
**Decision Session – Executive Member
for Transport & Planning**

14 September 2017

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy & Place

**Consideration of objections received to an advertised proposal to
change a R33GM Residents' Priority Parking Bay on Bootham Terrace to
a Community Residents' Priority Parking Bay**

1. **Summary**

To report the objections received and to determine what action is appropriate

2. **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised (Option One).

Reason: To provide a better balance of parking amenity for all R33 Permit Holders

Background

3. Following requests from several residents we advertised a proposal using officer delegated powers (minor change) to re-designate an R33GM Bay to a R33C bay. A GM bay can only be used by Guest House and House of Multi-Occupancy Permit Holders and is not available to Household permit holders. A Community Bay can be used for parking by any class of permit holder. The location plan is included as Annex A.
4. A Guest House on Bootham Terrace closed and the property reverted to a Residential Property, placing additional strain on the available household parking areas. Residents reported the GM bay (space for 6 vehicles) was left empty on many occasions and they struggled to find space to use their household permits.

5. We looked at the number of permits issued for each category against the number of spaces available for their use. We found:

Type of permit	Number Issued	Dedicated Spaces	Shared Spaces
Zone Overall			
Household	168	158	8 with Pay & Display 12 community + Pay and Display
Guest House + HMO	14	17	12 community + Pay and Display
Bootham Terrace/Sycamore Place Area			
Household	96	93	0
Guest House	6	12	0
Bootham Terrace/Sycamore Place if proposal is Implemented			
Household	96	93	6
Guest House	6	6	6

6. 40 permits are issued to properties on Bootham Terrace for an approximate 29 spaces allocation; there are no Guest Houses located on Bootham Terrace itself.

Representations Received in Support

7. We have received 12 representations in support of the proposal from Residents on Bootham Terrace. The representations are very similar in nature and make the following points:
- This bay is always empty and has been since the guest house at 19 Bootham Terrace was closed and the property reverted to a residential dwelling.
 - The parking spaces are often unused by any hotel guests and are serving little purpose with their current designation
 - Residents are continually not able to park on Bootham Terrace and have to drive around the zone to seek an alternative space.

- This is very annoying when this space remains empty.
- The proposed change will be of great benefit to the residents of Bootham Terrace and the quicker the change the better.
- The needs of residents in the street should come before those of a more commercial nature (one resident)

Objections Received

8. We have received three representations in objection of the proposal from Guest Houses in the area.

Précis of objections from the Sycamore Place Guest Houses

We recognise the pressure of demand on parking and would want to support fair and equitable proposals for the benefit of all residents as we also experience the issues of being unable to park our own car close to our home.

We run a small business which has a great dependence on being able to offer parking to guests. As you will recognise, guest houses are a key part of the York “offer” and contribute significantly to the economic and cultural life of the city.

We understand that the GM spaces on Bootham Terrace have been used less and that this may have led to the current proposal, however we would ask to you to take the following in to consideration:

The two guest houses on Sycamore Place have three permits each and use a dedicated space for 6 vehicles opposite our businesses. We have frequent issues with people parking illegally in these spaces leaving us without spaces for our guests. In this situation, we are forced to use the GM spaces on Bootham Terrace as overspill.

We understand that GM permits are still valid in Community Parking spaces so that in theory we would still be able to use these spaces. In reality, there are far more cars owned by residents of Bootham Terrace than there are spaces.

It has been suggested that the Community Parking spaces outside St Olave’s School are also available to us; even if a space was to be available (and these spaces are also heavily used), it would not be reasonable to expect our guests to leave their cars so far away from their accommodation and to ask this of them would have a detriment to our business and reputation, with the huge impact of online reviews. In

addition, there are guest houses on St Anne's Road and only 4 GM spaces there so there is similar pressure coming from them. We are concerned that this proposal is being considered in isolation and not as part of a strategic review of the whole R33 area both at present and in the context of a significant planned residential development. We therefore remain of the opinion that we need to have the option of GM spaces on Bootham Terrace for any overspill.

In the spirit of compromise, we would propose that the current GM box on Bootham Terrace could be shortened, leaving enough length at the end furthest away from Bootham for 3 GM spaces (which I believe would be a 50% reduction).

Précis of the objection received from a Guest House on Queen Annes Road

It would appear there is already a significant lack of parking space available in the R33 area for all users. On a daily basis we struggle to accommodate our guests in the allotted GM bay and frequently have to send our guests to the GM bay on Bootham Terrace.

Our guests boost York's economy therefore deserve preferential treatment and limiting the space available for them to park is detrimental to our business.

We are concerned the planned development in R33 may reduce the Guest House parking amenity further. One solution could be to abandon GM zones altogether where all available space can be used by any permit holder.

You should advise all concerned individuals within the whole zone of your proposals for any future proposals.

Analysis

9. The zone is at saturation point with no space availability for visitor use. Permit numbers and an estimated number of spaces is given at paragraph 5. We continue to receive conflicting information. Residents report the GM space on Bootham Terrace is empty nearly all the time, but are occasionally used by blue badge holders; the Guest Houses report they still use it – but only as an overflow.

10. The proposal we have made at this time is an attempt to alleviate the pressure on parking space for residents. A community bay (R33C) will allow the space to be used by any permit holder. Consequently, a Guest House Permit holder can still use the space, although we recognise the space will mostly be occupied by Household Permit holders. Our Residents' Priority Parking zones cannot guarantee a space is available for any class of permit holder.
11. The bowling green adjacent to the GM bays on Sycamore Terrace has planning permission for 4 properties. We have secured funding of £5k within a S106 agreement for required changes to the R33 zone. The amount of funding secured will allow us to undertake a strategic review of the whole zone. This will consider the suggestion of removing GM bays and allowing all spaces to be used by any permit holder.

Options

12. **Option One:** Implement as Advertised (Recommended Option)

This is the recommended Option because it provides a better balance of space allocation to permit numbers.

13. **Option Two:** Implement a shorter length of community parking and leave three spaces as dedicated GM parking.

This is not the recommended Option because it will leave three spaces which are only intermittently filled by Guest House permit holders and does not provide the best use of space.

Consultation

14. Notices were placed on street and in The Press. Details were delivered to adjacent residents and to the two Guest Houses on Sycamore Place.

Council Plan

15. The above proposal contributes to the City Council's draft Council Plan:
 - A council that listens to residents

Implications

16. This report has the following implications:

Financial – Residents parking schemes are self financing once in operation. The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to effect the regulatory signage change required.

Human Resources – None

Equalities – None

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 – None

Information Technology – None

Land – None

Other – None

Risk Management - There is an acceptable level of risk associated with the recommended option.

Contact Details

Authors:

Sue Gill
Traffic Project Officer
Transport
Tel: (01904) 551497

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris
Corporate Director: Economy & Place

Date: 5 September 2017

Wards Affected: Holgate

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Annex:

Annex A: Plan of the proposal/R33 Zone