

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy and Place

Consideration of results from the consultation in Sussex Road and immediate area following a petition received requesting Residents' Priority Parking

1. Summary

To report the consultation results undertaken in May for Sussex Road, Sussex Close and the affected properties which have frontages/access onto the proposed area, then determine what action is deemed appropriate (plan of consultation area included as Annex A).

2. Recommendation

It is recommended that approval be given to take no further action towards the implementation of Residents Priority parking at this location and remove the consulted area from the Residents Parking waiting list.

Reason: The required response rate has not been met along with the close percentage vote received for and against the scheme.

3. Background

We received a petition with 34 signatures representing 18 properties on Sussex Road. The petition was reported to the Executive Member for Transport and Planning on the 13th July 2017. The Executive Member gave approval to consult with residents when the area reached the top of the waiting list and to widen the consultation area depending on circumstances at the time.

The adjoining street (Sussex Close) and properties having a frontage or entrance onto the proposed area were included within the consultation area. Also included were the properties and carriageway frontage of 85-91 Crossways. A plan of the consultation area is included as Annex A.

We hand delivered consultation documentation to all properties on the 18th May 2018 requesting residents return their preferences on the questionnaire sheet in the Freepost envelope provided by Friday 15th June 2018. Details were also sent to ward councillors.

The consultation documentation is included within this report as :
Annex B: Covering Letter
Annex C: Consultation documentation and questionnaire

4. **Consultation Results (for full details see Annex D)**

In total 48 properties were consulted and asked to return their questionnaires. The returns did not equate to the required 50% response rate and the votes for or against the introduction of Residents Priority Parking were not substantially in favour.

Traditionally, we require a 50% return of questionnaires and the majority of those returned to be in favour. As the original petition was received from residents of Sussex Road only, the consultation results could be considered independently however even when the 50% response was received (on Sussex Close) the vote is too close to recommend introducing a scheme as this would not be beneficial to the residents in such a small area, equating to most vehicles then being parked on Sussex Road:

Sussex Road:	46% return	66% in favour, 33% against
Sussex Close:	64% return	55% in favour, 45% against
Crossways (83-91):	20% return	100% against
Properties having an access:	33% return	100% against

5. **Preferred Times of Operation (for full details see Annex D)**

For those residents who gave an opinion, just over half indicated a preference for a part time scheme operating Monday – Friday 9am to 5pm. An alternative was given as 24hours 7 days a week.

One alternative time of operation was suggested for:

Monday – Friday 8.30 to 9.30am and 3.00-4.00pm, however this would not prevent parking for school drop off and collection.

6. **Resident Comments (précis, full details Annex E)**

The most common views across all residents, who were either for or against residents parking, suggested the problems were being caused

by University students and staff, as such the University should be providing adequate parking for their needs. Concerns have been raised relating to school parking at drop off and collection times, however introducing a residents parking scheme would not prevent access or stop vehicles parking for the dropping off and collection of passengers, generally a ten minute grace period is given to allow this activity to take place in restricted areas, this includes ResPark zones and double yellow lines, so long as no obstruction is being caused.

7. **Options with Analysis**

Option 1 (Recommended Option)

- a) No further action to be taken.

This is the recommended option because:

We have not received the 50% return rate from the area to recommend introducing a Residents Priority Parking Scheme. As a whole we received a 48% return with 56.5% of those in favour and 43.5% against. We would not recommend taking forward a scheme with only 13 properties in favour out of a total of 48. The original petition was received from Sussex Road which only has a 46% response rate.

Even though the required percentage of returns were received for Sussex Close the votes show that 5 residents are in favour and 4 are against the scheme, it would not be advised to implement a scheme for such a small cul de sac based on these close results. Complaints were received regarding vehicles causing problems at school drop off and collection times; however introducing a Residents Priority parking scheme would not stop this practise from happening, as a ten minute period would be given for non permit holders to aid the collection and drop off of passengers.

8. **Option 2:**

- a) Advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a Residents Priority Parking scheme to include the whole consultation area.

This is not the recommended option because:

We have not received the required 50% return rate. Considering the results over the whole consultation area we received a 47.9% return with 43.5% of these against the proposal. The original petition was received just from Sussex Road residents, which also did not receive the required

return rate.

This option would not reflect the majority of resident's opinions for the area.

9. **Option 3:**

- b) Advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a Residents Priority Parking scheme to include Sussex Close only.

This is not the recommended option because:

This option considers the results from Sussex Close in isolation. The views of residents are marginal with 5 in favour and 4 against from a total of 14 properties. Concerns have been raised from Sussex Close about multiple occupancy properties causing problems in the close, however these properties would still be permitted to purchase permits for the scheme.

10. **Consultation**

The consultation documentation is reproduced within this report as Annex A, B and C. The results of the consultation are given in Annex D. Comments received during the process are préciséd with officer response as Annex E.

Letters will be sent to all residents updating them on the outcome of this meeting and what the result means to them.

11. **Council Plan**

The recommended proposal contributes to the Council Plan as:

- A council that listens to residents and follows procedures/guidelines which are in place.

12. **Implications**

This report has the following implications:

Financial – If the recommended option is not agreed then the following would apply: Residents parking schemes are self financing once in operation. The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking schemes.

Human Resources – If a scheme was implemented, enforcement would fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load. We understand Parking Services are increasing enforcement resources because of additional restrictions implemented recently.

Equalities – None identified within the consultation process

Legal – If the recommended option is not agreed then any proposals implemented would 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:

Annemarie Howarth
Traffic Project Officer
Transport
Tel: (01904) 551337

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Assistant Director for Transport, Highways
and Environment

Report
Approved ✓ **Date: 19.07.18**

Wards Affected: Hull Road

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Background Papers:

None

Annexes:

Annex A: Plan of the area consulted

Annex B: Covering letter (consultation)

Annex C: Consultation Information and questionnaire

Annex D: Consultation Results

Annex E: Précis of comments received from Residents