

Annex H – Consultation Responses

Dear Director of Place,

I am objecting to The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (amendment) (14/58) traffic order 2023.

I object on the grounds that it is unfair and unnecessary to remove residents parking for residents of Queen Street. All road users are catered for in the current lay out and should be in the new road layout.

Many thanks

Dear Director of Place,

I am writing to express my objection to the York Parking, Stopping, and Waiting (Amendment) (No 14/58) traffic regulation order for 2023.

The proposed changes outlined in this order have raised serious concerns among the residents of Queen Street, myself included. The effects of these changes are not only unfair but also fail to consider the practical and essential needs of the residents. Residents should have the right to reasonable access to parking spaces near their homes.

This is vital not only for maintaining the value of their properties but also for facilitating day-to-day activities. The proposed restrictions on residents' parking spaces would significantly impact our ability to meet basic needs.

There is space available to accommodate the various parties involved – residents, cyclists, traffic and pedestrians – as they do now, without imposing such strict limitations on residents' parking rights. It is my understanding that alternative solutions can be explored that prioritize the wellbeing and convenience of the residents.

It is my hope that the concerns of Queen Street residents will be given due consideration and that a solution can be found that respects the rights of residents to park near their homes, while also ensuring the safety and convenience of all parties involved.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Kind regards

Dear Director of Place,

I am objecting to The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (amendment) (14/58) traffic order 2023. I object on the grounds that it is unfair and unnecessary to remove residents parking for residents of Queen Street. All road users are catered for in the current lay out and should be in the new road layout.

Many thanks

Dear [...]

I would like to object about the traffic order to stop Queen street residents parking and stop and waiting.

This action will devalue our houses hugely, we are not being compensated. We bought these houses with parking outside, how could we sell a house where a removal van can no longer pull up outside. Where workmen will have no place to park for maintenance to our houses, deliveries will be unable to be made.

Tradespeople will charge double when they hear they will somehow have to transport their tools across town. I don't feel the situation has been addressed properly. City of York council are doing whatever they feel like without the consideration of the residents. They have passed us and our concerns from pillar to post, dragging out the negotiations with a constant change of representation of whoever may be free at that time. They are taking advantage we are not legally represented, bullying us and doing exactly what they feel. They have conducted meeting's to appease us as a complete waste of time.

Why does the council who should represent their constituents fight us all the way ?

We should be working together. Yes there should be a cycle lane, the original plans show a cycle lane and residents parking ! I don't understand why this was altered.

Many Thanks

Dear Director of Place,

I am writing to express my strong objection to the York Parking, Stopping, and Waiting (Amendment) (No 14/58) traffic regulation order 2023.

There is ample space available to accommodate both cyclists and residents' parking safely. This option has been considered in previous plans, making it a viable solution. There seems to be no justifiable reason for denying residents the right to park in the area.

The impact of this decision is significant and far-reaching. Denying any parking at all in front of our house not only affects the convenience of residents but also has a direct impact on the property's value. Furthermore, this restriction hampers necessary structural and maintenance work such as window cleaning, joinery, electrical services, roofing, plastering, carpet installation, cleaning, plumbing, painting, and any other maintenance tasks that are vital for maintaining a safe and well maintained home. One of the most important needs which we will require is domiciliary care. I believe that, in a similar situation, you would likely share the sentiment and concern that arises when such decisions impact one's own home and loved ones. I kindly request that you reconsider the current order and explore alternatives that take into account the needs of the residents and their essential requirements.

I have extracted CYC key values from the CYC website:

We work together

- we share information and knowledge
- we care about and respect others' views
- we encourage and support each other
- we support and enable individuals and our communities

We improve

- we challenge what we do and how we can do it better
- we try new ways of doing things
- we learn from our experiences, feedback and mistakes
- we are ambitious for our communities and our city

We make a difference

- we are honest about what we achieve
- we deliver on our commitments
- we communicate openly
- we make our actions count

The points I have highlighted are not being fulfilled by the action of removing our residents parking.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objection. I hope we can find a solution that balances the needs of the community while respecting the rights and well-being of the residents.

Kind regards

Dear Sirs,

I would like to object to the removal of the residents parking from Queen Street, York.

The original plan stated we would keep the residents parking and a cycle lane to be added, somewhere the parking suddenly disappeared. Removal of all residents parking from Queen Street devalues the houses, makes it impossible for deliveries, dropping children off, workman access and disabled access.

The taxi rank is keeping their parking only a few metres away from where the residents parking should be. Why are they allowed to keep their parking ? City of York Council have bullied the residents of Queen street as we have no legal representation and do not understand our rights. They have misused their position and do not stand for their constituents.

Why does this have to be a fight ? I feel like we are being tripped up every step of the way. The railings we were promised are part awful modern ones and only a couple of houses the ornate ones in keeping with our properties. We are being abused with half-truths, cloak and dagger all the way. We should all be having the ornate railings with our listed properties. Why do I have to find out when insisting to see the plans which had been hidden away.

Shame on York council treating its residents in this manner. You're not listening, you're doing exactly what you please. Give us our parking as originally promised.

Dear [...],

I would like to object to the removal of residents parking at Queen Street York.

The removal will make it impossible to gain access to the houses with a child or elderly person. Unloading shopping impossible, maintenance of the properties and unloading tools a nightmare. Losing the residents parking and stopping and waiting without any sensible alternative solution being in place is just another blow from The City of York Council who bully their residents and do exactly as they please.

The lack of parking devalues the houses. The taxi rank a few metres away remain with their parking ! This is very unfair and been underhand every step of the way. In this day and age taking away parking and stopping and waiting does nothing to help the families who live there, this will encourage us to sell and the whole street will turn into air B&B's. We will have to sell at a loss with no compensation. Please reinstate the original plans to keep the parking and cycle lane.

Many Thanks

Dear Director of Place

I am objecting to The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (amendment) (14/58)

traffic order 2023. I object on the grounds that it is unfair and unnecessary to remove residents parking for residents of Queen Street. All road users are catered for in the current lay out and should be in the new road layout.

Many thanks

Dear Director of Place,

I am writing to object to the proposed York Parking, Stopping, and Waiting (Amendment) (No 14/58) traffic regulation order for 2023.

My concern revolves around the removal of residents' parking spaces. This decision seems unnecessary and unreasonable, as it directly impacts the convenience and accessibility for residents in the affected area.

Residents should have the right to a reasonable and accessible parking option near their homes. Removing this option would result in undue inconvenience and potential difficulties in everyday activities including home maintenance.

I urge you to reconsider this aspect of the regulation order and explore alternative solutions that balance the needs of all parties involved. I hope to see a resolution that takes into account the concerns of the residents.

Best regards,

Dear Director of Place,

I am objecting to The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (amendment) (14/58) traffic order 2023. I object on the grounds that it is unfair and unnecessary to remove residents parking for residents of Queen Street. All road users are catered for in the current lay out and should be in the new road layout.

Many thanks

Hello,

I object to these proposals because, they will remove vehicular access to my house at 11, Queen Street. The restrictions imposed will adversely affect our ability to receive deliveries, bring food home from a supermarket and carryout work and maintenance on our property.

Life will become very difficult for anyone living on that street.

Regards

Good evening,

I am a resident of Queen Street, York and I would like to object to the purposed changes to the traffic regulations.

Thank you

OBJECTION – The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (Amendment)(NO 14/58) Traffic Order 2023

I write to express my objection to the proposals set out in the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (Amendment)(N) 14/58) Traffic Order 2023.

I object to these proposals because, if enacted, they will effectively remove vehicular access to my house at 19, Queen Street.

The restrictions imposed will adversely affect my ability to use my car, to receive deliveries, to carry out work on my property and to engage tradespeople who require access to equipment kept in their vehicle. Introduction of these restrictions will make life untenable for those with restricted mobility who need easy access to a vehicle, for those who require regular support from a visiting carer and for families who need to safely move young children in and out of car seats.

The video presentation on the York Station Gateway project which is available on the City of York Council (CYC) website clearly shows (see screenshot at **Attachment 1**) Queen Street reconfigured to include residents' parking, a cycle lane and a widened footpath. This appeared to provide an ideal solution for all stakeholders and was widely supported by residents. However, this plan was challenged by the York Cycle Campaign and the parking spaces were removed (Station Front Proposals – Objection 7, June 2019 Ref – 19/00535/FULM). The Cycle Campaign objection was comprehensive, well-researched (although recent observations suggest that their estimates of the amount of cycle traffic were greatly overstated) and passionately argued. The central tenet of their submission was that cyclists would be at risk of being hit by car doors being opened in the parking bays and that they would then be in danger of being run over by large vehicles on the carriageway. This argument is clearly flawed, as the proposed layout showed that the cycle lane was separated from the highway by the parking bays. This means that, in the event of a cyclist being struck by an open car door, they would fall into the cycle lane and not the main carriageway and would therefore be at no risk of being hit by a motor vehicle. As an active cyclist myself, I am very much in favour of improving cycling infrastructure, but I believe this should be done in a collaborative manner which acknowledges the legitimate needs and concerns of all stakeholders.

At the request of residents, the original safest case that resulted in the removal of residents' parking was reviewed in early 2023 (see minutes of the Queen Street Residents' Update Meeting 29 March 2023 paragraph 2.0 – **Attachment 2**). This review identified 'multiple areas of concern' with regard to re-instating residents' parking. These concerns were listed as:

- ❓ Conflict with road traffic and buses
- ❓ Movement and station access
- ❓ Queen Street parking spaces would not be able to be designated as restricted parking

Whilst these concerns are understood, there are many other locations on York's Inner Ring Road (A1036) and adjacent routes that have on-street residents parking and loading / access bays. Examples include the following:

- ❓ Lord Mayor's Walk – Permit Area R9 – Extensive residents and pay & display parking on the south side of the road.
- ❓ Monkgate – Permit Area R8 – Residents' parking on both sides of the road.
- ❓ Heworth Green – Permit Area R24 – Residents' parking on the east side of the road.
- ❓ Foss Islands Road – Permit Area MT – Extensive residents' and pay & display parking on the south-west side of the road.
- ❓ Fishergate – Pay & display parking on the north side of the road leading up to the junction with Paragon Street.

It should be noted that none of these areas benefit from a dedicated, separate cycle way as shown in the original Queen Street proposals.

In addition to the examples given above, there are two areas on the A1036 of particular interest. The first is on Barbican Road, in the vicinity of Lawrence Court. In this area, residents' parking bays are provided on the east side of the road. Four of the bays are aligned at 90 degrees to the carriageway (Permit Area R27 – see photo – **Attachment 3**). This arrangement means that when parking, the driver must either stop in the traffic and reverse into the space, or drive in forwards and then carry out the hazardous manouvre of reversing onto a main road, against the guidance of Rule 201 of the Highway Code. The second area of interest is on Queen Street itself: it is understood that the existing taxi bays and bus stop on the south side of the road adjacent to Fleetways taxi office are to be retained (see photo – **Attachment 4**). It is considered that these facilities, situated at what will be the narrowest part of the street, and starting only some 20 metres from the blind junction with Blossom Street present a much greater potential hazard than parking bays situated on a five-lane road over 100 metres from the junction.

Whilst I cannot gainsay the results of the safety audit (which has not been made public), the examples given above clearly demonstrate that there are a number of other locations where the potential hazards to road users are currently significantly higher than those that would exist on Queen Street with the provision of residents' parking. I also submit that, in enacting this TRO, the residents of Queen Street will be treated less favourably than other residents living on the A1036.

A house with no convenient parking and severely restricted access for deliveries is not an attractive prospect for a permanent home especially, as mentioned before, for those with children or with restricted mobility. It is therefore highly likely that Queen Street will change from a small but vibrant community of long-term residents into a strip of short-term holiday lettings, thus further reducing the stock of affordable housing in central York.

As a resident of Queen Street, I will receive no benefits from the York Station redevelopment. My home will effectively be moved from a quiet side street to a multi-lane main road with no vehicular access. This will

occur after many years of uncertainty and planning blight and will culminate in a lengthy period of disruption when building work eventually takes place.

We are the only group of people whose homes, whose health, well-being, and livelihoods are directly affected by this development. However, as the planning process has progressed it has become increasingly apparent that residents are very much on the bottom rung of the stakeholder ladder: the Railway Institute and LNER have retained their parking; the York Cycle Campaign have got their dedicated cycle way free from inconvenient parked cars; access is uninterrupted to the Premier Inn; the bus stop and taxi bays are retained – the residents get nothing.

For the reasons stated above, it is strongly requested that:

- ① The TRO proposals are withdrawn
- ① The residents' parking spaces as shown in Attachment 1 are reinstated

I urge you, as Director of Place, to withdraw this highly damaging TRO and work constructively with residents to accommodate our needs. I am sure that with pragmatism, common sense and goodwill we can create a new Queen Street that truly works for all.

Attachments:

1. Screenshot showing proposed layout of residents' parking
2. Minutes of the Queen Street Residents' Update Meeting 29 March 2023
3. Photo - Permit Area R27 -Barbican Road
4. Photo – Queen Street bus stop and taxi bays

ATTACHMENT 1.



City of York Council Presentation

ATTACHMENT 2



Meeting Title	York Railway Station Gateway Queen Street Residents Update Meeting
Date / Time	Wednesday 29 th March 2023, 10.00 am (Finish 11:15 am)
Location	Online Teams Meeting
Attendees	[REDACTED]
Circulation	Attendees and Queen Street Residents
Minutes By	[REDACTED]

Item	Discussion	Action
1.0	Apologies for Absence	
1.1	Some Queen Street residents were unable to attend owing to other commitments.	
2.0	PART 1 - PARKING	
2.1	<p>[REDACTED] presented a brief recap of the events that led up to this meeting. This included a summary of planning process, reviewal of the safety case and a reschedule following [REDACTED] email that requested to speak with the party responsible for upholding the decision regarding parking.</p> <p>[REDACTED] began explaining that the Highway Development Control (HDC) team reviewed the original safety case and identified multiple areas of concern that reinstating the parking would incur which provoked a safety audit to be carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict with road traffic and buses • Movement and station access • Queen Street parking spaces would not be able to be designated as restricted parking. <p>[REDACTED] disagreed with the signage issue, stating that a sign could easily have been installed as there are many other instances in which parking near a major transport structure is restricted by a sign. [REDACTED] explained that this was only applicable on private roads; in Council car parks or designated parking bays on adopted highway, Councils are required to give drivers a 10 minute grace period before a Penalty Charge Notice can be issued.</p>	
2.2	[REDACTED] explained that the initial concept did not indicate any conflict with cyclists and questioned why it was deemed a non-issue then. [REDACTED] answered that it was the kerbside	

movement was flagged as a concern [redacted] & [redacted] refused to accept this citing not every route can expect cycle lanes to be segregated and that everyone could have been accommodated.

[redacted] explained that when the scheme was conceived the designer provided a design ensuring equal quantum and equal parking to be distributed across the scheme to all stakeholders. This conceptual design went through many variations & adaptations following feedback and challenges from the planning & safety teams. [redacted] continued to explain that even if the location of the cycle lane had not been raised as an issue, there is still no guarantee the parking would have remained as there still were concerns raised over visibility issues. [redacted] & [redacted] responded saying it is unfair to publicly share outdated designs and they feel as if they have been pushed to one side. [redacted] reassured all that the project team is continuing to search for alternative options.

3.0 **PART 2 – NEW TRO**

3.1 [redacted] explained the proposition and process of a new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and that Queen Street will be subject to the same restrictions as the rest of the Inner Ring Road, i.e. loading ban in place between 8 and 9.15am and 4 and 6pm (no parking or loading activities allowed), double yellow lines for the rest of the time (allowing for loading activities and Blue Badge parking for up to 3 hours where it is not causing an obstruction) & temporary waivers can be issued by CYC in some circumstances to accommodate maintenance vehicles.

[redacted] highlighted the issue of reduced/lack of access to the property will not be solved by a waiver as well as being surprised to learn that Queen Street is due to be part of the IRR claiming first, they've ever heard of this. [redacted] confirms that the IRR has been spoken of before and explains that if the residents have any suggestions to please continue sharing with CYC.

3.2 [redacted] questioned how the proposal of a new TRO would affect Queen Street and asked whether the TRO would lead to see any physical changes to the road. [redacted] confirmed the TRO only changes the legal restrictions of the road and not any new structural changes. The reinstatement of the parking or service bays may be required to go through planning permission once again.

3.3 [redacted] raised question of the consideration for Blue Badge Holder spaces (BBH). EH highlighted that a BBH resident had decided to move away due to concerns of lack of parking. [redacted] explains that the new proposed IRR TRO will allow for BBHs to park for upwards of 3 hours on double yellow lines outside the loading ban hours, as they can elsewhere on the route.

ACTION: [redacted] to speak with designers regarding any considerations made for Blue Badge Holders

[redacted] agreed to follow-up with this point and will raise the BBH issue to the designers to gain their feedback.

3.4 [redacted] asked whether the TRO will address the back-access to the properties and whether CYC has considered trying to purchase any parking spaces from the Hotel behind the premises (Premier Inn). [redacted] confirmed that the hotel was approached back in 2020 and refused to sell any parking spaces citing:

ACTION: [redacted] to investigate whether Premier Inn's stance on parking has changed.

"The need to maintain a free route of access, coupled with increased and unregulated traffic flow across the car park would also create significant operational and safety concerns for the hotel."

[redacted] agreed he would investigate the hotel option again following requests from Queen Street residents.

3.5 [redacted] asked [redacted] to explain the TRO date and whether the residents will have an opportunity to raise any points / objections. [redacted] explained the new TRO is a statutory

consultation process that lasts 3-6 weeks in which any member of the public can raise objections or write in support of the proposals, all objections have to be considered and the feedback will all go into a report, which will be presented to the new Executive Member for Transport after the elections, for approval.

questioned why TRO is being raised when there has been no viable parking solution offered. highlighted that Toft Green's zone is the solution that has been offered with discussions continuing to resolve the problem. continued that the TRO is only posing the changes that were agreed at the planning permission stage in which the road layout was shown and approved by the planning committee.

4.0 Update on Conditional Survey & contact

4.1 stated that there is no benefit of these changes to Queen Street residents and that it is only a detriment to the area and will devalue the properties. explained that to help mitigate this worry, the Council have gone out to tender with three land surveyor companies and have successfully paid and arranged for conditional surveys to be carried out on all the properties on Queen Street. This is in the interest of both CYC & residents to protect everyone's assets; has been provided with resident's contact details and will be in touch week commencing 3rd April. to circulate all correspondence referring to the conditional survey works.

ACTION: to circulate correspondence for Conditional Survey works

continued by reminding attendees that within the scheme, anyone is entitled to claim compensation if agreed upon as part of the Part 1 claims process. asked whether double glazing for windows to reduce noise impact would come under the Part 1 claims remit, unsure but suggested that CYC could investigate this.

5.0 Open discussion on any further changes/resident's concern

5.1 asked for any information on the electric gates and the process surrounding this. confirmed the railings and electric gates will be provided by the contractor who will offer a provisional sum & solution. Once contractor has been announced they will appoint a communications officer to open up the dialogue and understand further details.

ACTION: to send landscaping & streetlight drawings/designs

requests to see landscaping & streetlight drawings. will send follow-up information.

6.0 AOB

6.1 reiterates the profile of the issue of Queen Street parking is as high and has been raised with CYC directors.

7.0 Date of Next Meeting

7.1 Next meeting TBC



ATTACHMENT 3

ATTACHMENT 4.



Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the removal of the residents parking from Queen Street.

The removal devalues the houses and adds costs to every future activity at Queen street. The Taxi rank and is keeping its parking a few metres away, there is no sense to remove what is already there. There is nothing to gain, the original plans stated residents parking with a cycle lane, this is the best solution.

The City of York Council are not working for the residents, we should not have to fight every step of the way to keep something we bought with our houses. Parking is vital to the residents of Queen Street to maintain our family working lives. The council are making it impossible to live here, all the houses will end up air B&B's, the families are being pushed out. There is underhand work at play to achieve whatever they want.

No sensible alternative to the parking problem has been found. The residents are jumping through every hoop set and still to no avail.

I hope the whole process in investigated fully, as we cannot afford legal representation and losing as the result. We should not have to lose out and not be compensated. We just want what was originally promised of the residents parking and a waiting area to remain.

Thank you

Objection to The York Parking, Stopping and Waiting (amendment) (no 14/58) Traffic Order

As residents of Queen Street and stakeholders in the York Station Gateway Project we strongly object to the above Traffic Regulation Order.

The TRO seeks to remove 8 residents parking bays from Queen Street and replace them with double yellow lines - ' No Waiting at anytime' notices and ' No Loading 7.00am - 10.00am and 4.00pm - 7.00pm' notices.

We object to removing resident's parking and introducing a 'No Waiting at Anytime' notice as the implication for us, family and neighbours will be detrimental to the Queen St community causing blight to our lives, properties and neighbourhood.

The TRO does not give detail within the statement of reasons but rather states generically that the TRO is requested to improve safety and avoid indiscriminate or obstructive parking occurring. The TRO states that safety is a factor in proposing to remove residents parking however this cannot be the case given:

a. The new road layout will make joining the main highway from a residents parking bay much easier and far safer than it is now.

b. Cyclists will have a segregated cycle lane (as requested by York Cycle Campaign) to protect cyclists from traffic wandering into the dedicated cycle lane therefore the new cycle lanes will be safer than the existing ones.

c. Fleetways taxi office, taxi rank and a bus drop off point are located near the junction with Blossom Street at a much narrower point of Queen Street. Traffic turning left onto Queen St. from Blossom Street have no visibility when turning this corner. Road user safety is clearly more compromised here than further down Queen Street where residents parking would be located as the road widens and visibility of the full road layout is clear.

As no changes are proposed for parking on this section of the road presumably because it is deemed to be safe then there is no argument on safety grounds further along the same stretch of road with more room and clearer visibility.

The notion that residents' parking is being removed to avoid indiscriminate or obstructive parking isn't substantiated. This has never been an issue on Queen Street (we have been residents for over 30 years) and there is no evidence to suggest it could become an issue. On the contrary, given that rail users will be better catered for at the station with a new drop off point there is even less likelihood that they will use Queen Street for parking not more. Note also that refuse and re-cycling collections have never failed due to not being able to park because of indiscriminate or obstructively parked vehicles.

Given that the existing highway includes two rows of residents parking bays and the fact that the newly created space is wider than what already exists - what exactly is the issue with moving residents parking to one side of the road? If safety isn't the issue and space isn't the issue then the issue seems to be a lack of will to design a scheme where residents parking works.

When the York Station Gateway Project was first brought to our attention most of the residents were on board with losing the bridge and the front of the station being visually improved. Over time the full impact of the proposed scheme has unfolded and it has become apparent that the needs of the residents of Queen Street who we are told are stakeholders are repeatedly being ignored and even the most vulnerable amongst us have just been

ridden roughshod over whilst other stakeholders insist that their perfect scenario is met.

I would like members of the committee to imagine their lives in which they cannot continue to live in their homes if they have a mobility disability or if they might require support from family or carers either now or possibly in the future.

Would you consider the decision to remove parking unfair, unreasonable and uncaring - I do and I think most York residents would think so too.

How might you look after your property without parking as you will not be able to engage a trades person if they can't park near enough to your property to access their equipment and materials. You certainly won't be able to ever put in a new kitchen, bathroom, do work on your roof or have your boiler maintained.

You won't be able to have your windows cleaned as window cleaners use equipment powered from their vans as do carpet cleaners.

How will your refuse and re-cycling be collected?

Sadly the implications of this project were too much for one registered disabled resident with restricted mobility (No 13) who moved early in the process when no one at CYC would guarantee that she could park her vehicle close enough to her property for her to access her home.

This house has now been turned into 3 holiday lets by the new owners.

A second resident has now set in motion plans to move as they recognise that they will need support from family, friends and possibly carers - without parking in place engaging this help will be impossible and consequently they too cannot continue living on Queen Street.

Is this really an acceptable outcome of this project? Are Queen St residents just collateral damage as long as the other stakeholders get what they want ?

This does not need to be the case - the removal of Queen Street bridge results in a wider carriageway and enough space to accommodate all road users safely.

What is required is for all stakeholders to be reasonable and to accept that the needs of residents must be met as well as their own needs.

I am quite certain that other York residents will find the Queen St residents predicament appalling - given the number of residents who rely on the York Residents Parking scheme.

As we all recognise the need to be more environmentally active CYC will need to develop road schemes which meet the needs of all road users - it will never be acceptable to say we're developing an area and we're designing out car use for the residents of that area because it will be a lot nicer for cyclists if residents just can't park there.

This will only serve as a red flag for future road layouts where residents will protect their ability to use cars at any cost. CYC will make progress more quickly if it collaborates with residents on schemes which work efficiently for all and where the benefits to all are clear. Decisions should be made on fact and not opinions. We attended a meeting with CYC and YCC representatives who made the claim that approx. 60 cyclists per hour used Queen Street and would therefore benefit from a segregated cycle lane. This was grossly exaggerated and obviously fabricated.

We have attended numerous meetings from 2019 onwards and expressed our concerns time and time again but time and time again those concerns have been pushed aside to allow for other stakeholders to have their ideal scenario.

The addition of extra residents parking spaces on Toft Green is not suitable or adequate alternative parking provision for Queen St residents. Some residents simply cannot walk this far and a trades person could not and would not carry materials from this distance even if

there was a parking space available. It really isn't feasible to ask a plumber, plasterer, kitchen fitter, boiler fitter etc to unload after 10.00am and re load before 4pm or after 7.00pm - this just would not work in the normal world therefore Toft Green does not meet the needs of Queen St residents.

Queen St is a small long standing supportive community of residents, over 50% of whom have resided here for over 30 years.

We have been champions of city living who walk or cycle whenever it's possible but we all need to use our cars at times and we all need full and easy access to our properties for maintenance, emergency repairs or re - furnishment by trades people as and when we need them. This is a fundamental requirement wherever you live.

There is very restricted vehicular access to the rear of some of the properties on Queen St and for several properties there is no vehicular access at all - therefore parking at the front is essential for day to day living.

With reference to CYC's document ' My City Centre Vision '
The following quote is in the Core Vision Statement

'First and foremost our city centre exists to serve the needs of the residents'

And this quote is in Section 6A

'Create a city centre where residents can live in successful and confident communities'

This is what Queen Street already is - a successful community. The implementation of this TRO will only further damage our community resulting in more residents moving out.

The initial plans included residents parking, cycle lanes and carriageway and I urge you to re-think the proposed road layout to re-instate residents parking and to consider the needs of the Queen St residents on a par with other stakeholders and not as a lesser priority.

Given that other residents living on the inner ring road have parking outside their homes and some on much busier roads than Queen Street it does seem as if the residents of Queen Street are being penalised.

It should be noted that residents have lived on Queen Street for over 180 years since before the current station was built. Please don't let it be the legacy of this local authority to destroy this neighbourhood when with the right will and determination a solution which serves us all can be found.

Yours Sincerely