

**Decision Session – Cabinet Member for
Transport, Planning and Economic
Development**

19 February 2015

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

Petition – Nunthorpe Grove, Micklegate Ward

Summary

1. The purpose of this report is to consider a 31 signature petition (see Annex A) representing 56% of the properties in Nunthorpe Grove requesting City of York Council consult with residents about introducing a Residents' Priority Parking Scheme.

Recommendations

2. The Cabinet Member is asked to approve a formal consultation with residents of Nunthorpe Grove in May 2015.

Reason: because this is in line with a well established procedure when dealing with requests for new Residents Parking Schemes.

Timescale: Resources are already committed for this financial year and consequently the consultation has been added to the forward work schedule for May 2015.

Background

3. In October 2014, a Residents' Priority Parking Area was implemented in Nunthorpe Drive, Nunthorpe Crescent, Nunthorpe Gardens and Nunthorpe View. The timing of this petition suggests there may have been some vehicles displaced onto Nunthorpe Grove.
4. The additional parking on Nunthorpe Grove has caused some residents to consider the amount of non-residential parking taking place unacceptable.

Consultation

5. Information about Residents Parking would be hand delivered to all properties. Information would include the cost of permits for residents together with a plan outlining the proposed zone boundary and approximate position of regulatory signage (Annex B). Residents are asked to return a ballot sheet in a Freepost envelope provided. The results of the ballot would be reported to an Officer in Consultation meeting for consideration on how to proceed.
6. It is common procedure to require a 50% return of ballot sheets with the majority of returns in favour of introducing a resident parking scheme before we support a proposal to amend the Traffic Regulation Order to include a scheme.

Options

7. The options available are:
 - To undertake a formal consultation as requested
 - To consider the level of support is not sufficient at this time to warrant further consultation

Analysis

8. Option1 gives a better indication of the level of support in this street. The ballot is confidential and residents will be able to express an opinion without fear of reprisal. A consultation will better inform officers of any special needs of residents which may have to be considered within a final draft scheme. This option is in line with the well established process for considering such requests.
9. Option 2 does not adequately meet the expectations of the local residents bearing in mind the percentage of properties the petitioners represent. Hence this is not the recommended option.

Council Plan

10. Considering this matter contributes to the Council Plan building strong communities by engaging with all members of the local community.

Implications

11. **Financial:** There are no financial implications.
12. **Human Resources (HR):** There are no HR implications.
13. **Equalities:** There are no Equalities implications.
14. **Legal:** There are no Legal implications.
15. **Crime and Disorder:** There are no crime and disorder implications
16. **Information Technology (IT):** There are no IT implications.
17. **Property:** There are no Property implications.
18. **Other** There are no other implications.

Risk Management

19. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

Contact Details

Author:

Sue Gill
Project Technician
Transport Service

Tel No. 01904 551497

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris
Assistant Director – Transport,
Highways and Waste
City & Environmental Services

**Report
Approved**



Date 16 January 2015

Wards Affected: Micklegate

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes

Annex A – copy of front page of petition

Annex B – plan of the area for consultation