

First Avenue comments

First Avenue

I live at _ First Avenue, Heworth and have been informed of proposed changes to the res park scheme to include the area of East parade closest to our road. I would like to object to the proposals. I think it will result in the residents of East parade parking for free on first and second avenue rather than paying for a permit. We have already had a large HMO approved at the end of our street with no off street parking and this is only likely to increase problems with parking on our street which currently just about copes with the parking requirements.

First Avenue

We have received the results from the priority parking consultation for east parade, first, second and main avenue. I've looked on-line for the full report using the link, but this appears not to be working?

Having seen the proposed boundaries for the extension of the R30 zone, I would like to object on the basis that the zone extends into First and Second Avenue. Residents of these streets would be prevented from parking in a significant proportion of there own road during the restricted period, having previously overwhelming rejected the original residents parking proposal.

My feeling is that by limiting parking in the first and second avenue portions of the extended R30 zone, it would create additional demand in the remaining parts of these roads and leave an additional shortage of parking space. Leaving the ends of first and second avenue out of the R30 zone would allow residents to park in their own street without restriction, and does not prevent other local residents parking there also. The need for residents parking on east parade also appears to be split 50-50.

I would also object that the current proposal did not form part of the original consultation. Had I been aware that we could be prevented from parking in a portion of our road I may have voted in favour of the new restricted parking scheme to include all of the originally proposed area.

Response for clarification

The extended boundary of the R30 Zone includes all property addresses on East Parade – some of those properties have side elevations on First and Second Avenue. The permit parking area (bays with associated signage) is exclusively located on East Parade and does not encroach into First and Second Avenues. First and Second Avenue will remain unrestricted as now. You may of course experience more pressure for space from commuters who can no longer park on East Parade and residents of East Parade who do not wish to purchase a permit if the scheme is implemented.

Additional response

I would like to still object to the proposal on the grounds of the likely additional pressure on parking in the surrounding area. Additionally, I would still also object to the new proposal as it didn't form any part of the original consultation.

First Avenue

I wish to lodge my objection to the residents parking scheme proposed for East Parade.

I live in First Avenue and we have voted against the scheme, for our street, so thankfully it won't be going ahead.

However if East Parade does go ahead then it will cause more people from there to park in our street, which already happens enough. There just aren't enough parking spaces for the number of cars. Equally we get commuters parking here too on a regular basis, which is a problem enough.

I challenged one person once who was getting his bike and bag out again, and his response was sympathetic but he said that he finishes after 8 pm and the park and ride is shut. Perhaps extending the hours there would be a good idea

First Avenue

I hereby wish to register my objection to the introduction of Resident Priority Parking to the whole of East Parade, York including the remaining eastern section of East Parade.

My objection is based on my fear that visitors (and indeed residents of East Parade) would seek alternative parking in First Avenue. Parking in First Avenue is already limited, especially in the evenings and at weekends, and I fear that Resident Priority Parking in East Parade would make it well-nigh impossible for residents of First Avenue to park our own vehicles.

I am a senior citizen and could ill-afford the annual fee associated with a Residents' Priority Parking Zone in First Avenue. This proposal was anyway rejected last year by an overwhelming majority of First Avenue residents.

I believe we residents have a moral right to be able to park our cars free of charge on the street outside our houses.

Hence my opposition to a Resident Priority Parking scheme in either East Parade or First Avenue.

First Avenue

I would like to object strongly to the proposal of residents parking being introduced on East Parade York as a resident of First Avenue.

It is already difficult to find a parking space on First Avenue with residents cars who actually live on the street, let alone having residents of another street who want to avoid having to purchase a parking permit!

My neighbours and I objected to the previous version of this proposal because of the same issue and I can't see how this benefits anyone except the council who will make money from the permits.

The fact that the B&B at the end of First Avenue was granted permission to be changed into an 8 bedroom occupancy already has the potential to make the parking situation worse and this will just add to it if allowed!

I'd just like to be able to park near my own home when returning from work or the supermarket with a week's food shop for a family of 4... is this too much to ask for!?

First Avenue

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed parking scheme around First Avenue, specifically East Parade.

We have anecdotal evidence from residents of East Parade, that rather than pay for parking permits they will use First or Second avenue for car parking, which will have detrimental effect on the residents of First and Second avenue.

We do not currently have any parking issues on First Avenue and we are generally able to easily park our car on First Avenue, or occasionally on Main Avenue. I feel that the proposed parking scheme will have a detrimental effect and make parking on First Avenue far more difficult.

I'm aware that we don't have a "right" to park outside our house, but I don't understand why the council are trying to implement a parking scheme where it is not required and most of the residents of First Avenue are opposed too.

I strongly object to the proposed scheme.

First Avenue

I would like to write to object to the planned East Parade residents' parking scheme outlined in your letter of 23rd April. I am a resident of First Avenue, which overwhelmingly voted against the scheme (94% against). The problem is that the proposal to add a residents' parking zone in East Parade would have substantial knock on effects for the other streets in the consultation, which all voted against the scheme. Only 24 out of the 88 properties in East Parade/Bull Lane/Parade Court were in favour of the scheme, which means that there is a likely majority of those properties that will opt not to buy a residents' permit and instead will park for free round the corner in First and Second Avenue, or on Main Avenue. There is just about enough space for parking in these streets right now, but with the extra vehicles the implementation of the scheme will lead to substantial problems in parking for the residents of these streets.

Given the knock on effects of the scheme on the whole area, it would seem fair to proceed with a residents' scheme *only* if there was a majority of households in favour of the scheme across the whole area. This is far from the case, with only 39/119 of the respondents as a whole supportive (33%). This amounts to just 18% of the properties consulted.

If the only impact of the scheme was on East Parade and Parade Court, then perhaps there would just about be a mandate to proceed. However, given that this is clearly not the case, there is no mandate to proceed with the parking scheme and I would urge you to leave things as they are.

Many thanks for considering my objection.

First Avenue

I am writing in objection to the proposed residents parking scheme for East Parade and surrounding area.

I am a resident of First Avenue and feel that the proposal will encourage residents of East Parade to park their cars on First and Second Avenues to avoid parking charges. This will I believe Create a parking problem for First and Second Avenue residents, where parking is limited but not currently an issue.

It would be a shame if this change means that we are not able to park near our own homes when returning from the weekly shop.

First Avenue

I wish to lodge my objection to the residents' parking scheme proposed for East Parade in Heworth

I live at _ First Avenue. We have voted against the residents' parking scheme for First Avenue and happily it won't be going ahead. I say "happily" because the sliding scale of charges for more than one vehicle becomes punitive. As a disabled person and cancer patient who is nominated by the Government as "a Vulnerable person" and who must shield, I require my car to take me to medical appointments at the hospital etc. I have been advised to avoid public transport. My partner owns a business and has a small van for work purposes, which we need to park in the street, to keep an eye on it and its contents. A great many households in First Avenue own more than one vehicle. Already, finding a parking space in the street is like a vehicular game of musical chairs... I am constantly having to move my car to park closer to the house. As I have trouble with mobility, I prefer to park close to my property whenever possible.

If the residents' parking scheme for East Parade goes ahead, both residents from East Parade and those already using First Avenue as a free "park and ride" will make parking in our street a competitive, and possibly combative, exercise. Every day, even on Sundays, people from outside the area arrive to enjoy the free parking which First and Second Avenues offer. Most of them park badly - taking up two spaces instead of one. Often I remonstrate with these strangers, asking them to park more considerately. Sadly, these days, a great many people are aggressive or hostile, even when asked politely to move their vehicle forward to accommodate another car.

You might say that this is reason enough to agree to a residents' scheme for these streets. I would argue that, with direct knowledge of how the scheme works at my rental property in Fountayne St YO31 8HN, the scheme proves costly for residents, tenants and landlords alike.

If I wish to visit my rental property in Fountayne St, I have to pay nearly £4 for the privilege per visit when using a Visitors' Parking Permit. Each year, I spend about £200 on these tickets, often for very short stays. My tenants pay a sliding scale for parking permits, a scale which escalates dramatically in cost for each permit applied for. There has been a need to show evidence of building works in advance of applying for a builder's permit, but this is simply not feasible for a landlord. Mostly, repairs at a rental property are unexpected and call-outs by tradespeople are often in response to unforeseen water leaks, or other plumbing or electrical emergencies.

Expecting a landlord or a property owner to predict repair works in order to acquire a suitable permit is ludicrous. Thus, those living along East Parade who require tradespeople will also face the same problem that I suffer as a property owner of a house along Fountayne Street. As a result, tradespeople attending call-outs to addresses at East Parade, will be jostling for the few parking spaces in both First and Second Avenues.

The problem has been further compounded by your Planning Department's short-sighted permission to change The Heworth Guest House at the corner of East Parade and First Avenue into an HMO which has 9 letting rooms. How the hearts of residents in First Avenue sank when permission was granted for this change in status to an HMO. Even if not all of the new tenants own cars, most certainly one third of them will. Thus, another 3 cars will be jostling for space in the street, alongside the three vehicles already owned by the HMO's owners (who will continue to reside next to their new HMO.)

In short, I object to the residents' parking scheme in East Parade vehemently. I should be grateful if you would note the points which I have raised above, which I hereby summarise for you:

Such a scheme would create overflow into the existing, over-stretched parking of both First and Second Avenues.

Residents of First Avenue already compete with some residents of East Parade to find a parking space in their own street. This competition will increase.

The residents of First Avenue currently jostle with those from outside the area who use the street as a free park and ride.

Tradespeople attending call-outs along East Parade will use First and Second Avenues in which to park when Builders' Parking Permits are not provided by householders.

The new HMO at the corner of East Parade and First Avenue will create additional competition for parking spaces for the residents of First Avenue.

Thank you for your consideration of these objections.

First Avenue

Please take this communication as a formal objection to the proposed Parking amendments to East Parade, York as detailed in R30 Extension paper.

I am a resident on First Avenue. My objection is to the fact that nowhere in your documentation do you state the intention and strategic objective to your decision to impose the parking restrictions that you outline. The effect of this decision will drive parking by non-residents of East Parade onto the already overcrowded First and Second Avenue. That is an inevitability, not a prediction. Where will the residents of First Avenue and Second Avenue then park? Most of the 'available' spaces will be permit restricted or to be paid for.

I can see no detail in the amendments where any scenario planning for such contingencies have been factored in. Has there been a detailed synopsis as to the impact that these proposed parking amendments will have on the parking for First and Second Avenue residents?

First Avenue

I am writing to raise my strong objection to the new proposal of making East Parade a Residents Priority Parking Area (with no action for other consulted streets).

You appear to have moved the goalposts. In the original consultation we thought the streets were being treated as a whole, but now you've decided to split them up.

I live in First Avenue and have already heard that people on East Parade will NOT be purchasing the required permits, but will be choosing to park on our side streets (First Avenue, Second Avenue and Main Avenue). This is going to cause chaos. Residents living in these side streets are going to suffer, as we will frequently be unable to park on our own street. This isn't fair. There are lots of people living in the street who will struggle to carry their shopping bags the further distance. And also workers like me who have lots of work resources to carry to and from their cars each day.

I don't see how you can make the change when the result is not what was originally consulted on. If you're going to move the goalposts, you ought to either consult again regarding the new proposal or *preferably* scrap the idea altogether. You already have the evidence to scrap it - out of 119 returns in total, 67% (80 properties) voted against it, and only 33% (39 properties) voted for it.

I do hope you take on board the objections - I have heard nothing but complaints about this in our neighbourhood and you will have lots of very unhappy residents if you go ahead regardless.

I look forward to hearing some good news from you.

First Avenue

I am writing regarding the proposals to amend the parking plan for East Parade. I would like to register my objection to these.

I'm concerned that proposal to extend the residents' parking area for East Parade will create unsustainable additional pressure on unrestricted streets in the immediate vicinity. While this possibility had been acknowledged, it does not seem to have been fully considered in the new plans.

I feel that longer term this would then mean that the extension of restricted parking into wider areas would become inevitable, despite the clear opposition that was voiced from the majority of residents that you consulted last year.

Thank you for taking this into consideration.