
**Decision Session –
Executive Member for Transport**

11 August 2020

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy and Place Directorate

South Bank Residents' Wider Consultation Update

Summary

1. To report the results of consultation in the South Bank area on Residents' Parking coverage. This follows on from the Executive Decision Session in November 2019 regarding the best form of consultation to allow extensions to be considered.

Recommendations

2. Having considered the information provided in this report the Executive Member is asked to agree:
 - (i) To the principle that all future zones and extensions in the South Bank area be designated R58C.
 - (ii) To the principle that the qualification area for properties in ResPark may be set wider than just the frontagers to the controlled streets.
 - (iii) To further consultation being undertaken to amend Zone boundaries of R6, R36, R54, R57 and R58 with a view to providing a more equal scheme for all residents.
 - (iv) To further consultation, in the sections of streets identified in Annex E, being undertaken to identify what parking measures should be applied at this time.
 - (v) To further consultation, in the streets identified in Annex F, being undertaken to propose and discuss implementation of selected movement controls to better manage traffic flow in these streets.

Reason: To respond to the views and suggestions coming out of the comments received from residents in the South Bank area and to better inform the layout and type of further ResPark controls in streets in the future.

Background

3. This report takes forward the Executive Decision from the session in November 2019 regarding the best form of consultation to allow extensions to Residents' Parking coverage to be considered.
4. That consideration was informed by the findings of a Task Group that reported to Committee in November 2018. The Task Group suggested a review of 'the current pattern of ResPark zones with a view to rationalising them and identifying the most logical extensions into surrounding streets that suffer from non-resident parking'.
5. The choice of South Bank for this wider area consultation enabled us to also take forward a number of petitions for further ResPark controls in streets in the area, which the Executive Member had considered during 2019.
6. This is with a background that implementing new schemes and extension to zones has, in the past, caused displacement of commuter parking activity. This has been the trend over a number of years. The current extent of Zones is shown in Annex A.
7. We carried out a consultation with residents, in over 1,500 homes, in the South Bank area (not currently covered by the ResPark zones). The consultation was done as a letter drop in January 2020 (see Annex B). This explained that we were considering a Residents' Parking Scheme, as an extension to the exist zone, in the streets that were the subject of the petitions. The letter asked residents of the wider area 'should ResPark be introduced in those nearby streets near you now?' at the same time as the zone extensions (see Annex C).
8. Ward Members supported the consultation exercise by organising drop-in sessions prior to the close of the consultation on 17th February.
9. People had the option of replying in paper on the pro-forma we provided or to email their comments.

10. We received over 320 responses. This is a level of response of over 21%. The majority view (62% of all respondents) was that further coverage is likely to be needed in the middle to longer term.
11. There was clear support for introducing ResPark measures in the petitioned street. These streets are the remainder of Bishopthorpe Road between Southlands Road and Terry's Mews; Rectory Gardens (by Area signage); Balmoral Terrace between Bishopthorpe Road and Montague Street and Albemarle Road between numbers 15 and 71 (odd) Albemarle Road (by Area signage). The decision on whether to introduce Residents Parking in the petitioned streets is covered in a separate Report to the August 2020 Executive Member Decision Session.
12. Although there was no clear mandate for introducing Residents' Parking measures in streets other than the petitioned streets, the comments did flag up several issues which need considering.
13. See Annex D for snap-shot of comments, street-by-street. The Streets are sorted by Post Code; the area is YO23 1++; streets are referenced by the two last letters. As can be seen, some pairs of comments are contradictory.

Results

14. There are several key groups of comments that come out of the responses.
15. The degree of the problem perceived by residents very much depends upon the time of day that return to the street is required. The local level of 'commuter' parking activity also depends on the availability of space when the commuter turns up (typically morning 7:30 to 9:30).
16. Residents do accept that majority of parking demand is cars that belong to local residents. This underlying aspect is, however, made worst by cars from out of the area.
17. In a number of cases, an additional level of problem is caused by those that live fairly nearby parking for long periods in an uncontrolled street to avoid the need to pay for a permit in streets closer to home.
18. Some areas experience more activity from parking which they identify as a particular 'type'. These include activity associated with

local schools, community facilities, GP's and recreation areas (Knavesmire, Roundtree's Park and Riverside).

19. 'Commuter' parking can be fairly local (for access to shops and services) or involves walking some distance even a Park and Cycle 'mixed mode' commute.
20. The former Terry's Factory lies to the south of this area. Activity here include workers parking as well as residents and visitors parking vehicles; presumably due to there being more demand than provision on site.
21. Many residents consider that the introduction of further restrictions will generate further 'displacement' parking.
22. Some question if Permit Parking is the right 'tool' to address parking; that the root cause of the need for commuters to park should be addressed at 'source'.
23. Other question City of York Council's motives in promoting ResPark and the income that these parking controls generate.
24. Some residents draw attention to specific aspects such as parking close to junctions, access points or on bends that should be addressed by waiting restrictions.
25. Others consider the potential conflicts that occur along these terraced streets should be addressed by the introduction of entry controls and/or one way systems.
26. In more detail, the response from a large proportion of residents in some streets indicated support for the introduction of ResPark now. These include the remainder of Bishopthorpe Road, Rectory Gardens, Balmoral Terrace (Part) and Albemarle Road (between 15 and 71 odd). Proposals for these streets are the subject of a separate report.
27. There was a low response rate from those in Philadelphia Terrace although five out of nine respondents were in favour. This level of response does not provide a clear indication of support at this time.
28. There was a low response rate from those in Ovington Road, Adelaide Street, Windsor Street and Argyle Street although fifty percent or more of respondents from each street were in favour. This level of response does not provide a clear indication of general support at this time.

29. There was a 25% response from properties in South Bank Avenue. We received 10 responses to this consultation; out of which seven households indicated support for the introduction of a ResPark scheme. Although this is 70% of the returns it only represents 18% of all households voting positively.
30. There was a 29% response from properties in Knavesmire Crescent (66 addresses - three Post Code Areas). We received 19 responses to this consultation; out of which 15 household indicated support for the introduction of a ResPark scheme. Although this is 79% of the returns it only represents 23% of all households voting positively. The response does not provide a clear indication of support for ResPark at this time. Problems here include leisure and event activities on the Knavesmire, activities associated with the former Terry's site, commuter and displacement parking.
31. Several residents of the southern part of Curzon Terrace expressed similar views to those in Knavesmire Crescent.
32. Residents in Lorne Street and the southern part of Trafalgar Street expressed similar views. Problems include activities associated with the former Terry's site, commuter and displacement parking and activities associated with the nearby school.
33. Residents in the more central areas of this part of South Bank did not experience such a problem that they considered the introduction of ResPark was required.
34. A number of residents across this area suggested that one way working might ease traffic flow problems in some of the terraces.

Discussion

35. There has been a consistent level of comment over the years, as evidenced in the response summarised in Annex D, which those residents living close to the boundaries of Zones experience inconvenience and frustration when the level of supply to demand varies across the zone boundaries. Clearly, there are 'winners' and 'losers' in this respect although this can, actually, vary across the year, the season or even the day. This can be particularly acute when parking must be controlled for road works, traffic or event management.
36. We are therefore recommending the potential for indicating a wider zone area so that any streets that came forward in the future would join that zone rather than having to create, extend or amend

another zone. It is recommended that all new ResPark schemes for this area be included in Zone R58C, even if there are, initial gaps between these schemes.

37. R58C has been chosen as it currently lies to the east and adjacent to the consultation area. The zone has, relatively recently, been extended south and the existing residents generally accepted the benefits of being in a larger zone.
38. In parallel with this there is potential to set the qualification area for obtaining permits wider than just the frontagers of the streets to be subject to controls. The aim here would be to afford more flexibility of options for residents close to the newly created zone extensions.
39. There is also the opportunity to re-examine the boundaries of the zones just north of the consultation area to see if this principle can be applied there.
40. As stated above, a ResPark scheme, as an extension to Zone R58C is being proposed for certain streets within the consultation area. It can be seen from the Summary of Responses in Annex D that there is a measure of support for parking controls to address commuter parking and other identified issues. The Plan in Annex E shows, very generally, the areas where support is more apparent (edged and shaded green).
41. One-way working can improve flow. It can also facilitate more parking provision as head-on conflicts are reduced.
42. Key potential issues with one way working are that vehicle speeds along the street do increase and that journey time and distance do increase for residents to access some properties on the street.
43. If it is considered that there should be further consultation on this, a simple scheme of entry controls is set out in Annex F. This is aimed at reducing conflict and improving flow without the requirement for more draconian one-way measures.

Council Plan

44. Considering this matter contributes to the Council Plan; building strong communities by engaging with all members of the local community.

Implications

45. The following are the identified implications.

- **Financial** – The Report makes recommendations only so does not, in itself raise financial implication.
- **Human Resources** – Again, although not requiring resources, any future work will require staff input. The management and monitoring will be a Traffic Management function.
- **Equalities** – A communications plan is being developed for the wider Residents' Parking Service to help those that either don't have access to the internet or the skills to use it to access the parking system as they do with other similar ICT access requirements.
- **Legal** – Some of the recommendations, if taken forward, will require, in future, changes in the parking Traffic Regulation Orders.
- **Crime and Disorder** - None
- **Information Technology (IT)** – There is an existing ICT in place.
- **Property** - None
- **Risk Management** – The proposed extension to the existing Residents' parking provision will be something that most residents/customers will welcome but may disadvantage some people, who may object to the proposal. These objections will be reviewed in the usual way with further Reporting if necessary.

Contact Details:

Author:

Ken Hay
Traffic Projects Officer
Transport
Tel No. 01904 552474
ken.hay@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Assistant Director of Transport, Highways
and Environment

Report **Date** 31/07/2020
Approved

Wards Affected: Micklegate

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

- Annex A Existing ResPark Zones Plan
- Annex B Consultation Letter 6th January 2020
- Annex C Consultation Area Plan
- Annex D Summary of Consultation Responses Received
- Annex E Streets for Additional Consultation
- Annex F Traffic Flow Controls (Proposal for discussion)