

### **Legal**

25. The implementation in due course of the various proposals/schemes referred to above may have implications from a legal perspective, such as the need to make Orders pursuant to the Council's statutory powers pursuant to statutory process(es).

### **Equalities**

26. The Council recognises its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions). Equalities Impact assessments will be carried out where work is taken forward on schemes as a result of this paper.

### **Crime and Disorder**

27. There are no implications around the decisions in this report.

### **Information Technology (IT)**

28. There are no implications around the decisions in this report.

**Property**

29. There are no implications around the decisions in this report.

**Other**

30. There are no other implications identified.

**Risk Management**

31. The risks associated with the delivery of the outcomes of this report with respect to responding to petitions will be managed in each individual projects.



## Contact Details

**Author:**

Dave Atkinson  
Head of Highways and  
Transport,  
Highways and Transport

**Chief Officer Responsible for the  
report:**

James Gilchrist  
Director of Transport, Planning and  
Environment

**Report  
Approved**

**Date** 12/09/2022

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** List information for all

Financial Implications  
Jayne Close  
Principal Accountant

Legal Implications  
Gerard Allen  
Senior Lawyer

**Wards Affected:** All wards

All

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

**Background Papers:** N/A

## Abbreviations:

DfT – Department for Transport  
LTN – Low Traffic Neighbourhood  
LCWIP – Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure plan

## Annexes

**Annex A: Petitions summary**  
**Annex B: Resident parking list**  
**Annex C: New Lane, Acomb**  
**Annex Di: Thirkleby Way, Osbaldwick**  
**Annex Dii: Farndale Avenue, Osbaldwick**  
**Annex E: Petition from Compton Street, Grove View and Rosslyn  
Street Area Residents**  
**Annex F: Petition from Huntington Road Area Residents**  
**Annex G: Petition from Dodsworth Avenue Residents**  
**Annex H: Harcourt street**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Annex A: Petitions summary**

<b>Petition details</b>	<b>Petition type</b>	<b>No of Signatures</b>
165. Petition for Speed Calming measures on New Lane	Paper petition presented to Full Council 27.04.22 on behalf of lead petitioner by Cllr K Taylor	124
167. Survey petition of residents on Westerdale Court, Rosslyn St, Grove View and Compton St regarding request for Residents' Parking presented by Cllr Danny Myers and Cllr Margaret Wells.	Paper petition presented to Cllr D'Agorne at Executive Member for Transport Decision Session on 17.05.22	16
<p>169. Title: Thirkleby Way/Farndale Avenue Highway Condition</p> <p>We the undersigned petition the council to attend to the disgraceful condition of the road surface of Thirkleby Way, Osbaldwick and Farndale Avenue which are becoming unsafe to walk across, cycle and drive along. Both are highways of concrete sectional road that have been overlaid with tarmac some decades ago a process that was never successful, the tarmac overlay needs scraping off and the concrete road underneath renovated. It is disappointing that once again these sections of highway have been overlooked by CYC Highways Officers for attention in the current Highway Maintenance Programme and this petition is to draw attention to this omission and request effective renovations of these highways without further delay.</p>	ePetition	26
170. Petition for road resurfacing of The Village Earswick and the cul-de-sacs of Shilton Garth Close and Stabler's Walk	Petition presented at Full Council, 14 July 2022 by Cllr. Doughty	86 +30 additional submitted 27/7/22

171. Stockton on the Forest & Hopgrove new footpath and road safety petition	Petition presented at Full Council, 14 July 2022 by Cllr Doughty	113
172. Petition to CYC from Huntington Road Area Residents, YO31 8RT, YO31 8RR, YO31 8RZ, YO31 8RY, YO31 8RU, YO31 8RX: We the undersigned, the residents of Huntington Road Area (including Oakville, Kitchener and Ashville), petition the council to carry out a consultation for our street to become a Residents Priority Parking Area. We find it hard and hard to park on our street and have too many commuters parking here at all times of the day often causing dangerous access problems	Petition presented to Full Council, 14 July 2022 by Cllr. Perrett	26
173. Petition to CYC from Dodsworth Avenue Residents, YO31 8UB, YO31 8SG, YO31 8UD, YO31 8TZ, YO31 7TX, YO31 7TL, YO31 8UF, YO31 8SR, YO31 8TY, YO31 7TR, YO31 7TH, YO31 7SX: We the undersigned, the residents of Dodsworth Avenue, petition the council to carry out a consultation for our street to become a Residents Priority Parking Area. We find it hard and hard to park on our street and have too many commuters parking here at all times of the day often causing dangerous access problems	Petition presented to Full Council, 14 July 2022 by Cllr. Webb	29
174. Petition to CYC from Harcourt Street Area Residents: We, the residents of the area local to Harcourt Street, would like the council to investigate options to close Harcourt Street to create a Low Traffic Neighbourhood.	Petition presented to Full Council, 14 July 2022 by Cllr. Douglas	21

### Residents Parking Scheme Waiting List

Residents parking schemes are dealt with in order of when they are received.

The number of schemes introduced per year depends on funding, staff resources and other workload priorities.

Process	Approximate timescale
<p><b>Stage 1 – initiation</b></p> <p>The request (normally by petition) indicating significant support in an area or street is reported for either approval to take forward or refuse.</p>	8 weeks

If approved, when the potential scheme reaches the top of the waiting list work begins.

The time between stage 1 and 2 varies significantly depending on the length of the waiting list. Once stage 2 begins a residents parking zone will normally take around 9 to 12 months to complete.

<p><b>Stage 2 – start of project</b></p> <p>A draft scheme and questionnaire will be sent out to all properties within the proposed area. A proposal will normally be taken forward if there is at least a 50% response rate and the majority of returns are in favour. Depending on circumstances, there is potential for individual streets to go forward from an area if the streets return is very positive whilst the areas is either low or opposed.</p> <p>The consultation is then reported along with a proposed scheme for approval to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).</p> <p>TRO preparation and advertising</p> <p>Any objections to the proposed TRO are then reported for consideration.</p> <p>If the objections are overturned the scheme will then be implemented.</p>	<p>6 – 8 weeks</p> <p>8 weeks</p> <p>4 - 6 weeks</p> <p>8 weeks</p> <p>12 - 15 weeks</p>
---	--

## Waiting List

Area	Date received	Progress (NOTE: not all will get through to implementation)	
Alma Terr. (pt) / Alma Grove Also several requests from other end of the street. Consolidate with: Kilburn Road And expand R20	Nov. 2018  May '19	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes Yes  January 2022 April 2022 October 2022
Wellington, Gordon, Willis and Wolsley Streets  Expand R27 or R20 or R21	May 2019	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
Yearsley Grove New Zone	Dec 2019	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO Advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes
St Edwards Close  New Zone	June 2020	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes Yes May 2021 Oct 2021 N. A.
Broadway West  Expand R63	Oct 2020	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes Yes Feb 2020 May 2020 Feb 2022 November 2022
Government House Road	Sept 2020	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	Yes

Compton Street, Grove View & Rosslyn Street	May 2022	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	
Huntington Road Area (Oakville Street, Kitchener Street & Ashville Street)	July 2022	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	
Dodsworth Avenue	July 2022	Reported Consultation Consultation report TRO advertised Objections report Implemented/dropped	


### Completed Residents Parking Requests 2016 Onwards

Area	Date received	Finished/date	
South Bank Avenue Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	April '18
Butcher Terrace area Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	April '18
Phoenix Boulevard Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	Feb '18
Railway Terrace / St Paul's area Petition	Summer 2016	Implemented	April '18
St. Aubyn's Place	February 2017	Implemented	Jan '18
St. John's Place and Chestnut Court	August 2017		NO ACTION
Sussex Road petition	May 2017	See Windmill Gates, below and R39A Ext.	NO ACTION
Broadway / Westmorland Drive	Sept. 2017		NO ACTION
Rosedale Street	April 2017	Implemented	April '19
Danesmead Estate	April 2017	Implemented	Sept '19


Lower Ebor Street	June 2019	Implemented	March '20
Pasture Farm Close	Sept 2017	Implemented	April '20
Windmill Gates - R39A Extension	Dec 2018	Implemented	Sept '21
Fulford Cross	April 2017	Implemented	June '20
Clifton Dale	June 2017	Implemented	March '20
Albemarle Road- Bishopthorpe Road area	Jan 2018	Implemented	Jan '22
Main Av, First Av & Second Av	May 2018		No Action
Farrar Street	Nov 2018		No Action
Main Street, Fulford	Dec 2018		No Action
Windmill Gates, Badger Hill	Dec 2018	Implemented	Sept '21
Slingsby Grove	Dec 2018		No Action
Longfield Terrace	May 2019	Implemented	May '20
Revival Estate	June 2019		No Action
East Parade	Dec 2019		No Action



# New lane, Acomb




**Date:** 11 Sep 2022  
**Author:** City of York Council  
**Scale:** 1:2,500



This page is intentionally left blank

# Thirkleby Way Osbaldwick



**Date:** 08 Jul 2022

**Author:** City of York Council

**Scale:** 1:1,250



This page is intentionally left blank

# Farndale Ave Osbaldwick




**Date:** 08 Jul 2022  
**Author:** City of York Council  
**Scale:** 1:2,500




This page is intentionally left blank

# Compton Street, Grove View & Rossllyn



© Crown copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey: 100020818

**Date:** 02 Sep 2022  
**Author:** City of York Council  
**Scale:** 1:1,250




This page is intentionally left blank



# Petition from Huntington Road Area Resi



CITY OF  
**YORK**  
COUNCIL



**Date:** 02 Sep 2022


**Author:** City of York Council

**Scale:** 1:2,500




This page is intentionally left blank

# Dodsworth Avenue




© Crown copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey: 100020818

**Date:** 02 Sep 2022  
**Author:** City of York Council  
**Scale:** 1:4,000




This page is intentionally left blank

# Harcourt street



**Date:** 11 Sep 2022  
**Author:** City of York Council  
**Scale:** 1:2,500



This page is intentionally left blank