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

7 February 2019

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy and Place

Consideration of results from an additional consultation in Fulford Cross

Summary

1. To report the consultation results for Fulford Cross and to determine what action is appropriate.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that approval be given to advertise an amendment to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Residents' Priority Parking Area for Fulford Cross as outlined in Option 2 with a plan provided for clarification (Annex B).

Reason: To progress an amended scheme which meets Residents requests for an additional permit parking amenity on Education land.

Background

3. We received petitions from the Danesmead Estate, Fulford Cross and Broadway West requesting consideration be given to introducing a Resident Parking zone. The petitions were reported to the Executive Member for Transport and Planning on the 22 June 2017 and the 19 October 2017. The Executive Member gave approval to consult with residents when the areas reached the top of the waiting list and to widen the consultation area depending on circumstances at the time.
4. The results of the initial consultation were reported to the Executive Member on the 25 October 2018. The report, minutes and decision made from this meeting are on the website.
5. Some residents of Fulford Cross who made representation and spoke at the meeting requested a second consultation to confirm the majority view

about the proposals presented in the report for the small area of Education Land.

6. Consequently, the Executive Member resolved:
 - a) To advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a new Residents' Priority Parking Area to operate Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm in the Danesmead Estate as outlined on plans included as Annex I. To be allocated the zone number (R63).
 - b) Not to proceed with Residents Priority Parking area on Fulford Cross at the present time, but to undertake further consultation in this area and to report the results of this consultation back to the Executive Member at a future decision session.
 - c) No further action to be taken for Broadway West and Westfield Drive at this time. If residents of these streets provide additional evidence of support within 18 months of implementation of a scheme on neighbouring streets then we seek authorisation to re-consult with these areas at that time.

Reason: To progress the majority views of the residents consulted.

Consultation Results, Fulford Cross

7. We undertook a second consultation with the 26 properties on Fulford Cross and 254, 256 & 258 Fulford Road on the 16th November. The consultation documentation provided is included as Annex A. In addition information letters and details were sent to York Steiner School, Danesgate School and Homeyork House.
8. Traditionally, we require a 50% return of questionnaires and the majority of those returned to be in favour.
9. We received a low return compared to the first consultation and the results are inconclusive. 8 residents are happy with the proposal on offer, two residents returned a decisive "No". 6 residents would support the introduction of Resident Parking on the proviso that the proposed 10 minute bay (Mon-Fri, 9am to 5pm) is amended to allow residents to park within it throughout the day.

FULFORD CROSS SECOND CONSULTATION RESULTS			
No. of Properties	Yes	No	Comments
29	8		Support the scheme as proposed
	2		Only if Residents are allowed to park in the proposed 10 min drop off zone throughout the day
		2	Do not want Resident Parking
		4	These preferences would be changed to Yes if Residents are allowed to park in the proposed 10 min drop off zone throughout the day
% Returns 55% (return from 1 st consultation was 72%)			

Comments Received

2 Residents:

10. Whilst we voted yes when we were initially consulted on residents parking, we do not support the proposal that has been made. The current proposal prioritises the needs of a fee paying school over the interests of residents. It is also against the express wishes of the education authority who own the area in question. On this basis, please register our vote on the scheme as proposed as 'No'. It is also worth noting that, at the last residents' meeting, the representative from the Steiner school said that the proposed drop off zone was not even beneficial for the Steiner school. However, we would be in favour of a Residents Parking Scheme if the Education land remained available for residents to park on at all times. If the proposal is amended to reflect this, please count our vote as 'Yes'.

Officer Comments

11. The Council has a duty to consider the needs of the wider community and not just residents. The proposal, reference the 10 minute marked parking area, was the preferred option of the Education Department at that time.

1 Resident:

12. Staff and visitors to either school should not be able to park on street as each business should have their own parking arrangements. If they were allowed even 10 minutes I believe this would be abused and they would take far longer, negating the whole concept.

As people have already taken advantage of street parking it has resulted in expense to the residents as we are now having to pay to park outside our own houses. I believe the businesses should have been made to manage their own parking arrangements and it would not have come to this.

6.25 for a book of 5 is expensive for elderly people receiving visits from friends and family!

Officer Comments

13. Residents over 60 are able to purchase a book of 5 permits for £1.50. This discount is additionally available to residents receiving certain benefits. Details about this were provided to residents within the first consultation process.

1 Resident:

14. CYC is not listening to residents.
The problem is caused by Steiner School and Danesgate, they should provide a solution before residents are asked to pay extortionate amounts. What has CYC done about this?
It is immoral and unethical to support this scheme, knowing that Steiner School parents will park in other Streets. Why should we, and more importantly, CYC, dump this problem on other York Residents? At what point have CYC been charged with making the lives of York Residents worse?
What evidence is CYC using to make this decision? Since when are opinions evidence?
There is not a problem in the school holidays, only during term time. Why is CYC not able to sign this? Other authorities can sign parking restrictions e.g. Stadium parking in Coventry on specific dates. Fulford Cross Residents are at the bottom of the pile in this proposal. Steiner and Danesgate have enhanced provision – lots of parking space is taken out of use. Once again CYC puts residents last.
This scheme represents a failure of CYC's Transport policy – people who work in York refuse to use P & R, public transport, walk or cycle and residents are the losers.

Officer comments

15. Danesgate School have recently provided additional staff parking. Other residents have reported the pressure for parking on Fulford Cross has eased since this occurred. It is our understanding that York Steiner School have no space capacity to increase the staff parking area or provide an area on site for parents to drop off and pick up.

It is difficult to sign a “term-time” restriction because the dates of terms are not “set” and differ between schools and authorities.

Ward Councillor Comments

16. We had a meeting with 9 residents (from 7 households) as well as a representative of the Steiner School. A clear view from all present seemed to be opposed to the 10 min drop off zone so we have encouraged them to respond saying that they want to see a scheme introduced but with this area open to residents permit holders to use during the times of operation of the scheme. While this may mean more parents parking in front of houses they still preferred this option and we are therefore willing to support that change, which the Executive Member could make before formal consultation with the TRO advert.

CYC Land under the remit of Education

17. Part of the proposed area for parking restrictions on Fulford Cross is not adopted highway. This is City of York Council land and falls under the remit of Education (adjacent to the Danesgate Community School). We have been informed that the Education department are now willing to permit this area being annexed to the Resident’s Priority Parking Area. (See Recommended Option)
18. York Steiner School have told us they require a minimum of 20 minutes for drop-off/pick up as parents use this time to go into the classroom and speak to the teachers. They have pupils attending from a wide catchment area including Harrogate and Ripon. As a consequence the school will have a high percentage of pupils arriving by private car. A Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm scheme will not have a detrimental effect on the morning school run (school starts at 8:30 am). The amended scheme we are now recommending will not provide the requested 20 minute time allowance for drop off and pick up. Parents and carers who require a longer stay will be required to park on nearby unrestricted streets.

Proposed Disabled Bay (Enforceable)

19. It has been brought to our attention that the advisory disabled bay provided for a resident of Fulford Cross is not of standard length to meet highway regulations to enable enforcement. The length provided is causing difficulties for the resident as vehicles parked close and/or overhanging the disabled space can prevent

wheelchair access. It is intended to resolve this anomaly by revoking 1.6m of No Waiting at any Time to provide a more usable parking amenity for the resident and to meet the length required under Highway Regulations.

Options with Analysis

20. **Option 1** – Advertise the proposal as proposed in the consultation (see Annex A)
- a) Advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a new Residents' Priority Parking Area (R63) to operate Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm in Fulford Cross.
 - b) Advertise a parking area on Fulford Cross with a 10 minute limit Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm.
 - c) Advertise a 6m Disabled Parking Bay on Fulford Cross adjacent to No 3 Fulford Cross
 - d) Advertise No Waiting at any Time Restrictions as detailed in the plan included with Annex A

This is not the recommended option because:

It is not the preferred option of a high proportion of residents and not now supported by Ward Councillors.

21. **Option 2:** Recommended Option, See Annex B
- a) Advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a Residents' Priority Parking Area (R63) to operate Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm in Fulford Cross. To include the Education Land adjacent to Danesgate School.
 - b) Revocation of 1.6m of no waiting at any time of No Waiting at any Time (double yellow lines) adjacent to 2 Fulford Cross and to enable (c) below.
 - c) Advertise a 6.6m Disabled Parking Bay on Fulford Cross adjacent to No 3 Fulford Cross
 - d) Advertise No Waiting at any Time Restrictions (double yellow lines) as detailed in the attached plan (Annex B).
22. This is the recommended option because it reflects the views of several

the residents who responded to the consultation and the Ward Councillors.

23. The scheme we consulted on (Option one, Annex A) included an area that allowed any vehicle to wait for 10 minutes between 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday. This was designed to provide a drop-off zone/short term parking for parents and guardians for the adjacent schools. Some residents wanted this area be included within the scheme to enable them to use it for long term parking with Resident Parking permits.
24. We have now been given the necessary authorisation from Education to include this area within the Resident Parking Area and consequently meet this request.
25. All of our Resident Parking Areas/Zones allow vehicles to wait for 10 minutes for loading/unloading purposes and this includes passengers. We are assuming those residents who supported the scheme as presented as Option A, will have no objections to the amended proposal because it provides more permit parking amenity for residents to use.
26. **Option 3:**

- a) No further action to be taken

This is not the recommended Option because it is not in line with the stated preferences of residents from the two consultations we have undertaken.

Consultation

27. The consultation documentation is provided within this report as Annex A.
28. If approval to proceed is granted further consultation will be carried out as part of the legal process. Notices will be placed on street, in The Press and hand delivered to properties in the area.

Council Plan

29. The recommended proposal contributes to the Council Plan as:
 - A council that listens to residents. The Council is delivering a service which works in partnership with the local community to try and solve the problems they have experienced.

30. **Implications**

This report has the following implications:

Financial – The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking schemes. The ongoing enforcement and administrative management of the additional residents parking provision will need to be resourced from the income generated by the new measure

Human Resources – If implemented, enforcement will fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load. New zones/areas also impact on the Business Support Administrative services as well as Parking Services. Provision will need to be made from the income generated from new schemes to increase resources in these areas as well as within the Civil Enforcement Team.

Equalities – None identified within the consultation process

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

Author:

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

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Assistant Director for Transport, Highways
and Environment

Report Approved: ✓

Date: 24/01/19

Wards Affected: Fishergate

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Annexes:

Annex A: Consultation Documentation

Annex B: Plan of Option 2 (Recommended Option)

Abbreviations:

CYC: City of York Council