

East Parade comments

East Parade

I would like to object to the decision to extend the R30 Residents Priority Parking Area for East Parade only.

The consultation gave the impression that the residents parking would cover a wider area. Was the consultation about residents parking in single streets or over the entire area?

As a resident of East Parade, my reaction to the current plan and that of the neighbours I have spoken to is there is no benefit for residents parking on East Parade only as we can save the cost of the parking permit and park in First or Second Avenue or even Main Avenue which is not far away.

I am happy with the current arrangement of first come first served on East Parade and surrounding roads.

East Parade

Following your letter and enclosures of w/e 23 April, I am writing to object to the proposed extension to the ResPark scheme (R30 East Parade). The grounds for my objection are as follows:

1. Having previously lived in a Residents' Parking zone I have first-hand experience of what it means. It does not 'guarantee' you a parking space, much less one outside your house. It results in your visitors receiving parking fines if you don't remember to give them a visitor's permit. If all the spaces in your zone are taken, and you are forced to park elsewhere, or on a double yellow line, it can result in you receiving a parking fine. The cost of the residents' permits and the visitors' permits is extortionate (what exactly do we get for our money??), and it is a source of stress and tension between local residents. When I moved to East Parade, I was immensely glad to leave it behind, and I doubt that any of those in favour of the scheme will appreciate these points until it is too late.

2. According to your consultation there is virtually nobody who thinks that the issue of people from outside the area parking here in order to walk into town etc. is a problem. So exactly what is the problem that the scheme will solve?

3. I quote from your Annex C: 'A partial implementation will increase pressure for parking on other streets', to which you have concluded 'This outcome would be likely.' Yes - exactly. There is currently more than adequate parking for residents, and we happily share with neighbouring streets. The fact that the residents of First and Second Avenues and Main Avenue were so overwhelmingly resistant to the scheme demonstrates this. However, given how few parking spaces there are on East Parade itself, if the scheme is extended, residents of East Parade will continue to park on First and Second Avenues and Main Avenue. Additionally, the fact that they will be able to do so without an eye-wateringly expensive permit makes it highly likely that residents of East Parade will simply choose not to participate in the scheme - especially if there is more than one car in the household. This will result in a breakdown in currently good neighbourly relations.

4. Your Annex C records 18 comments to the effect that the system currently works, even if it is occasionally inconvenient. It will stop working if you implement a ResPark scheme.

5. The Director's Decision states that at 48% 'the returns were close to the threshold we stipulate'. I conclude from this that you stipulate 50% of consulted households as the minimum requirement that must be met in order to approve a scheme. 48% is not 50%. The whole point of thresholds is that they must be met, or else they are meaningless. I am certain that local residents would be keen to look further into whether legislation in this area is legally binding, or indeed if the Director is mandated to take decisions in contravention of the stipulated threshold.

6. Your own figures state that out of 88 households that were consulted, merely 24 were in favour of the scheme. You cannot assume that those who did not respond are in favour, so you are proposing a scheme that will affect everyone in the area based on the preference of a small minority. There was also a good number of returns that were not in support of the scheme.

I know that there is considerable unhappiness among many residents at this proposed extension of the scheme, and I urge you to reconsider it.

East Parade

We are writing to object to the decision made 6 May 2020 by the Corporate Director of Economy and Place, Neil Ferris, in consultation with the Executive Member for Transport, Councillor Andy D'Agorne, concerning the extension of Residents' Parking Zone 30 along East Parade in Heworth.

We note this was against the officer's recommendation to make no change contained in the 23 April 2020 decision session report.

Our objections are as follows:

1. The decision made to impose Residents' Parking on East Parade exclusively is counter to the basis on which the consultation was made, which was that Main, First and Second Avenue would be part of the proposed parking zone.
2. East Parade residents did not form part of the original petition, highlighting the lack of impetus for the scheme on East Parade.
3. The return rate for East Parade was below the council's long-stipulated return rate of 50%, further undermining the legitimacy of imposing a solution that was not up for a vote.
4. Voting amongst residents of Main, First and Second Avenues also shows they now strongly oppose the scheme.
5. Extending the R30 zone along East Parade alone will have the opposite effect to that intended, as it will concentrate parking onto Main, First and Second Avenues of those working in York who are avoiding park and ride sites, and will additionally result in many East Parade residents opting out of the scheme and

continuing to park on First and Main Avenue for free, as we do now. This is likely also to create resentment amongst residents where there is no issue currently.

6. In our specific case our house has a bus stop directly outside, which means we have no parking immediately outside our home. We see this as something that benefits all neighbouring residents. As a result we already have to hunt down a parking space away from our house and are happy to do so, but certainly have no wish or intention of paying as well.

7. The council should make better use of the funds involved to encourage strong take-up of park and ride schemes, and to plan for the provision of charging points for electric cars for those who have no access to off-street parking.

As a result of the Executive Member's decision East Parade residents risk having imposed on us something we did not ask for, were not consulted on, did not vote for and which will not work.

We ask that the original recommendation of the decision session to change nothing be accepted.

East Parade

Re your letter to Residents of 23.4.21: I'm a bit puzzled by this. I understood the original proposal was instigated by residents of First Avenue, who objected to people parking on their street, yet they seem to have voted comprehensively against it. I'm happy to pay for parking if it would actually achieve anything, but as far as I can see the surrounding streets will just absorb cars owned by people who are not prepared to pay. I can't park outside my house because of the bus stop, so my options are to pay to park in East Parade at least 20 metres from my house, or park for free the same distance away in First Avenue. It seems to have been a rather pointless (and presumably expensive) exercise.

The returns (48%) did not reach the stipulated threshold (50%) and yet you overrule your own recommended option (Take no further action across the full consultation area) which upholds the majority view. It's not only undemocratic but bureaucratically inept and wasteful of the council's budget.

East Parade

I am responding to the letter we received at _ East Parade York in respect of the proposed changes to parking on East Parade.

We would object to residents parking only on East Parade.

We park mainly (2 car household) on First or Second Avenue but can usually find places on East Parade if this is not possible (and often is)

We worry if there is permit only on East Parade then we would not find a place to park on First or Second Avenue as at present these roads are busier and it is often easier to park on East Parade.

We would prefer to park on First or Second Avenue as we live on the South Side of East Parade and it is safer getting in and out of your vehicle on these side

roads. You have to park facing out of York as otherwise impossible to see to safely leave your space. And is always tricky getting out of the car from the drivers side especially the you have supermarket shopping to unload when parked on East Parade due to the traffic volumes.

If residents parking were to go ahead would prefer it to cover East Parade and First and Second Avenue as think people park there when working in York, To make East parade residents only willi only make the parking on First and Second Avenue even busier as at present there are always spaces on East Parade which they will no longer be able to use.

If East parade becomes permit only I don't believe there would be enough spaces as there is only parking on one side f the street at the East End and there are house both on the Nor and South side and there are bus lanes also taking out space.

The other end of East Parade where there is permit already there are house only on the North Side - South side is the Park.

Another alternative would be to allocate the North Ends of First and Second Avenue for permits for East Parade house owners (where the road is beside the side of houses on East Parade.) I know that several people living on the South side of East Parade use this area to park at present.

East Parade

We are writing to object to the proposed extension to the R30 East Parade residents priority parking area.

The original request for such a scheme was instigated by one or more residents of Main, First and Second Avenues.

In your original letter dated 20th January 2020 the second paragraph reads "Any scheme taken forward will be based on individual streets where **the majority of residents have responded to the letter** and more residents would support the introduction of resident parking than not"

However, in your letter of 23rd April 2021 it states that only 48% of the properties consulted on East Parade, Bull Lane and Parade Court responded, which is less than a majority of the those consulted. The proposed scheme is therefore not supported by the residents in line with the consultation process as was originally described.

Also, adopting the proposed scheme merely pushes non-permit parkers a short distance onto the other streets in the area, exacerbating the parking issues on these other streets consulted whilst incurring expense for those residents on East Parade who wish to continue parking there if the scheme goes ahead.

We are also concerned that in the application of the scheme the available space may be further reduced, resulting in fewer cars being able to park there, thus potentially more cars will then be parked other the streets in the locality.

East Parade

I'm afraid this is an objection - sorry!

Since I cannot actually park in front of my house (on the bus clearway section of East Parade), I have no wish to pay for a parking space I shall not be able to use. Of course, I realise that a permit would enable me to park in front of other houses (no doubt to the annoyance of their residents); but with spaces already at a premium, 126 East Parade becoming an HMO for 8 occupants on 1 July and no parking allowed anyway on the south side of the road, I am going to have problems.

I understood that it was residents of First Avenue who wanted Res Park for their street and I can completely understand why this might have been. However, since then, some goalposts appear to have moved - resulting in the proposed targeting of East Parade.

I hope this matter can be resolved in some way to address the concerns which I know also exist among my neighbours.

East Parade

Thank you for your letter dated 23rd April 2021, regarding the proposal for an extension of a residents parking scheme to include the eastern section of East Parade.

Our house is located opposite the church, and there is also a bus stop outside, which dramatically reduces the space available for parking. The introduction of a residents parking scheme would not benefit us at all, as the cars that park outside our house tend to be visitors to the church, parents picking up school children or visitors to local shops. 90 minutes (which is proposed as a free parking period) would be more than sufficient for most people to visit the church/shops/school, and it would therefore provide very little benefit to us. We do not have the luxury of off road parking (i.e. a driveway), unlike many of the other houses on East Parade; and we therefore have no choice but to park on the street. The thought that we could be forced into paying for the privilege really does feel unfair.

My husband and I both work for the NHS, and the last year has been tough for us all, but we are lucky to have some wonderful neighbours, and we have all supported each-other. I am not aware that **any** of our neighbours voted in favour of the residents parking scheme, and frankly I am very surprised it had any support at all. In effect, we will be paying for parking spaces that we won't have any guarantee of securing.

Another issue is visitors to our home; we rely on family support for childcare (obviously we cannot do this at the moment, but from the end of next month, we hope that this can start again). Our parents travel long distances to help out – which means staying over in York. We already have issues finding parking spaces for them, and this scheme would likely make it impossible, and potentially expensive (i.e. purchasing passes).

On a final note, financially this has been a really hard year for us all, with many people losing their financial security. Introduction of a scheme such as this, where

we will be paying for a service that will (if anything) make our lives more difficult feels very unfair and badly timed.

I hope that the council will reconsider their plans.

East Parade

Thank you for your recent letter of 23rd April received, regarding Consultation Results for the Residents' Priority Parking Scheme (ResPark) concerning East Parade and surrounding streets.

We have a number of objections regarding your decision to take forward a proposal to amend the Traffic Regulation Order to extend the R30 Residents Priority Parking Area and would appreciate it greatly if you could address these.

1) Why, when the recommendations of the Consultation Results by the Report of the Assistant Director of Transport, Highways & Environment (23 April 2020) were that no further action should be taken (Option i), is it that the ResPark scheme for East Parade (Option ii) is in fact being approved?

2) The threshold of responses to the consultation of 50% for East Parade was not met and so should not be used as a marker of residents on East Parade being in favour of the scheme.

3) The comments and requirements of the majority of residents in the whole consultation area have not been taken fully into account where it is abundantly clear that a ResPark scheme on East Parade only will have a detrimental affect to all surrounding roads. Additionally, other issues concerning for instance speeding on East Parade are of much greater importance to the residents.

4) The proposed ResPark scheme for East Parade only will mean that more cars will be parked on adjoining roads causing even more problems for the residents of these avenues than currently is the case.

5) I am a blue badge holder with mobility problems and could encounter problems if I am not able to park near my home. This issue may not be just my problem as other residents or visitors may also have this issue.

6) There are at least two Houses of Multiple Occupancy (numbers 126 and 130 East Parade), both of which the capacity for 8 students which will cause problems with owner cars plus visitor vehicles.

7) Having bus stops on each side of the road in close proximity this reduces the capacity for parking.

8) We live in close proximity to Holy Trinity Church where the necessity of parking for people attending funerals and weddings will undoubtedly cause increased problems to residents of surrounding roads, particularly First, Second and Main Avenues, should the proposed ResPark scheme for East Parade be introduced.

9) Have residents of First, Second and Main Avenues been given the opportunity to respond when they realise the impact this new ResPark will have on their roads?

10) Is it possible to opt out of such a ResPark scheme for East Parade if one so desires?

11) What is the actual reasoning for the ResPark scheme to only East Parade being approved? How specifically will it improve anything for the majority of residents of this area?

East Parade

With regards to the proposed Resident parking scheme on East Parade and surrounding avenues.

As a resident on East Parade I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the on street parking.

The residents consultation received strong opposition from residents living on the Avenues citing a variety of reasons why this should not go ahead:

First Avenue: 94% against (71% voted)

Second Avenue: 84% against (62% voted)

Main Avenue: 68% against (55% voted)

The only street that voted in favour was **East Parade**, however the turnout for this vote was a mere 48% with 24 out of 88 properties in favour. This is noted on the councils response as being below their normal level for acceptance. To put this into perspective, **only 21% of residents consulted on East Parade were in favour**; leaving 79% either against or indifferent.

The council propose to go ahead with parking restrictions on East Parade only, which directly goes against the Avenues concerns that doing so would just shift the perceived problem from East Parade to the Avenues.

My perception of the problem on East Parade is that there are houses down both sides of the street, yet parking is only available down one side. This immediately causes a shortage of parking and adding a residents parking scheme to this street would serve little purpose other than costing residents to park on the street and any visitors to their property aswell. Of greater concern is the speed at which cars travel down the street; this could easily be addressed by adding additional parking bays on the south side of East Parade and mean cars are forced to slow down, whilst adding more parking for residents - win win!

The proposed system by the council would allow 90 minutes parking on East Parade for non residents, to allow continued access to local amenities which I very much welcome. However from my observations, during busy periods on the street parking bays are only occupied for a short period of time as people visit the shops etc. So the proposed Res Park scheme wouldn't actually assist residents in this

regard either, cars will still park and a temporary shortage of spaces would still exist.

It appears no real investigatory work has been carried out by the council here and they are acting purely on the wishes of a small number of residents on one of the streets in a larger area.

East Parade

I am writing formally to object to the extension of the residents parking scheme (ResPark) on East Parade. My husband and I objected previously and now feel the alternative scheme proposed is even worse for us. I am appalled that given less than 50% of residents returned a response, you are still planning to forge ahead with this scheme, when you cannot assume that the majority of residents would be in favour of the change. We live at _East Parade, opposite First Avenue and given that those residents rejected the ResPark scheme, if it goes ahead here, those who live at this end of East Parade and don't wish to purchase a ResPark permit, will no doubt try to park on First Avenue meaning those spaces will be even more in demand and potentially cause upset and bad feeling amongst neighbours.

As you may know, we are unable to park outside our house at any time, as there is an overly large bus stop which prevents this. As a result (and as we have 2 cars in our household) planning to impose a charge to me and my husband of almost £300 a year to *not* be able to park outside our house is outrageous. I am aware that residents' priority parking schemes do not automatically offer the right to park outside one's home, but the option to be able to, should at least be there.

If the purpose of introducing the scheme is to reduce the number of non resident cars parking on East Parade during the day, the scheme would not impact that in any meaningful way as the majority of cars parking here, do so for very short periods, dropping/collecting children from school or to visit the local shops or take away. Additionally, If your scheme is introduced, those wishing to park on East Parade and walk into town could still do so at evenings and on Sundays.

I am not in favour of this scheme and I urge you to reconsider imposing it.

East Parade

Objection to proposed ResPark Scheme - R30 East Parade

Following your letter w/e 23 April, I am writing to object to the proposed extension to the ResPark scheme (R30 East Parade).

I note Your Annex C records 18 comments to the effect that the system currently works, even if it is occasionally inconvenient.

It will not work if you impose a ResPark scheme.

I note that according to your consultation there is almost nobody who thinks that the issue of people from outside the area parking on East Parade in order to walk into town is a problem.

I note in your Annex C that *a partial implementation will increase pressure for parking on other streets and that this outcome would be likely.*

There is adequate parking currently in the area, even if we have to walk several hundred yards to our front door sometimes - the proposed scheme would only make this worse.

I note the Director's Decision states that at 48% 'the returns were close to the threshold we stipulate'. This must mean you stipulate 50% of consulted households as the minimum requirement to be met in order for a scheme to go ahead, and this has not been met.

I note that out of 88 households consulted, only 24 were in favour of the scheme. Lack of response from others does not mean consent.

The scheme is faulty because:

It does not 'guarantee' you a parking space.

Your visitors require permits - which is highly inconvenient - and you receive fines if you forget to give them a visitor's permit

If all spaces in the zone are taken it is often difficult to find a legal space to park

It is dangerous for young families who do the school run twice a day, but have to cope with busy roads and parking far from the house

The cost of permits is enormous - with no benefits to the permit holder, given that the current arrangement works

It would increase pressure on First and Second Avenues, etc. especially as we would consider parking there always rather than using the permit scheme - there is currently no problem sharing with our neighbours in the other streets.

All neighbours I have spoken to are unhappy at the prospect of such a scheme

East Parade

We write to strongly object to the decision to introduce residents parking to only East Parade (and not the immediate adjoining streets) outlined in your communication dated 23 April 2021.

While at face value your decision may appear democratic it shows a complete lack of joined up thinking. Moreover, you will probably end up both moving the issue and making it worse (which in our opinion is currently limited in terms of impacts)

If we go back to the root cause as to why some NIMBYs are looking to introduce residents parking. It is because some commuters and shoppers park their cars in East Parade, 1st/2nd Avenues, Main Street etc and then walk or get the bus into town. This decision will not stop them but merely ensure they continue to park their cars in 1st/2nd Avenues, Main Street etc but this will now be compounded with those drivers who would previously have parked on East Parade.

To compound things further I would imagine a number of the residents on East Parade will refuse to pay the residents parking fee and park instead on 1st/2nd Avenues, Main Street etc - just moving the issue 10 to 100 meters away. Indeed, the issue is not a straightforward all or nothing - for example we live on East Parade but our back alley fronts onto 1st Avenue and indicatively we currently park say 50% of the time on East Parade, 25% on 1st Avenue and 25% on Main Street.

And do not under-estimate the knock-on impact. For example, our next door neighbours and the house three doors down on East Parade are both HMOs, with

8 students in each house and a potential for worst case up to 16 cars in any one year. There are a number of other HMOs on East Parade - in my student days I most certainly would not have been paying for residents parking.

In summary, the distances involved are just too short for a piecemeal introduction of residents parking to act as any kind of deterrent.

In our view the decision needs to be all or nothing. That being either no residents parking is introduced or it is introduced for all the streets covered in the submission.

Note, we did not reply to the original consultation as it was an issue we did not feel strongly enough about at the time. We now believe the consultation was fundamentally flawed as a piecemeal introduction of residents parking was not an explicit option - I think if you present the revised options to residents you will get a very different answer.

East Parade

I have been asked to contact you on behalf of ... as I am his social worker.

... has received a letter dated 23rd April advising that the residents parking permit scheme will be implemented if no further objections are received. Nick resides at _ East Parade and does object to this scheme being implemented for the following reasons;

The scheme is expensive and not affordable.

... has various support staff and it would potentially make visiting him difficult/expensive.

Outside .. home it is double yellow lines. He therefore already cannot park outside his house and once all residents on East Parade park outside their homes ... is highly likely to struggle to find a parking space on his street, because many East Parade homes are two car households.

The expense of parking on East Parade will mean he will need to park on streets near that are not part of the scheme which will cause an overflow problem for the neighbouring streets; it will compound an already difficult parking situation.

Parking away from his home is a significant cause of anxiety for ... as he has experienced being assaulted in the street previously and does not cope well with having to walk any distance to get to his home.

On an ethical note he raises the very valid point of why should he have to pay to park outside his own home/on the street where he lives. He might be more inclined to support the scheme if one free permit were to be given to each household.

Therefore almost guaranteeing all residents get parked on the street. People outside the area who cause the main problem regarding parking would run the risk of getting fined and those households with more than one car would have to seek alternative parking spaces elsewhere. This seems a much more equitable approach to resolving the problem.

He is also struggling to understand how such a scheme can be implemented when out of the 88 residents residing on East Parade consulted only 42 replied which means that 52% of the residents have not stated a view for or against. Also, of the

42 who did reply 24 were for the scheme and 18 were against. Which means of the total residents on the street only 27.5% have clearly stated they are in favour – not even half and certainly not a majority. It therefore seems grossly unfair to implement this scheme given it brings with it a cost to all residents wishing to park outside their home.

... would be grateful if you could seriously take into account his views on this matter.

East Parade

I would like to register my objection to the extension of the respark scheme on east parade.

I live opposite the church. Parking here is already inconvenienced by the bus stop and people park outside our house to go to the local shops, or to pick up from the school. The proposed changes would not benefit us as 90 minutes would be enough for anyone visiting the school and shops. In fact we don't mind if people do this they are fellow parents at the school our children go to; or are supporting local businesses. The other people parking outside our house would be our neighbours, who have as much right as us to park there.

The problem is we simply don't have many spare spaces in the area. In fact the additional "no waiting areas" further down the road will create more pressure in the area. I believe these changes will bring no benefit to us, or the street. It will make parking worse while costing residents more money. We have two cars; which we need for our jobs working in healthcare in the local area and across North Yorkshire. We also depend on family help with childcare.

While we could reduce expense by not purchasing passes (for us, family and friends) and parking on neighbouring streets; this would not be in the spirit of the community that has come together over the last year to help each other. Why create division with a scheme like this?

I don't know anyone who voted for this; only 27% of those asked did. Some of those in favour will have driveways so will not be affected, in the main, by the changes.

I would expect more than 24 objections to proposal; and if so I hope the council will abandon these plans.

I also believe it would be unusual (if not unheard of) for the council to go forward where less than 50% of properties returned. I hope my objection and those of the rest of the community can persuade the council not to go forward with the residents parking plans.