

**Decision Session –  
Cabinet Member for City Strategy**

26<sup>th</sup> July 2011

Report of the Director of City Strategy

**University Related Parking in Nearby Residential Areas**

**Summary**

1. The purpose of this report is to agree a strategy for dealing with the increased parking issues that are arising in the residential areas in the vicinity of the University of York as its planned programme of expansion is developed.

**Recommendations**

2. In order to develop a robust parking strategy aimed at alleviating the growing parking issues affecting those living in the residential areas close to the University, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member approves the following:
  - The adoption of the strategy outlined in paragraph 38 when reviewing or considering new emerging parking issues.
  - The introduction of an experimental Traffic Regulation Order as detailed in paragraph 39.
  - The introduction of a clearway order along Field Lane.
  - Continue close liaison with the University representatives.

**Reason:**

To reduce non-residential parking in the area, to ensure parking doesn't transfer to the main road network and to provide a more rapid response to issues that escalate quickly due to the University development.

**Background**

**The Heslington East Campus**

3. The University's Heslington East Campus, which is adjacent to the Badger Hill estate, was subject to a public enquiry. Concerns regarding parking were raised as an issue and the Planning inspectors report (paragraph 719 highlighted in Annex B) states, with regards to the possibility of the implementation of a residents

parking scheme, *“that the costs of that scheme would be met by the University and that local residents would not be charged for permits”*. The conclusions of inspectors report were used to inform the conditions attached to the Planning consent and the Section 106 agreement.

4. The Heslington East Campus Outline Consent Planning Conditions (see Annex C, condition 10 and Section 106 agreement) state what surveys will be carried out and the consequences of what is to be done if University related parking increases by more than 20% in the vicinity of the University Development. This is for a period of 15 years from the first occupation of the Development, which takes the end date of the University’s commitment to October 2024.
5. The whole Heslington East Campus was envisaged to be developed over a 15 - 20 year timescale, however a robust assessment of what further elements and when they might be implemented beyond those listed below is not available.
6. The University's capital programme for the next four years within the Heslington East campus includes the following elements:
  - Social and Catering building granted approval last autumn and due for occupation in October 2011
  - Sports Village with 207 space car park for public and student/staff use, due to be opened December 2012.
  - A combined heat and power plant serving the campus, due for use in 2012.
  - Langwith College providing 650 beds, due for occupation in 2012.
  - 150 space car park for staff, available from October 2011, and accessed from Grimston Bar Park and Ride entry
  - Internal road network, including cycle and pedestrian routes to support these developments.

### **Responsibilities**

7. The University are responsible for:
  - Carrying out and analysing parking surveys,
  - the cost of traffic management measures necessary to tackle parking and if permits are required they would be at no cost to the local residents,
  - The cost of providing enforcement presence in the area (a figure of 20% of a fte Civil Enforcement Officer has been suggested as appropriate),

8. The City of York Council are responsible for:
  - Introducing schemes to control parking
  - returning the income from enforcement action (less a reasonable administration fee) to the developer
  - taking on all responsibilities after 15 years following first occupation

### **Existing Situation**

#### **Badger Hill Estate**

9. The area referred to as the Badger Hill area in this report includes the properties bounded by Hull Road and Field Lane and Archbishop Holgate's school. The bulk of the area is in the Hull Road Ward and Central York Parliamentary area, but two of the roads are in the Heslington Ward and Outer York Parliamentary area. As always, issues that are in, or very close to, two or more wards are tackled as a single issue.
10. The Badger Hill area is a modern housing estate, properties have off street parking spaces, and hence there are lots of private accesses along every street. There is a parade of shops with unregulated on street parking facilities in front, a primary school and a secondary school are also in the area. On street residential parking demand is low in comparison to traditional terraced streets and the roads are narrow (4.7m) so only single sided parking is possible. The number of accesses off the highway to residential properties further limits this.
11. Complaints about excessive parking and obstruction to property entrances on the Field Lane slip road and in Low Mill Close began to be received and as it became apparent this wasn't down to isolated instances but rather a change to the ongoing parking situation remedial actions were put forward.

#### **Actions Taken so far**

12. The first batch of parking surveys carried out as a consequence of the University development highlighted that the trigger point for the University to fund remedial works had been hit for University Road and part of the Badger Hill Estate (Annex D shows the parking survey zones). Widespread restrictions along University Road were relatively uncontroversial and unlikely to adversely affect local residents (in terms of yellow lines preventing parking outside their home); hence they have been implemented following the usual traffic regulation order process. Some yellow lines have also been put in place at some junctions within the Badger Hill estate and another short section is in the process of being taken forward to

improve forward visibility. It should also be noted that some white bar markings (which have no legal backing) have been put in place to discourage parking that obstructs driveways.

13. Following the analysis of the parking surveys the University's traffic consultants put forward a draft suggestion for a residents parking scheme covering much of zone 9. This outline proposal was a very broad brush solution put forward without taking into account the road width / environment, ongoing cost implications, etc. and did not explore other restriction options.
14. Observations carried out suggest (and seem to be confirmed by the complaints received) the bulk of the University related parking is in the two streets closest to the University. Any large scale action taken on these two streets in isolation would likely merely result in the parking relocating to the next nearest street. A petition has also been received from the residents of Low Mill Close (see Annex E) requesting the introduction of a residents parking scheme.
15. Observations have been carried out to determine to what extent parking on Field Lane itself is taking place or what the likely impact large scale parking along this key route would have. Whilst there is currently no parking taking place, given the very adverse impact such a transfer of parking would have on the main road network in the area is it considered essential to implement restrictions to prevent this from taking place.

### **Discussion**

16. It is clear from paragraph 719 of the Inspector's report that car parking within the vicinity of the campus was a problem that he recognised. As the paragraph makes clear, the need for residents only parking, if required, was accepted by the University who undertook to meet the costs. It was also confirmed that no costs were to fall on local residents.
17. Condition 10 of the consent is tied to the obligations in the 106 Agreement. In the Condition, the University was required to carry out an initial survey before the commencement of development and then every year after that. The review of each annual survey have to be submitted to the Council and remedial measures are to be introduced if the results show an increase of more than 20% over what was identified in the first annual survey.
18. The Section 106 obligation is that if the survey confirms that the increase arises from University use, the University is require to pay the cost of introducing parking and waiting restrictions in each of those areas affected. The University are also required to fund the payment of some individual to enforce the controls introduced and

they in turn are due the proceeds of enforcement action after an allowance for costs.

19. It is important to bear in mind that the choice of restrictions put forward to tackle any parking problems is not limited to some form of residents parking. Hence options are put forward to try to resolve the bulk of the parking issues that will be cost effective in terms of implementation, ongoing maintenance, administration and enforcement operations. It should also be noted that regardless of where parking issues originate the Highway Authority is not able to implement restrictions that would return an area to how it used to be. All that can reasonably be achieved for residents and other highway users is that the road is not unduly obstructed and can be negotiated safely by drivers taking reasonable care.

### **Residents Parking Schemes in York**

20. Because a Residents Parking scheme has been raised as a possibility at various times in relation to the University development it is important to have an appreciation of how these schemes began and operate in the wider York area.
21. Residents parking schemes began in York in the traditional terraced property streets close to the central area with the aim of providing residents with greater priority to park by allowing unlimited duration of stay in parking bays whereas non-residents were limited to a maximum stay of 10 or 60 minutes. Because this is a service provided to residents at their request (established by consultation to be the majority of residents in an area) and is not available to all residents in the city, the existing schemes are self-financing so that costs do not fall on the general council taxpayer. The cost of permits covers the issue and administration of the permit, plus the regular patrols throughout the week and year by the council's Civil Enforcement Officers. None of the residents parking schemes in York are free of charge to residents or paid for by other organisations.
22. There are currently 2 types of residents parking scheme in York:
  - The standard type where residents are able to get up to 4 household permits (at an escalating cost for each successive permit) and 200 visitor permits per year,
  - The special conditions type where residents are only allowed 1 household permit and no visitor permits. This type of zone is where there is virtually no off street parking and the number of parking spaces available on street in the area is very low in comparison to the number of properties.

23. The design of bays and waiting restrictions for different road widths and junctions has been worked out with the emergency services to ensure the fire service are able to attend properties unhindered by vehicles parked in officially marked out bays.
24. In recent years there have been changes in traffic signing regulations that allow for a different style of residents only parking scheme than is currently in use in York (at present special approval to use this type is still required). The change allows the use of an entry sign only without the need for bay markings, but only in a cul-de-sac and not roads open to use by through traffic, hence its widespread use in an area is not an option. This new style of residents parking scheme also imposes other limitations such as not allowing non-permit holders the ability to park for short periods of time. Whilst the cost implications for introducing such a scheme would be reduced the ongoing costs for administration and enforcement would remain.

### **Consultation**

25. Based on previous correspondence, opinions expressed at Ward meetings and from ad-hoc observations made, the bulk of the concerns raised indicated that the problems stem from the all day or longer term parking in the area by students and university staff. There are a number of routes that could be taken to try to resolve these issues, some being quite a low level of regulation and others being more strictly regulated. Three broad initial proposals were developed that could be considered to tackle the parking:
  - Double yellow lines at junctions and single yellow lines elsewhere for a period of time during the middle of the day.
  - A controlled parking zone – very similar to the above but potentially has a reduced need for signing along the individual streets and should be simpler and more cost effective to amend times or expand the zone.
  - A residents only parking scheme of some description.
26. Because some of the parking is student related and students don't necessarily attend lectures all day, the time and duration of daytime only restrictions is more open to question than areas close to the city centre, for example, where parking for shoppers could reasonably be expected to take place at all times throughout the day.
27. Informal consultation has been carried out with Badger Hill residents (that is: long term residents, students living in the area and local community groups) by way of a questionnaire (see annex D) outlining a number of options for consideration. It should be borne in

mind that this consultation needs to be viewed as a “straw pole” to determine the level of concerns rather than a firm vote for one or other option. Concerns over the validity of the consultation results have been raised due to there being no mention of who would fund the cost of any permits for residents. The inclusion of information on funding of permits in the consultation was considered, however cost is only one of the issues that needs to be considered by residents (other issues for consideration being: number of permits available, position of parking bays, duration of non-permit parking, how building works / carers / HMO’s / landlords / Businesses are accommodated) and including partial information was considered liable to possibly influence a residents decision more than if just the broadest of questions was put forward. It is fully accepted that some residents may have responded differently if information and questions had been worded differently, but this doesn’t invalidate the consultation returns because as mentioned above this doesn’t tie either residents or the council to one course of action it merely indicates the level of feeling locally and should act as a guide to officers and members as to what might be an acceptable way forward taking into account the balance between tackling external parking, minimising inconveniencing to local residents and keeping long term ongoing costs to the authority under control.

28. The views of residents in response to the questionnaire are shown in Annex E. The headline results of the initial consultation indicate that:
- the majority of residents prefer the option of a controlled parking zone
  - the preferred time band for restrictions is 10am to 2pm, but there is also a reasonably strong demand for a longer period of restriction (see Annex E)
  - there is also a reasonable degree of support for residents parking.
29. The level of support for the options put forward varies throughout the estate depending on the streets location. It has been suggested that some responses will have been put forward with a view to not risking the parking problems relocating closer to their property or street. It’s reasonable to suppose this view has some justification and emphasises the need to have a strategy for tackling the estate as a whole rather than merely selecting individual streets.

### **Options and Analysis**

30. It is important to bear in mind that whilst the area would benefit from being considered as a whole, the restrictions do not need to be uniform across the estate and there is scope to use a “pick and mix”

approach to the options available to try to achieve the best outcome for residents. Once a suitable set of restrictions has been established these could then be rolled out through the estate if parking problems are identified. It should also be stressed that where reference is made below to the use of officers delegated powers this would be to allow proposals to be put out to residents. If as a consequence of the proposals there were objections raised these would have to go through the normal process of being formally considered before any action was taken. The purpose of the delegated powers would be to speed up the process for taking action to resolve residents concerns, hence the importance of developing a strategy for the area.

#### Types of Traffic Regulation Order

31. Permanent Traffic Regulation Order - To take forward a permanent TRO proposal the formal consultation required involves advertising the proposals in a local paper giving a 3 week period that allows groups or individuals an opportunity to make representation. Any objections received during the 3 week period have to be considered and either dismissed or upheld. If the objection is upheld a lesser restriction than the one advertised may be implemented without further consultation. If, however, a revised set of restrictions are put forward as a result of objections that would result in a greater restriction than advertised previously, the proposals would have to be re-advertised and the whole process would start again.
32. Experimental Traffic Regulation Order - An experimental TRO allows restrictions to be put in place for up to 18 months without having to carry out formal consultation in advance. During the first 6 months of the experiment objections can be made. Alterations to the experiment if considered desirable can be made relatively quickly. Before the 18 month experimental period expires a decision has to be formally made after considering all the objections made as to whether to make the experiment permanent or to bring it to an end.
33. **Option 1** - Parking restrictions. These can either be:
  - A. approved individually if problems occur in the estate, or
  - B. if problems are identified officers could use delegated authority to propose restrictions in line with those used elsewhere in the estate. For example, No waiting at any time up to 20m from a junction and daytime restrictions elsewhere.

Option 1B is favoured due to the ability to respond more rapidly to changing conditions whilst maintaining elected member input if objections are raised.

34. **Option 2** - The day time parking restriction (a single yellow line) options are:

A. 8am to 6pm

B. 10am to 2pm – This is the preferred option to begin with because it ties in well with residents views.

C. 10am to 4pm

These single yellow lines could operate:

D. 7 days per week

E. Monday to Friday - This is the preferred option to begin with because it reduces the impact on residents, but it can be extended if desirable.

F. All year -.

G. September to June

All the sub-options above could be implemented as part of a Restricted Parking Zone. Options 2 B and G are favoured because they tackle both term time parking and staff parking outside of term time whilst minimising the adverse impact on residents. The options also tie in well with the residents preferred options as set out in the questionnaire, however the hours could be extended if desirable at a later date.

35. **Option 3** - Parking near the shops:

A. Restrictions could be considered that would allow parking for up to 3 hours. This time limit is thought appropriate because there are currently 3 hairdressers in the area whose appointments may be adversely affected if the time limit were shorter.

B. Take no action at present but if problems should occur regularly the action as outlined above could be taken forward.

Because the University parking problems have not been identified at the shops Option 3B is the preferred option.

36. **Option 4** - Residents parking:

A. A standard residents parking scheme as used generally elsewhere in the city. This has high implementation and ongoing cost implications. The ongoing cost implications are a key factor to consider for the authority once the University obligations are ended, and because this would understandably likely result in residents in other parts of the city to expect the same benefits at no cost unlike at present.

B. A special conditions residents parking scheme. Again, this has high implementation and ongoing cost implications.

C. A new “cut down” residents parking scheme as now permitted by the revised regulations (but only in a cul-de-sac). Implementation costs are much lower and depending on what conditions are settled on, ongoing costs should also be much reduced. The option of cutting out some through route movements by implementing road closures could be considered to permit the use in more streets. The issuing of permits and enforcement needed for this cut down residents parking scheme should be covered entirely within the 20% funding by the University of a council Civil Enforcement Officer (see above paragraph 7 above). Hence, the scheme could be provided whilst the University have their obligation under the Planning Approval at no cost to residents or the City Council. Please note: a scheme of greater duration as used elsewhere in the city would have cost implications for local residents. In addition, after the 15 year agreement period a decision will have to be considered to bring this scheme into line with other residents parking schemes in the city.

Conditions put forward for a new style of residents parking zone:

- C1. Issue a maximum of one household permit,
- C2. No visitor permits,
- C3. Restrictions in force for the same period outlined in option 3 above,
- C4. The ultimate extent of a zone is determined by geographical area at the outset. Hence, if parking problems migrate new streets can be added into the zone rather than having to create a new zone or negotiate with the residents to permit the additional streets to become part of their zone.

Although the questionnaires returned by residents indicate that the Restricted Parking Zone is the preferred option there has been a sustained expectation expressed by groups representing residents and at meetings that there will be some form of residents parking scheme put in place (see Annex E). Hence, it is suggested that this be tried in the cul-de-sacs as part of an experiment and if it fails to meet expectations the Restricted Parking Zone option can be reconsidered.

### 37. **Option 5 – Field Lane**

- A. restrict parking using yellow lines. These restrictions are well understood but would be an expensive method of restricting parking and yellow lines are usually kept for use in a more urban environment.

B. restrict parking using a rural clearway restriction. This involves the use of small signs placed at regular intervals.

Option 5B is the cheaper option in both the short and long term.

### **Summary of Recommended Options**

38. Bearing in mind the outcome of the initial consultation carried out the proposed options put forward as a strategy for the Badger Hill area are:

A. Delegate authority to officers to formally propose restrictions in line with those used elsewhere in the estate (Option 1 B)

B. Approve a Restricted Parking Zone using daytime parking restrictions between 10am and 2pm, Monday to Friday, all year round (Options 2 B, E and F).

C. Take no action at present in the vicinity of the shops (Option 3B), but review if long term University related parking becomes a problem.

D. Approve a “new style” residents parking scheme for Cul-de-sacs with the option of implementing road closures where desirable. Conditions to be: one permit per property, no visitor permits, restrictions in force 10am to 2pm Monday to Friday all year round and that the zone be expanded to include other streets in the badger Hill area if necessary (Option 4 C and C1, 2 3 & 4).

E. Approve the use of a rural clearway on Field Lane (Option 5 B).

39. The above strategy of recommended options translates to an initial experimental TRO to implement (see also plan in Annex F):

24 hour waiting restrictions at the Deramore Drive / Yarborough Way junction,

A controlled parking zone to cover Deramore Drive between Field Lane and Yarborough Way,

A road closure at the Badger Wood Walk end of the Field Lane service road to create a cul-de-sac and then implement a “new style” cul-de-sac residents parking zone covering Field Lane service road, Badger Wood Walk and Low Mill Close, and

A permanent TRO to implement a clearway on Field Lane from the A1079 Hull Road roundabout to Heslington village.

### **Corporate Strategy**

40. Considering this matter does not impact on the corporate strategy.

## Implications

41.

<b>Legal</b>	There are no legal implications.
<b>Financial</b>	Implementation costs will be funded by the University. Ongoing maintenance costs will become part of the annual Highway Maintenance burden. Under the Planning Agreement terms, income from parking tickets in this area will have to be forwarded to the University, less a suitable administration fee.
<b>Human Resources</b>	There will be a contribution for funding 20% of an fte Civil Enforcement Officer.
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	There are no Crime and Disorder implications
<b>Sustainability</b>	There are no sustainability implications
<b>Equalities</b>	There are no equalities implications
<b>Property</b>	There are no property implications

## Risk Management

42. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

## Contact

### Details:

#### Author

Alistair Briggs  
Traffic Engineer  
Tel No. (01904) 551368

#### Chief Officer Responsible for the Report

Richard Wood  
Assistant Director City Strategy

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** 11/7/2011

Wards Affected: Hull Road and Heslington

**All**

For further information please contact the author of the report

## Annexes

- Annex A - Plan of area
- Annex B - Condition 10 and Section 106 agreement
- Annex C - The Planning inspectors report (paragraph 719 highlighted)
- Annex D - Copy of questionnaire sent out to local residents
- Annex E – Questionnaire results
  - E1 - Low Mill Close representation
  - E2 - Badger Hill Residents Community Group representation
  - E3 - Précis of Residents comments

## Annex F – Plan of Recommended options

Background Information

Questionnaire returns