

ANNEX E

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS:

HOLGATE JUNCTION

Comments Received from Church and Spiritualist Centre	Officer comments (where appropriate)
<p>Spiritualist Centre: Our services are attended by many vulnerable, lonely and ill people who come to the centre for healing, comfort and company. We ask you to consider any parking restrictions are suspended between 6pm and 8pm on Sundays. Our mid week services normally have lower attendance figures and our small car park can accommodate parking for these.</p>	<p>The officer recommendation for hours of operation will ensure unrestricted parking for the times requested.</p>
<p>St Paul’s CE Church: We run groups most weeks of the year for older people, carers and toddlers, for children, for people with learning difficulties, dementia as well as Sunday Services, weddings and funerals. We have no car parking amenity. We note that the Holgate Road R60 Scheme allows 90 minutes for visitors and we feel this amount of time would be sufficient for the vast majority of our activities.</p>	<p>Ward Councillors have expressed support for this request. In addition we have received several emails of a similar nature from members of the congregation. Option one (Officer recommendation) will allow unrestricted parking on Sundays). We are recommending limited parking bays (2 hours) on Watson Street to allow some parking for local amenities. The 90 minute restriction on Holgate Road will remain as now.</p>

<p>General Comments from Residents and other interested parties</p>	
<p>Several Residents commented on the increase of non-residential parking, often for days or weeks at a time.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Several Residents commented they do not have problems finding a space now and/or they do not consider the parking situation has deteriorated significantly to warrant a ResPark Scheme. There is no problem to be solved.</p>	<p>The majority of residents would disagree with these views when considering the area as a whole.</p>
<p>It is important that residents parking covers Enfield Crescent as they also receive a lot of commuter parking which often obstructs back gates etc.</p> <p>The back lane to St Paul's Square (off Enfield Crescent) needs to be included to prevent opportunist parking.</p> <p>The displacement of parking onto the private streets will be difficult to manage and enforce.</p>	<p>We are unable to extend the area into Enfield Crescent or the private part of Wilton Rise (private streets). We do intend to adjust the Street Name Plates to include "Private Street, Resident Parking Only" as part of the scheme.</p>
<p>There has been no pre-consultation between Residents of St Paul's Square by those who raised the petition. It would be quite wrong to impose this on us.</p> <p>This consultation is inadequate – you have not explained how the scheme would work, enforcement etc. A proper Public Meeting consultation should have been arranged.</p>	<p>All residents have received the same consultation documentation.</p> <p>Normal procedure has been followed for the consultation process.</p>
<p>We are opposed to a "partial scheme", if adopted it should be the whole area (several residents made this comment)</p>	<p>This is the recommended option (except for the private areas and St Paul's Mews)</p>

<p>Problems in St Paul's Square are mostly in the evenings and overnight</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>There is no justification for a full time restriction; there is ample space after 7pm in the streets that have petitioned the council. The times of operation only need to be weekdays for a short period to prevent commuter parking.</p> <p>Seven days a week scheme will give residents full benefit.</p> <p>Saturday shoppers use our street as much as Mon-Friday commuters. It might be OK to make Sunday the exception.</p> <p>Main difficulty is Mon-Sat</p>	<p>The majority of residents who gave a preference requested a 24 hour scheme.</p>
<p>Short term parking of 60 minutes for non-permit holders should be allowed throughout the whole area of operation</p>	<p>This can only be achieved if implementing a scheme with marked bays and individual signs. Poles/signs would narrow footways and add to street clutter.</p>
<p>Parking arrangements must be made for the staff of the St Paul's Schools</p>	<p>Several residents have requested special arrangements for the schools.</p>
<p>No Parking should be allowed for staff of the schools as these occupy a lot of the available spaces.</p>	<p>Most comments we have received are in support of staff parking.</p>
<p>Current waiting restrictions in the area of operation should be reviewed with a great many of them removed.</p>	<p>Most existing restrictions have been placed to enable access and these needs will not</p>

<p>Request for additional waiting restrictions for full length of the non-residential side of Railway Terrace.</p>	<p>decrease. Any investigation into removing or adding restrictions would be better done after implementation of a scheme.</p>
<p>We strongly object and would appeal against any introduction. Residents should not have to pay to park outside their own houses especially as we already pay council, road and car tax.</p> <p>We don't want a paid parking scheme.</p> <p>Don't use Respark as a scam to fill council coffers.</p> <p>These schemes have become a profiteering opportunity for the council with the cost of permits ridiculously high.</p> <p>Please explain the benefit of this to us, besides the financial gain to the Council.</p> <p>Permit structure is unfair with price reduction for low CO2 emissions and the permits prices for 2 to 4 cars</p> <p>Household Authorisation cards adds another unnecessary administration and cost.</p> <p>Discriminates against residents who have more visitors.</p> <p>You do not have to be in receipt of income support to be struggling.</p>	<p>The permit charge covers the cost of implementation, maintenance and enforcement. The cost falls to those residents who benefit from a scheme rather than the general taxpayer.</p> <p>All of our Resident Parking Schemes are initiated by residents.</p>
<p>The problem seems to be the number of size of vehicles owned by residents. Unless they can be persuaded to own fewer and smaller cars we can see little benefit of this scheme.</p> <p>The number of residents' vehicles is too</p>	<p>None of our resident parking schemes guarantee a space will be available. They work by giving residents priority for available parking space over</p>

<p>many for street capacity anyway – a scheme may not help.</p> <p>Still no guarantee of parking and number of residents cars would mean not much would change and only serve to add more cost living here.</p> <p>People who initiated this have unrealistic expectations to have priority parking directly outside their house.</p>	<p>non-residents.</p> <p>The results of the 2011 census in the Holgate Area showed:</p> <p>29% of households do not own a motor vehicle</p> <p>51% of households owned one vehicle</p> <p>Overall car ownership is 0.95 to each household.</p>
<p>We should close the footbridge as an alternative, most parking is caused by easy pedestrian access over this bridge. This will worsen if York Central is developed.</p>	<p>A scheme would remove the commuter parking for access via the footbridge.</p>
<p>The parking situation on St Paul's Mews has got so bad it is becoming dangerous over the last two years.</p>	<p>The level of return from St Paul's Mews was poor, although the majority who did reply were in favour.</p>
<p>Parking problems are a direct result of the high cost of city centre parking plus the advent of Resident Parking in other areas.</p> <p>The root cause of the problem should be addressed instead; lack of suitable and affordable parking by the railway station.</p>	
<p>We should have this restriction to encourage people to use public transport, Park & Ride and not use our streets as a free car park.</p> <p>This is in line with COYC transport strategy; increased use of public transport and discourage multiple car ownership in the area.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>It will cause inconvenience to the school and church</p>	<p>We are trying to redress this within the recommended option.</p>
<p>Consider St Paul's Terrace and Railway Terrace as one way only</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of this consultation.</p>
<p>The properties on Holgate Road (currently in R5) should be included in this scheme. We should be provided with adequate provision within easy walking distance.</p>	<p>We have recently advertised a proposal to allow R5 permit holders to use the R60 bay outside 108 – 122 Holgate Road to address this issue.</p>
<p>If a new TRO is proposed it should consider the likely demand by residents against the number of spaces available. If necessary only one parking permit should be allowed per property.</p>	<p>Unlikely to be popular with residents who require parking amenity for more than one car.</p>
<p>A parking scheme needs to be sufficiently large to not simply displace vehicles to nearest available space. How many properties are actually currently affected versus the number that would need to be included in the scheme to stop displacement?</p>	<p>This cannot be defined or calculated. We cannot determine how many non-residents would displace to other areas or how many residents in restricted areas prefer to park on nearby unrestricted streets to avoid paying for a permit.</p>