

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

<u>Street</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Officer response</u>
Arncliffe Mews	In favour We have a car park however the overflow from Alma Tr parks in the car park so residents of the flats can't get a space	Noted. Private enforcement could be contracted by the owners.
Alma Terrace	In favour Becoming impossible to park. Introducing Respark may stop people driving down Fulford Rd to park and reduce pollution.	If residents parking was introduced for the whole area commuters/visitors may make the decision to utilise P&R or still travel to use City Centre car parks.
	In favour Difficult to park on evenings and weekends as well as during the day.	Full time scheme may help if parking is not resident related.
	In favour Even at present it is easier to park during holidays than term time so this would only get worse with the developments.	Suggests that students may be using the area for parking which could increase due to nearby student accommodation being built.
	In favour Must be full time for it to be any good	Noted
	In favour Parking on Alma Terrace is a disgrace. Non-residents and commuters use the street everyday leaving residents nowhere to park	A Residents parking scheme would give residents priority over non-residents.

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	<p>In favour We reluctantly agree to ResPark due to the increased commuter and student parking but would like there to be a 60 minute free waiting time (owner)</p>	<p>When implementing a scheme with Entry Signs rather than separate bays and signs there is only a 10 minute wait permitted for non-residents.</p>
	<p>In favour The flats who have designated parking should not be included within the scheme. Any of their vehicles parked on the street are second cars as such should be charged as a second permit not the same as other residents who do not have designated parking spaces.</p>	<p>All existing residential properties in an area are eligible to be part of a proposed scheme. Permit costs and eligibility are agreed through existing agreed legislation.</p>
	<p>In favour Part time scheme does not make sense as parking is difficult to find on a night. The student development leaves residents with no choice but to pay for parking. CYC should ensure sufficient parking is available on new developments.</p>	<p>Comments relating to planning guidance.</p>
	<p>In favour Unhappily supporting and fed up with poor planning decisions around adequate parking for developments.</p>	<p>This is a comment relating to planning guidance.</p>

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	In favour 7 day restriction between 9am-6pm	Noted
	In favour If the scheme is made M-F we would need the opportunity to vote again as it is a lot of money for little benefit as Alma Tr has a parking problem 24/7	Noted
	In favour Strongly support. Fed up with non-residents parking to avoid parking fees for work or visiting York and walks along the river.	Noted
	In favour Parking by non-residents often leaves no space until well into the evening. There is noticeable more space down the street outside of University term times which means that parking problems will indeed be exacerbated due to the new 300 units	Suggests a lot of non-resident parking is by university students which may increase due to new student accommodation in the area.
	In favour Even before the prospect of being an overflow car park for the student flats the parking situation is already awful. Street is being used to park & walk to the city etc. along with park & ride catching buses.	If a scheme was introduced the area would not be liable to parking by commuters or developments not part of the scheme boundary.

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	Concerned about the number of flats with parking which could sway the survey for terraced residents with no off street parking.	
	In favour Prefer full time as a lot of people park at weekends to walk into town. High second permit price will make residents vote against, should be same price as a first permit.	Noted. Permit costs are agreed by full council decision.
	Against Permit parking would only mean paying for a space which will still not be available due to the amount of residents. CYC have passed the student accommodation so parking should be accounted for.	Suggests that on street parking is mainly by residents as such implementing a scheme would not help with the parking situation. Comments relating to planning guidance.
	Against Weekends only	Noted
	Against The developments should have appropriate parking via planning. Main parking difficulty is on a weekend.	Comment relating to planning guidance.
Alma Grove	In favour I can see the parking issue getting worse and something needs to be done. A weekday	Noted

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	only restriction could deter parking but can see the benefits of 24/7	
	<p>Against Have been observing the area at different times and always plenty. Do not share cllr's views that the development will cause problems. Strongly object to having to pay. Wonder if this is a revenue generation exercise rather than to assist residents.</p>	Noted. Residents parking schemes must be resident driven due to the costs involved. Annual parking report can be viewed to show costs and expenditure.
Frances Street	<p>In favour With the planned developments we would never get a space, its bad enough already. However not happy at the added expense to park outside our home</p>	Noted
	<p>In favour I don't think this is a very user-friendly way of collecting responses and will put people off. A Link to an electronic form would've helped</p>	Noted. Work is ongoing to progress to electronic consultations.
	<p>In favour Only concern would be the issuing of permits for households with multiple cars. Could be that despite the scheme there is still insufficient space. Could find ourselves paying for permits and still have nowhere to park.</p>	There is a significant price increase for additional permits which would deter residents from purchasing multiply permits/vehicles.

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	<p>In favour Full time required as parking is particularly bad on weekends</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>In favour 8am - 8pm. Marked parking bays would help parking on street. Half spaces should be used for planters and trees.</p>	<p>Marked parking bays would require extensive lining and signing and would still leave available space due to the different lengths of vehicles. Planters are outside of the remit for this consultation.</p>
	<p>In favour Very disappointed CYC granted permission for student accommodation with no parking. No extra capacity in the area for vehicles therefore residents now have to pay the price and it is inevitable we will now require ResPark</p>	<p>Comments in relation to planning guidance</p>
	<p>Against Do not agree that Frances St should be ResPark. Always able to park. Neighbours have an issue with not being able to park directly outside their property and have started to place cones on the highway. This will not be resolved by introducing permits.</p>	<p>If an obstruction is being caused to the highway then enforcement action can be taken. If an area is not restricted then anyone is able to park on a first come first served basis.</p>
	<p>Against Strongly disagree as there are no parking problems. New neighbours dislike not being able to park directly outside their house however the scheme won't fix this and there</p>	<p>As above</p>

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	are always spaces along the street. Refuse to pay so much for permits.	
	Against Problems only happen when university term time. Something needs to be done about that rather than charging residents. Weekends only	When streets are unrestricted they are available for any users on a first come first served basis.
	Against Against the scheme due to cost and difficulties obtaining visitor permission	When virtual permits are introduced this element may be easier for some residents.
Ambrose Street	In favour Can space be allocated for a few trees within the process. The street is bare, a few trees and a handful fewer car spaces would not be unpopular. If not planters should be included within the design	Planters and trees outside of the remit for this consultation
	In favour Mon-Fri 8-8	Noted
	In favour 7 days a week 5pm - 7am	Noted
	In favour 6pm - 6am	Noted
	Against Parking is rarely a problem and the scheme just adds additional costs.	Noted

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	<p>Against Understand why a scheme may be required due to the development however it is unfair to charge so much for permits. There are always spaces available.</p>	<p>Noted. Charges are agreed at full council meetings.</p>
	<p>Against Adequate parking should be applied for the new properties. Had no problems with parking. If problems arise it is due to the new developments so they should be penalised. Oppose that we should have to pay. Low cost on site rental scheme on the new development should be provided.</p>	<p>Comments relating to planning guidance</p>
	<p>Against As little as possible. Parking is generally not an issue. Good use of parking to keep vehicles out of town and enable exercise. I don't want to pay to park outside our house. Biggest challenge is September when students move in, this dies down Oct/Nov, part of living in a diverse and vibrant city.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Holly Terrace</p>	<p>In favour This is a necessary scheme as it is very difficult to find any parking spaces</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>In favour concerned about how the private cobbled area will be signed to ensure it is</p>	<p>Should the scheme progress to implementation in this area signs can be</p>

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	extinguished within the scheme as private and not a part of the available parking	erected to maintain the private section. Residents will be consulted.
Carey Street	In favour Fully support. Currently over run with commuters etc. with the additional 300 students shortly parking will be impossible for residents and our families.	Noted
	Against Cost is excessive for our necessary two cars in the household. Not an issue with parking and can always park within a minute's walk. Should there be an issue from nearby developments this should be raised once they are completed rather than introducing a potentially unnecessary scheme	Residents parking schemes must be resident driven due to the costs involved. Comments noted in relation to the development.
Wenlock Terrace	In favour It would be positive to have parking permits. The street is increasingly used by commuters and our tenants struggle to park.	Noted
	In favour Mon - Sat 9am-8pm Concerned that if Wenlock Tr votes against a scheme they will not be permitted to purchase permits for the surrounding area.	Should the scheme be progressed with only a proportion of streets then only those properties residing within the extended area would be eligible to purchase permits. The rest of the streets would however remain unrestricted.
	In favour	Noted

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	In favour but don't have a strong preference for times of operation	
	In favour As a non-car owner this would cause some inconvenience however I support it as being in the interest of the community.	Noted
	Against The price is unfair on students and prevents short term parking for visitors without incurring a cost.	Permit costs are agreed at full council. Visitor permits are available and will be quicker to obtain when moved virtually.
	Against Weekdays are the worst times for people parking for work or shop in York	Noted
	Against Not required no issues with parking	Noted
	Against At no time would I want a Residents Parking Scheme	Noted
Kilburn Road	In favour Serious problem of commuter parking on Kilburn Road. The scheme should be a package and not exclude Kilburn Rd if percentage is not met as this would have serious repercussions	Each streets results will also be considered separately within the decision report.
	In favour Difficulty caused to bin wagons etc. due to parking on the corner of Edgware	There are already restrictions on the junctions. If the area becomes residents parking then the amount of vehicles should

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	Road/Kilburn Road. Resulted in grass verge being damaged. DYL's required	decrease meaning residents can park more considerably if the problem is opposite.
	In favour Agree with the proposal however the cost of the scheme was agreed to be covered by the letting company. The cost per annum will be very expensive for us if we have to pay.	As the petition reached the top of the waiting list the area has been consulted. The developers would have to carry out on street surveys to show that parking had increased due to their development which would then hit trigger points for them to pay under the Section 106. This means residents would have to wait until after the site has been completed and surveys undertaken.
	In favour Unsure how parking would be monitored given the influx of non-local people parking.	Should the area become residents parking only permit holds would be permitted to park. Patrols would be undertaken by CYC CEO's
	In favour Definitely no charges should apply. A book of visitor permits would last me a week. No charges residents did not want 360 student apartments with every possibility they each have a car	Charges are considered at full council. Residents need to make an informed decision due to charges involved.
	In favour 0800-1800 Mon-Sat	Noted
	In favour 8am-6pm Monday – Sunday	Noted
	In favour Inconsiderate parking by commuters has become an increasing problem. Student	Should a scheme be introduced then residents should have enough on street availability to not park on verges or require

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	development will have an impact. People park on the verges causing damage. DYL's should be implemented opposite Edgware Road. Neighbours worried about front gardens being paved over.	additional waiting restrictions. The area can be revisited should the scheme be implemented if there are still concerns with parking near junctions.
	In favour Full time required as people from Fulford Road park on a Friday leaving them until Monday making the street full from top to bottom leaving no room for residents	Noted
	In favour Before giving planning permission for new developments why don't you make sure there is enough parking spaces on the plans	Comment relating to planning guidance
	In favour I hope it doesn't mean everyone will pave their gardens. I want to vote for Kilburn/Edgware to not be part of R20 as this is already a large scheme	It is currently common practise to extend zone rather than create small separate areas.
	In favour 8am - 6pm Monday to Saturday	Noted
	Against Will be extra hassle to obtain permits for visitors etc. Will have a knock on effect for allotments and walkers. More thought should be given to improve public transport with bus from Fulford Rd to the university.	Noted. Comments will be passed to Transport Officers

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	Against Limited space on driveways so parking on street is often the only option	Should residents parking be introduced permits would be required to park on street.
Lastingham Terrace	In favour The permit costs are too high and will prevent people voting in favour which is a shame as it is required.	Costs are agreed at full council.
	In favour Full time is required due to the number of cars which are left whilst owners walk to town or along the river. Also park and head off with cases then reappear up to two weeks later.	Noted
	In favour We reluctantly agree to ResPark due to the increased commuter and student parking but would like there to be a 60 minute free waiting time (owner)	When schemes are implemented under Entry signs there the only permitted waiting time for no permit holders is 10 minutes.
	In favour Non-residents are using the area as a free car park. Residents often return late evening to find no spaces. Exacerbated by houses having multiple vehicles - these households then make things worse by voting against	Should residents parking be introduced a permit would be required to park on street which should provide increase availability if the current problem is caused by non-residents.
	Against Introducing residents parking will not solve the problem. The houses were built at a time	Noted

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	when parking spaces were not needed and nothing can solve the present problem. Just complicates things adding charges	
	Against Monday - Saturday 9am - 5pm	Noted
	Against already said No twice, please stop the scheme	Noted
Hartoft Street	In favour Permits are prohibitively expensive. Will be a worrying additional cost for some residents. Reduced fees for households with children, elderly and disabled. Historically been voted against in the neighbourhood due to cost	Costs are agreed at full council. Blue badge holders are able to park free of charge and discounts provided for certain types of benefit holders.
	In favour Since the introduction of respark in nearby streets residents have started to use Hartoft St area for parking. On numerous occasions I have been unable to park anywhere unrestricted nearby. Large number of HMO's. Commuters also park. Strongly urge the council ensure ALL streets are included in the scheme regardless of response levels. A number of rental properties are empty	A decision will be made at Executive Decision Session and a decision made dependant on returns.
	Against 6pm-8am	Noted

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	<p>Against Residents will be penalised as problems are in an evening so suggests residents have too many cars. Discourage GMO's from having vehicles unless disabled. No provision for electric charge points. Raise a lot of money for CYC with no benefit to residents</p>	<p>As residents need to vote in favour for a scheme to progress they will know best if the problems are due to existing residents or commuters/non-residents.</p>
	<p>Against We do not support the scheme due to the cost of permits as they are excessive. If the cost were reasonable then our response may be different</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Against Hartoft St should remain free of restrictions</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Farndale Street</p>	<p>In favour Existing no waiting restrictions on the junction of Farndale St must be retained. Cost of second permits is far too high especially when a second car is a necessity not a luxury. Discriminates against people that are not very well off and live in modest streets. Big jump in prices should be for 3rd vehicles.</p>	<p>All existing waiting restrictions will remain in place. The cost of permits are agreed at full council.</p>
	<p>In favour Would support a full time restriction as parking problems occur from non-residents</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	mostly on evenings and weekend. Thank you for taking action.	
	In favour Previously said no but parking has significantly increased in the last year especially at weekends and I struggle to park.	Noted
	Against If you want to repeat a referendum let's do Brexit again. How many times are you going to repeat this one?	Noted
	Against Parking can be difficult but it's because there are too many residents' cars. Although non-residents parking make it difficult during the day, the problem remains at night. Electric vehicle charging should be considered alongside the proposal. (Charging strategy sent)	As residents need to vote in favour for a scheme to progress they will know best if the problems are due to existing residents or commuters/non-residents. Information on charging strategy can be seen as follows https://www.york.gov.uk/EVChargingStrategy
	Against Cannot afford the permit prices for the privilege of not necessarily being able to park near my house.	Noted
Levisham Street	In favour Very much welcomed as many people park to walk into town or along the river making it	Noted

Comments received from public maintainable streets

ANNEX G

	more inconvenient to find parking for residents.	
	Against Strongly oppose, the cost is out of proportion. Similar schemes in Glasgow are £50 per year. Many will be unable to afford it and will not solve and parking issues.	The cost of permits are agreed at full council each year.
Fulford Road	Against Do not support as I have a garage and would then need to pay for visitor permits. It may reduce illegal parking on yellow lines however this should be enforced anyway	Illegal parking can be reported through the parking hotline number.
	Against Weekends only or school holidays	Noted