

Objections and comments received to the advertised extended R70 Residents Parking Scheme

6 x objections relating to the cost of permits

I am writing on behalf of _ resident of ... Ambrose Street, York, in the area expected to be included in the extension of resident parking scheme R70 if it is approved. _ is a vulnerable adult who relies on his car for essential day to day tasks, and to get to e.g. medical appointments. I am writing on his behalf as he is not able to respond himself.

He is objecting to the proposal on two grounds, affordability and effectiveness. Firstly Joe is living on benefits. Even with the discount because of this, the cost of the permit will still significantly affect his budget. Not having a car is not an option, so he will be forced to pay for the permit and make cuts to his already low living standards to compensate.

Secondly the proposed scheme is not solving an actual problem. It can sometimes be tricky to find a car parking space in the evening, but it has always been possible to find one in the area. Assuming that the scheme will be enforced only during working hours as originally proposed, the scheme does not even alleviate that problem. It is currently much easier to find a spot during the proposed hours than outside them. The scheme rewards those who drive to work every day, and penalises those who opt to commute in more environmentally friendly ways, leaving the car at home.

In summary, the scheme is too expensive without significant benefit to the environment or local residents.

I am writing to you as a homeowner on Ambrose Street, YO104DT, about the proposed extension of the R70 parking scheme.

We have recently started to let the house on Airbnb as a holiday let and are unsure of the impact that a residents parking permit will have on both our guests staying at the house and myself when I am there to clean and for maintenance etc.

I am therefore against the proposal, as it has never been an issue to find a parking space in all the time we have lived there.

Please can you get back to me with more details; of the impact it will have on my business and personal use of the parking spaces on my street.

I am just writing to object against the proposed Research scheme on Ambrose Street earlier this year I also objected against the scheme. I am happy with the current parking scheme and with the current rise in petrol fuel food etc I struggling to make ends meet and do not need another expense.

We would like to oppose the proposal to extend the parking scheme to include Frances Street, Ambrose Street, Holly Terrace, Carey Street and Wenlock Terrace. The reason is that we don't think it will improve the parking provision for our street and will make the situation worse for everyone with a car.

Annex D

I am against the above proposal my reasons been I object to been charged for parking in the street for which I have been a resident for 38 years, also I believe you would still not be able to guarantee me a parking space outside my own home or possible in my own street due to the amount of cars out weighing the spaces available.

I am writing to object to the proposed parking scheme on Ambrose Street Fulford York. Not only do I think its unfair to pay to park outside my own home I think the prices are extortionate can you explain to me how you come up with these prices and why is there such a jump from one car to two. Can I also be guaranteed a space if I pay for a permit? I am also flabbergasted by the timing with all the price hikes at the moment can you justify this at the present time. I can understand restrictions on major roads but not on side roads. Can you also tell me where the money goes from the permits? Please can you send my reply ASAP and confirmation you got my objection.

2 x comments relating to the proposed time restriction for the limited waiting parking bays on Carey Street

I have been thinking about the waiting bays that you mentioned that are greatly appreciated but I just don't think 90 minutes is enough.

A lot of my customers like I explained are not very mobile or are elderly, struggle with mental health or the main issue is loneliness. Many customers use my cafe as a hub where they have company most of the day and meet new people or have met friends here where they all meet regularly.

I honestly feel that 3 hours would be more accommodating for the more elderly customers and for my business needs.

Is it necessary to reserve four bays for trades people in Carey Street? This seems a large number of spaces for the one business trading in Carey Street, given the enormous pressure on parking places; it will not help with trades people attending premises in the other streets; would it be possible to designate these bays as available for visitors for up to 90 minutes *or for ResPark permit holders?*

I realise that I did not make myself clear in my third question. I was suggesting that vehicles with resident permits would be able to park in the 90 minute bays for as long as the residents/owners wished, but that other vehicles would be restricted to 90 minutes. This is a restriction which I have seen introduced elsewhere.

1 x objection from a local business

We have major concerns for Staff and clients parking. The parking has been a big problem while builders have been constructing the new student accommodation. No where for clients or staff to park.

We have a forecourt for two vehicles, but we-have five staff plus clients.

The council have placed two wooden blocks in pavement, which stops us getting on the forecourt.

We have now been informed that we will have to have permits or pay a yearly fee. It has been so hard keeping business open. Can you please look into this matter.

2 x comments relating to the ResPark process and extending the proposed R70 area as a whole

As the R70 area has already been agreed, this objection concerns the process rather than the terms of the proposed extension.

Parking pressure on areas surrounding the existing 'decided' R70 zone will be exacerbated unless all the above subject streets are included.

However, it is unethical to extend the resident parking scheme incrementally in this way: the new extended area residents need to acquiesce to the extension to avoid the additional pressure resulting from designation of Alma Street etc as a resident parking area.

My principal objection is to resident parking zones generally, where property ownership/tenancy confers private rights on a public asset. This further erodes civil liberties.

More investigation into the reason for original pressure should have been made - perhaps revealing that a more imaginative solution could be found. For example, in London, commuter and shopper pressure on some local streets has been relieved by applying resident parking restrictions for only one mid-morning hour every weekday.

In summary:

- I object to the principle of resident parking zones.
- I object to a poorly-conceived process that forces incremental acquiescence to a bad idea.

Firstly, in the previous letter which excluded Ambrose Street from the scheme I believe there was sufficient agreement to put the restrictions in place and am pleased that this is now being re-considered, although disappointed that this is the way to deal with it.

Secondly with all the new student accommodation being built on Fulford Road coupled with the rise in AirBnB type housing in the area, parking is and will continue to be more challenging and this change will support residents being able to park.

Thirdly, when the scheme comes into force surrounding Ambrose Street and Ambrose Street not being included will make parking an even greater challenge and unfair as other streets take advantage of the schemes lack of application close by, especially as they are connected via Carey Street.

I look forward with interest to the results reached.