

**Support**

The scheme is fine and should be implemented as soon as possible.  
Many thanks

**Officer comments**

Noted, thank you

**Objection**

This is my formal objection to the proposals for Residents Parking Scheme as detailed in your letter dated 24th August 2021.

To be honest I was appalled by the changes made to the proposals dating back to February. In your own words the proposals sole purpose was to improve the parking situation for residents, but the scheme delivered to me does just the opposite, not only making parking for residents much more difficult, but also increasing the possibility of incidents as cars try with difficulty to insert themselves into narrow gaps in the face of two way traffic, because of the difficulties bought on by the proposed reduction in parking spaces.

I should state that I live alone, have multiple sclerosis, and am a blue badge holder. I have managed to maintain my independence, in no small part due to my ability to park outside my home. I am totally dependent on my car for food, attending appointments etc., and cannot carry items more than a short distance .The proposals as outlined will make it extremely difficult to continue to do this, that said, the primary purpose of my objection is for the common good.

As your letter states the main reason for the changes to your proposal i.e. the sight lines and reduced spaces, were bought in due to a letter sent by St Oswald's Church .On receipt of your proposals I arranged an onsite meeting with the vicar, and she was quite clear and specific in saying that you had misread their position, and that it was never the intention of the church to ask for the removal of the 2 spaces outside no. 11 .Someone has taken the issue of 'sight lines' and blown it out of proportion -The sight lines proposed will have very limited value in safety terms, but the scale of the cutback in available spaces will significantly increase the risk of an incident on the road as detailed above. The whole issue of the sight lines is to be honest a red herring, it works against the interests of the residents, not in their favour, and is based on a misreading of the views and wishes of St Oswald's. The spaces in front of no 11 should be retained, and the reduction in spaces in front of no 7-9, and no 5 bought about by the sight line issue should be reversed.

I now address the situation of the parking bays on the west side of the road, opposite no's 5-11, which are currently a 3 hour parking restriction. When some years ago the changes to main street were made with the introduction of bus lanes/cycle lanes etc., the Planning Officer at the time asked me to keep an analysis of the usage of the bays opposite, This is something I have been doing again since receipt of your proposals, checking on an hourly basis. On only 2 occasions in the last 2 weeks have there been 3 or more vehicles occupying the bays, and they coincided with an event going on in St Oswald's Church- on both these occasions there were still available spaces ,For much if not most of the 2 week period occupancy was zero or one. The situation of our 5 properties is a little unusual, in that we have no dwellings opposite us, With the huge unused capacity of the bays opposite our houses there is an opportunity for a solution to all the problems that we are trying to improve, and would vastly reduce the possibility of accidents on the road that would not be an option for most households. This could be bought about by re-assigning the bays as unlimited parking for residents, whilst retaining the parking option for non-residents. This would have the combined benefit of removing the pressure on residents trying to occupy one of the spaces outside our properties- it would greatly help with road safety as at busy times we could leave our vehicles across the road, when either all available spaces on our side were already full or by attempting a difficult parking manoeuvre in the face of ongoing traffic .This would be more beneficial than any 'improvement 'bought about by sight lines .

In summation ,

1. The first priority is to ensure the spaces available currently in front of no's 5-11 remain in their entirety, As envisaged in the original proposal from the council in February 2021. This would mean the ditching of the changes brought about by the sight lines, the whole idea of which was based on a misinterpretation of the wishes of the church, these spaces should be designated for resident's usage.

2- This will only have a major improvement for residents if the spaces opposite are also designated as full time access for those with residential permits, whilst retaining usage for non-residents as already in place.

3- the combined effect of these measures would I think get the agreement of all concerned, whereas the proposals as proposed to us 2 weeks ago seem to please no one, and would only result in what is a difficult situation becoming an untenable one .

At the beginning of this representation I talked of my personal situation and how much it could change if the current proposals went forward. I find it hard to believe that in light of the displeasure they have bought on that common sense will not eventually prevail- after all the whole purpose of the exercise is to improve the situation for residents, not to make them irate .

That said if my objections and those of others do not get a reversal of the plans of 24th August, I will, with reluctance have to make a personal plea on my own behalf. At the time of the major changes some years ago, without any prompting from me, the planning officer at the time offered to put a disabled bay on the verge outside no 11. I thought hard about it, but turned it down for on balance I thought I could cope, as indeed I have, but the new proposals throw in serious doubt my ability to maintain my independence, I am aware that a disabled space is available for any badge holder, and am not asking for the option for a bay on the verge to be reopened, but if our objections are not addressed and the proposals go ahead, I am asking that a single bay should be retained outside no 11, and designated a disabled space- whilst this would not give me a guaranteed lifeline it would considerably increase my chances of continuing an independent lifestyle.

As I say, I hope this request will not have to be looked at as it would not I think be necessary if something akin to my summation proposals is enacted.

**Officer comments**

When formalising on street parking areas all factors, including sight lines and visibility splays have to be reviewed. As such the recommended proposals took all safety aspects into account whilst maintaining sufficient vehicular access to the bus clearway and providing residents priority parking bays where sufficient space was available.

We are unable to formalise grass verge parking which is currently taking place by residents.

Blue badge holders are permitted to park on double yellow lines for three hours, so long as no obstruction is taking place, this could be utilised until an appropriate space was available within the proposed scheme.

**Objection**

**Please accept this email as my objection to the scheme as it stands.**

For the purpose of clarity, my wife and I are the owner occupiers of No \_ Main Street, a property of this section of road. My wife, children and I are negatively affected by the current parking situation which is why we brought our needs and those of our neighbours to the Council's attention. We are frequently unable to park by our house because of non-locals parking there in order to get on a bus or to cycle into the City centre. Their cars often remain in place over night.

The need we originally defined has been forgotten through the intervening months and instead of addressing the residents' needs, the Council's proposal:

- now reduces the number of parking spaces available (at a time when the number of residents, properties and cars has remained the same);
- does so on account of improving sight lines, which is absurd. The Council is trying to address simultaneously an unrelated problem which could only be solved satisfactorily on a road of this size by removing all parking.

Let's stick to the matter in hand by maintaining the number of parking places and trying to prevent persistent non-residents from using them at the expense of those in No \_\_, and Nos \_\_ and \_\_ both busy households with five children between them.

The proposal as it stands achieves nothing positive and I know will be objected to by some if not all residents.

The Church has made it clear its original objection has been taken out of context and it was certainly not its intention to reduce the number of parking places.

Following discussion amongst the residents, it seems important to:

1. ensure that the two spaces remain in front of 11;
2. ensure that the four spaces remain in front of 9 & 7;
3. ensure that the four spaces remain in front of 5 and beyond towards York;
4. reserve all of these spaces for the residents of 11, 9, 9A, 7, 5 Main Street;

5. Provide additional access for the residents to the spaces on the west side of the road (currently limited to all for three hours) on an unlimited time basis. This provides overspill for when spaces are not available on 'our' side of the road and for the use of tradesmen and visitors. It should be noted that this suggestion would not disadvantage people visiting the doctor or church as there is now always capacity here for those purposes.

We hope you can amend the proposal accordingly and bring back something that achieves our aims. It is a pity to lose further time but we believe that it is more important to get the details of the scheme correct prior to implementation even if that means a delay into 2022.

**Officer comments**

When formalising on street parking we are unable to implement individual bays without following DFT guidelines for the length and required visibility/access requirements which may need to be protected.

The proposal currently provides 7 spaces for 5 properties (one of which is a guest house who have confirmed no vehicles currently require on street parking) the bay opposite can already be utilised by visitors and trades people for up to three hours with no charge.

**St Oswald's Church comments**

In response to your letter dated 24 August 2021 but received in the last week of October, we would like to clarify a number of issues.

We understood that the proposals you put forward in the initial consultation

document, which we received for comment, were those put forward by local residents and were trying to be supportive of their wishes. We have since learned that these did not have the approval of all residents. From our point of view the current arrangements work very well and the intention of our comments was to try and lessen the impact that any restrictions would have on the users of St Oswald's Church and hall while supporting our neighbours.

The adaptations, far from making things better for us and our neighbours, appear to allow for a lot less flexibility and will certainly making matters worse.

We have discussed this at a meeting of our Parochial Church Council on Tuesday 9 November and should like to make the following points.

Until the end of this year we are having building work carried out on our church roof and so have very little parking. Once it is completed we will return to having 9

parking places available in the church car park, which includes 1 parking place for people with disabilities. This, together with the parking on the other side of main

street is usually enough for regular Sunday services or events which take place in

the church hall – especially as the majority of users are able to avoid the use of cars. However, we do struggle finding adequate parking for weddings, funerals, baptisms or larger events when people are traveling to the church from outside the area. At one time we had an arrangement with Townend's on the corner of Main Street and Heslington Lane to allow us to use their car park outside office hours but this is no longer possible on a regular basis. On road parking is therefore essential for us at times. 1 hour parking is not sufficient for somebody to attend services or events so we would like to see a *minimum* of 2 hours parking available for non-residents. The 3 hours parking on the opposite side of main street is very useful. We do recognise that our neighbours wish to be able to park outside their homes and for that reason are not totally opposed to a residents' parking scheme, we would just like to have flexibility built into any scheme. Fortunately we do not need parking places overnight which certainly helps the situation.

With regard to exiting the car park we were expressing gratitude for the cooperation of our neighbours. We are helped by being between two sets of traffic lights which means traffic is often slowed or stopped. We certainly did not want to

deprive our immediate neighbour of the option to park outside his house, which we know is essential for him. With cautious driving and a bit of patience we have coped with the situation as it is for many years. We would welcome the opportunity to be part of any continuing discussion on this matter. We too are concerned for the impact on the environment of excessive use of cars, but we are also aware that in these times when many people are struggling with isolation it is particularly important that we maintain access to those who through age, infirmity, or other circumstances still have to rely on their vehicles and therefore require parking spaces near to the church and hall.

**Officer comments**

To increase the limited waiting within the proposed new bays would disadvantage residents, particularly on weekends, as such the bay opposite should remain as existing to give temporary overflow for residents/visitors along with church visitors when required.

