

ANNEX C

Comment	
<p>Regarding the proposed Residents parking – -Work out the amount of available parking and only sell permits for that amount of cars -Make sure the parking is regulated and enforced so that people who park leaving half/three quarter length gaps are stopped -Parking bays per household would stop many of the problems that are going to arise.</p>	<p>This would need to be looked at through a city wide policy change to existing regulations for Residents Priority parking schemes.</p>
<p>Object to having ResPark on Nunthorpe Grove as existing, opportunity to express my dissatisfaction with the current imposition. Having a permit scheme where the vast majority of residents have driveways seems unfair to those wanting to use the road. Now feels less communal. Want to live on a street where friends and family can freely park and not worry about giving them a permit. Not territorial and feel we should live in a care free society. Even when the street was busy it made no difference to the well being of residents.</p>	<p>As with the implementation of a scheme a majority of residents must be in favour of removing a zone before further consultations can take place. This should be done in the form of a petition.</p>
Objection	
<p>Business owner on SBA with many customers visiting by car. The introduction of permits would be costly for our business and inconvenient for customers and may put them off visiting. Parking is not an issue during the day and is more problematic on an evening therefore I fail to see what benefit there will be. Concerned for fellow business owners in the area.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme would only allow a 10 minute wait for non permit holders. Customers would need to find alternative unrestricted on street parking. Alternatively a 2 hour parking bay is available on Bishopthorpe Road near Cameron Walker Court.</p>
<p>Object to 151-153 Bishopthorpe Road being included as they are non residents with no vehicular access. There is still unrestricted parking on Bishopthorpe Road or they could join R58C opposite.</p>	<p>After representation being received It was agreed at the last executive member decision session to advertise a proposal to include these properties as they have pedestrian access onto South Bank Avenue</p>

<p>Object to implementing ResPark on my street. There is not a problem with parking. I have never known there not to be many free spaces on the upper part of South Bank Avenue. Cannot afford the charges. Charges disproportionately penalise those on lower income, the higher the cars emissions the more a resident pays, the older the car the higher the emissions. Proposal also included properties with drives, those able to afford a house with off street parking will not have to pay for a permit, this is surely unfair. Area should be reconfigured to exclude Upper South Bank Avenue.</p>	<p>If a parking scheme is implemented excluding part of a street it has been proven that this section will be inundated with non residential parking and people avoiding paying for visitors etc. Properties with off street parking still have the chance to vote as they are part of the community involved with the change and will still need to purchase permits for visitors, work trade vehicles, second cars etc.</p>
<p>As a resident of South Bank Avenue I want to object to the scheme. I do not believe this is in the best interest of residents. It is in reality a money making scheme. There is plenty of available on street parking. This will divide and shatter the community. Ill conceived plan will cost residents at least £200 extra a year.</p>	<p>Residents' priority parking schemes are only consulted on after support from residents has been received. New schemes are then only progressed if the majority of residents are in favour.</p>
<p>Objection from Nunthorpe Grove</p>	
<p>As a resident of Nunthorpe Grove I object to the extension due to increased parking and traffic on Nunthorpe Grove. As a mother with a child who plays in the street my concern would be his safety.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Object to the extension. Allowing vehicles from South bank Avenue to park in the Grove would increase the congestion and access problems caused by alternative parking too close together. Sometimes difficult to access drives when vehicles are parked opposite, this would increase if a larger number of vehicles can park. Sightlines at junction already blocked and more vehicles on the Grove would increase the difficulty. More parking will take place at the junction making passing and entering Nunthorpe Grove more difficult. South Bank Avenue should have its own zone number to avoid unnecessary congestion and access issue.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>Since the introduction of R57 the previous long standing traffic problems has greatly improved. The verges are now nice and green again so why should residents of adjacent streets park there once more and spoil them. Residents have paid to improve there driveways to park off street, this has greatly improved the street view so why should others now come and park there. A separate ResPark zone should be created for South Bank Avenue. If the proposal goes ahead then a by-law should be set up to prevent verge parking.</p>	<p>If implemented their should still be no need for residents to park on grass verges. Non residential parking will be removed leaving more available space on South Bank Avenue for residents.</p>
<p>Strongly object to the extension. I was not given the opportunity to object to the original scheme in Nunthorpe Grove. It is impossible to provide off street parking at my property therefore I have no option but to buy a permit. Parking is already difficult as most properties have a drive and the street is too narrow to park opposite. If the scheme is extended I will be paying for a permit for no reason as the parking conditions will be the same as before ResPark was implemented. South Bank Avenue should have its own separate zone to prevent visitor overspill in both directions.</p>	<p>Every property on Nunthorpe Grove were hand delivered letters at each stage the R57 Scheme was proposed and implemented.</p>
<p>Object to the extension of Nunthorpe Grove. When we voted for the priority parking we were not informed of any likely hood of the area been extended. South bank Avenue should have its own zone.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Object to the extension. We agreed and voted for our street to become ResPark as it was becoming problematic with non residents parking. If the proposed extension comes in force we will be back to square one. South bank Avenue should have its own zone.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>Strongly object to extend the existing R57 Scheme. Any extension would instigate a return to the widespread disruption long suffered by Nunthorpe Grove residents before the scheme was introduced. The road and footpaths are now safe to use, grass verges are undisturbed and resident's access has improved. Extending the scheme is not a viable option. The most effective solution would be for a separate scheme to be implemented. This would create a fair and even distribution of excess vehicles instead of shifting the problem back to Nunthorpe Grove, which has seen a successful ResPark implementation.</p>	<p>If a separate scheme is implemented there would be no alternative parking available for either zone should there be gully cleaning or resurfacing works taking place, along with no additional provision for visitors etc.</p>
<p>As a resident of Nunthorpe Grove I oppose the proposed extension. South Bank Avenue should have a separate scheme and residents be informed that this is likely to expand in the future. Currently we have reduced traffic due to it being a no through road which makes it safer for children. Expanding the zone will cause residents of SBA to drive up and down looking for parking. Majority of properties have off street parking this reduces the available on street parking due to driveways. The street is not wide enough for two sided parking. Priority parking should prioritise those living on the street not the adjoining or near by streets. Extending R57 does not serve the common good for Nunthorpe Grove residents.</p>	<p>Residents' parking does not give drivers permission to cause an obstruction to the highway or off street parking provisions.</p>
<p>Object to R57 being extended. Because a lot of South Bank Avenue properties do not have off street parking we envisage many will encroach into Nunthorpe Grove, not only residents but visitors and work vehicles. Thereby bringing more traffic which we voted to do away with in the first place.</p>	<p>Removing non residential parking from South Bank Avenue will create a better opportunity for residents to park close to their property.</p>

Object to the extension as it is highly likely to cause notable congestion on Nunthorpe Grove. Nunthorpe Grove contains enough traffic and parking is at a capacity, an extension will encourage people from surrounding area to use the street for surplus parking. Double parking could prevent large emergency vehicles accessing the whole of Nunthorpe Grove, we object to further traffic and parking. We anticipate that that people would park intermittently at the top end to utilise popping to the shops, especially near the turning area. Introduce a separate scheme for South Bank Avenue.

Residents' parking does not give permit holders permission or consent to cause an obstruction to the highway or highway users. It also does not give residents permission to obstruct private driveways. If turning areas are constantly blocked then a request for restrictions can be added to the annual review.