

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

Decision Session - Executive Member for Transport

To: Councillor Ravilious

Date: Tuesday, 28 April 2026

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: West Offices - Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on **Monday, 20 April 2026**. The attached additional documents are now available for the following agenda item:

6. **Consideration of representations received during the Statutory Consultation for the proposed amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)** (Pages 3 - 22)

The attached written representation presents the views of residents and members unable to attend the meeting.

This agenda supplement was published on **Friday, 24 April 2026**

This page is intentionally left blank

D1 – Cllr S Fenton:

In view of the likely high number of registered speakers for this meeting, I am providing a written rather than oral representation, so that those more directly affected are able to have their say in person.

I would like to express my support for the recommendations set out in Annex D of the report, which relates to Dringhouses & Woodthorpe ward, and would like to comment in particular on location D1 – Nelsons Lane.

In recent years parking along the 's-bend' near the children's playground has increased and has become an issue of concern for residents, primarily due to the adverse impact on visibility for motorists coming to and from the Goodwood Grove / Lingfield Crescent part of the estate and due to concerns about the safety of children crossing the road to get to and from the playground.

There is a lot of daytime parking elsewhere on Nelsons Lane and on the streets off such as Hob Moor Terrace and Breary Close. Much of this is associated with the Nelsons Court NHS facility and the Little Green Rascals children's nursery. Both sites provide important services for residents. Having met recently with managers from both sites, I know that parking is an issue of concern to them and their staff, and they report their staff and visitors finding it increasingly difficult to park locally. This may be in part due to double yellow line restrictions being implemented on nearby streets such as Chalfonts, following requests from residents there.

There is also anecdotal evidence of more people choosing to park in residential areas close to the city centre, such as Nelsons Lane and other streets off Tadcaster Road, and then walking into town, rather than pay to park in a city centre car park or pay to use the Park & Ride service from Askham Bar.

There is growing frustration locally as more residential streets become daytime car parks for non-residents, with more residents calling for a ResPark scheme to be consulted on.

I am keen to explore ways in which the cause of the increase in non-resident parking can be addressed. Conversations I have had recently with managers at Nelsons Court and Little Green Rascals have identified the Park & Ride as one obvious option to be pursued. At the moment, staff and visitors do not have the option of using this service as there are no intermediate stops along Tadcaster Road. If the service could stop inbound and outbound near to the junction with Nelsons Lane, and if staff were supported to use it in preference to parking on street, that might help to reduce parking pressures. I am aware that further meetings are planned to pursue this, which I hope will be fruitful.

Cllr Stephen Fenton
Dringhouses & Woodthorpe Ward
24 April 2026

D1 – I Bews:

Just wanted to share my concern at the parking around the children's play area in Nelson's Lane

I live on Nelson's Lane which sits in a small cul de sac on the left side just after the play area going towards the railway line.

The view shown in the 1st photo below shows my view when I am exiting my cul de sac. I need to turn right to drive towards Tadcaster Road.

As you can see the parked cars force me to turn out with zero visibility of cars coming towards me from the right. Due to the parked cars, these oncoming cars are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road. them often travelling in excess of the permitted 20mph).

I have long thought that it is only a matter of time before a car, bicycle or child will get killed or seriously injured.



As shown in the photo below, all traffic is forced to pass closest to the children's play area exit. Without the parked cars this would reduce the proximity risk by 50%



Additionally, the photo below shows how the exit from the fisherman's pond leads pedestrians to cross between parked cars (see the path on the left just beyond the gritting box). There is no safe place to cross. Even at 20mph, pedestrians appearing from between parked cars are a serious risk of injury or death.



I know from my own observations over the last 18 months that the vast majority of these cars are NHS staff from the nearby respite centre and the children's nursery on Tadcaster Road. The uniforms and lanyards give them away.

Regards Ian Bews

D1 – P Docherty:

I am a resident of Lingfield Crescent, nearby, a retired GP, and I ought to declare that I now do some work in the CYC Road Safety Team teaching Bikeability sessions and Pedestrian Training in schools via 'Work With York'. I support the proposed amendments to the TRO, specifically the double yellow line restrictions relating to **Nelsons Lane**.

Parking is obviously a challenging problem for all towns and cities. The increased parking on Nelsons Lane has become problematic with very significant increases recently. My main concern is pedestrian safety. The parking changes sightlines through the S-bend at a point in the road where crossing is frequent due to the nearby pond, the pedestrian/cycle track to Little Hob Moor and the children's play area. At many times of the day, there is very poor visibility in an area of frequent crossing of the road by people on foot.

Yellow line restrictions on both sides as proposed would restore those sightlines and so help the safety of pedestrians here. The S-bends in the road seem to me to need restrictions on both sides to be effective. The current parking problem near the green space is often on one side and yet the sightlines are seriously impaired.

I certainly understand the issue of displacing parking and wonder if:

1. The NHS site could promote walking/cycling/drop-offs/public transport where possible but, if there is a need to park, that this is done responsibly with consideration to others (avoiding any pavement parking, double parking etc). Could they look at prioritising Blue Badge parking on the site and prioritising patient parking perhaps? In my experience generally, NHS organisations could do more to promote non-car alternatives to both staff and patients, although I'm not familiar with any initiatives at Nelsons Court.
2. The Little Green Rascals nursery could similarly promote non-car alternatives to staff and visitors. This was a strong part of their initial planning application, although I understand the nursery has new owners.

Despite the risk of parking displacement which I hope can be managed, I think the safety of pedestrians and particularly children who are less experienced at crossing should take priority in the decision and the proposed new parking restrictions should be implemented.

Best Regards

Paul Docherty

D1 – S Trundle:

Could I express my concerns in relation to the proposed parking restrictions for Nelsons Lane in Dringhouses, York.

I am concerned that far from solving the traffic issues, the problems will simply shifted to surrounding roads. I am a resident of Weddall Close and it is clear that Breary Close and Weddall Close are already being used as parking during the working week.

I have witnessed increased traffic congestion and incidents of inconsiderate parking which is certainly going to become far worse once the proposed parking restrictions come into force.

Should the parking restrictions come into force will there be provision by way of residents parking permits, enforceable through fines?

Yours sincerely

Steven Trundle

D1 – P Abbott:

As a retired lapsed Member of the Chartered Institute of Transport and Institute of Logistics it is my professional opinion that only by fully double yellow lining both sides of Nelson does City of York Council Highways satisfy its Statutory Obligations!

May I explain much of Nelson Lane was Railway Land! Very important legal, responsibility and Statutory matters exist! Covenants with formal, solemn and binding agreements, promises and pledges relevant to Nelson Lane! As an example the Earth Bund embankment separating the railway from the Goodwood houses that back onto it is protected by stringent Railway Statutory Legislation

It is my interpretation and understanding the Statutory Regulations protecting 24/7 access to the Railway Emergency Gates covering 25000 volt infrastructure extends to the A1036 (Tadcaster Road). The Emergency Services, heaven forbid, wil have to have immediate control of FOUR MAINLINES that frequently carry NINE CARRIAGES at SPEED with absolutely no foreseeable IMPEDIMENTS!!! Such as inconsiderate parked cars!

It is my opinion having mentioned this before CITY OF YORK COUNCIL HIGHWAYS EXECUTIVES HAVE DELIBERATELY AND WRECKLESSLY IGNORED THEIR STATUTORY DUTIES. THAT OPINION FORMED BY STUDYING THE ROGS REGULATIONS 2006! Somewhere in all those Regulations (could be 2003) are

specific duties Councils MUST COMPLY WHEN INTERFACING WITH RAILWAY INFRASTRUCTURE!

In November 2025 the Railway Bill gave THE OFFICE OF RAIL AND ROAD ADDITIONAL POWERS! Fortunately The Office of Rail and Road has an office in York. SHOULD CHAOS BECAUSE OF THESE PROPOSALS I will have no hesitation making representations requesting continuous Audits and Safety compliance!

NHS NELSON COURT

It beggars belief and speaks volumes of how little residents are thought of when informed by news letter those organisation who have create this chaos have enjoyed negotiations! It is obvious patient visitors to the 39 bed wards are a nuisance! Priority to parking is for the staff! There are only TWO DISABLED PARKING SPACE which I consider totally inadequate. Consequently, especially BLUE BADGES, park directly opposite on Nelson Lane pavement without aforethought (and in breach of Office Rail and Road Interface Regulations) causing ridiculous vehicle access problems to the estate!

I have already been in touch with CARE QUALITY COMMISSION! Title is a contrdiction in terms! Aware they don't care elderly blue badge patient visitors are treated with contempt! Their pavement parked cars force children rushing to playground into the road. All it takes is an silent electric vehicle. ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENT!!!

WILL CITY OF YORK COUNCIL HIGHWAYS ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY?

D1 – Z and A Burns:

I would like to express my concerns at Nelson's Lane being double yellow lined. I live on Goodwood Grove and I believe the parking on Nelson's Lane is a problem, but guarantee if you put double yellow lines down there it will only push the problem into Goodwood Grove & Lingfield. The issue on Nelson's Lane is that the road is narrow and windy so with cars parked up, travelling vehicles can't see on coming traffic!

Well Goodwood Grove is narrower and has more bends than Nelsons Lane so couldn't take the volume of cars. If you double yellow Nelsons lane you must either make Goodwood & Lingfield permit only or resident access only. The same issues will be pushed into Goodwood & Lingfield if they are not considered at the same time as Nelsons Lane. Our street is narrow and not wide enough for cars to park on the road which would mean they have to park half on the path creating difficulties walking past/push chairs & wheelchairs. We have alot of families living in our estate and this would become a safety problem. Part of the issue is the number of staff from little green rascals & the NHS place parking here for the whole day . Could they be

encouraged to request their staff use the park & ride or maybe the area behind the post office on Tadcaster rd or The cross keys car park? There must be other places for them to park ?

Furthermore it has come to light that The Delta hotel on Tadcaster Rd have started charging residents to park so residents who complain are actively directed to park for free in our little estate adding to our problem. As well as this Chalfonts has recently had yellow lines which has pushed their vehicles into our estate too. This proves that restrictions don't stop the problem they simply move it on to somewhere else. With this in mind you must consider parking in the whole estate not just Nelson's Lane.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns

Alistair & Zoe Burns

D1 – W Dann:

I currently live in Lingfield Crescent, unfortunately will not be able to attend the meeting on the 28th and so would like to submit my thoughts and concerns to be considered at the meeting.

Firstly, I agree with the proposed parking restrictions on the S bend on Nelsons lane near the playground, I wrote to my local councillor two years ago to express my concern regarding the hazards that the parking was causing.

My concern now is that the parking restrictions proposed do not go far enough to resolve the problem. As indicated in your letter the parking restrictions that were put in place in Chalfonts has caused displacement and I am certain that this will happen again if the proposed parking restrictions are put in place. This will simply result in the parking moving further down Nelsons Lane, around the T junction with Goodwood Grove and Lingfield Crescent and beyond the junction into these two streets. This will then result in a dangerous situation at the T junction. Both Lingfield Crescent and Goodwood Grove are both quite narrow streets and both have S bends in them and so this will cause issues for residents accessing their properties and also for service and delivery vehicles.

My proposal would be to have Nelsons Lane and the streets that come off it, together with Lingfield Crescent and Goodwood Grove as residents parking only areas.

The parking has become worse since additional treatments are being administered at the NHS building on Nelsons Lane. I would suggest that the treatments are administered at the NHS Askam Bar site where there is ample parking. Perhaps a concession could be arranged for the employees of Green Rascals to allow them to park there and use the bus service.

I doubt that there would be much take up on the idea of using the park and ride as it would mean anyone coming from York, Acomb or Woodthorpe would have to join and add to the congestion at the York College only to park up and then come back through the congestion on the bus.

Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinion

Will Dann

D4 – J Armstrong:

Edited at resident's request 27/04/26

Thank you for your email and for providing the report ahead of the decision session.

Having reviewed the officer report for Item D4 (Hunters Way / Middlethorpe Grove), I would like to raise several concerns and respectfully request that these are considered prior to any final decision.

I would also like to emphasise that I am not opposed to safety improvements. However, it is important that any intervention is evidence-based, proportionate, and targeted at locations where demonstrable problems exist.

1. Lack of supporting evidence

The report confirms that no collision data is available, and the recommendation is based on site visits and visibility assessments. However, no objective evidence or measurements are provided to demonstrate the extent of any obstruction, or to justify restrictions significantly exceeding the Highway Code guidance of 10 metres from a junction.

The proposal is justified on the basis of maintaining access to the tactile crossing points. However, the evidence provided does not demonstrate that access is being obstructed. The photograph included in the report — which appears to be the only specific evidence relied upon — shows a clear pedestrian pathway, with reduced visibility at most rather than actual obstruction.

As such, the case for a persistent obstruction issue appears to rely on a single snapshot in time from over a year ago, which does not clearly demonstrate the problem the proposal is intended to address.

2. Outdated site conditions

The reduced visibility shown in the report photograph relates to a previous household that parked multiple vehicles close to the junction. As demonstrated in the attached evidence pack, this situation is over a year old and not representative of current conditions.

A current photograph shows that the junction now operates without obstruction to the tactile crossing points. An updated site visit would therefore likely show materially different conditions.

3. Displacement of parking and secondary impacts

Removing parking within approximately 20 metres of the junction will displace vehicles further along Middlethorpe Grove, where the road is narrower and visibility is more limited, particularly around bends.

The report does not appear to assess these secondary impacts. This is a significant omission, as the proposal may relocate – and potentially worsen – the safety issues it seeks to address.

4. Proportionality

The proposed restriction length (approximately 18–20 metres) materially exceeds standard guidance and removes a substantial amount of usable parking, without clear justification based on evidence of an ongoing problem.

5. Interpretation of consultation responses

The report refers to one representation in support of the proposal. However, this submission appears to be requesting restrictions at a different location (near the bend by Tadcaster Road), rather than expressing support for this specific proposal.

This is important, as it suggests that the only “support” cited is not in fact support for Item D4, and that more immediate safety concerns may exist elsewhere.

6. Consistency with other items in the report

In other proposals within the same report (for example D3), displacement impacts are explicitly considered and influence the recommendation.

In this case, similar concerns have been raised but do not appear to have been assessed, suggesting an inconsistent approach.

Request

Given the above, I would respectfully ask that consideration be given to deferring this item, or reviewing the necessity of the proposal, to allow for:

- an updated site visit, and
- a fuller assessment of current conditions and displacement impacts

so that any decision made is clearly necessary, proportionate and evidence-based.

I appreciate your time in reviewing this, and I am very happy to provide any further information if helpful.

Kind regards,
John Armstrong

Your Evidence Photo (Taken Over A Year Ago)



Google Maps Image From 2024 Showing The Same Cars As In Your Evidence Photo (As Evidence They Belonged To Previous Residents)



Photo Taken At 14:00 On 20/04/2026 Showing Issue No Longer Present



E1 – A Craig:

Regarding the double yellow lines down Garths end:

Unfortunately, we are unable to attend the meeting but would like to put my point across. I live with elderly parents who would struggle to keep walking to the end of the Rd my mum had a degenerate spine condition, they need the space in the street to park their car. My son has a skin Condition on his feet called Epidermolysis bullosa blistering on his feet.

Also all the pupils from Fulford school park in Grants avenue, top of put road which makes it impossible to park.

I suggest the councillor sort this situation out first as it is getting worse and impossible to find a parking space at the top

Kind regards, Amanda

E2 – A and K Dixon:

Re: Proposed Parking Restrictions on Fordlands Road, Fulford, York

We are unable to attend your 28 April meeting , but would like to give our input and make an objection to a proposal that will be considered at your meeting to put parking restrictions on the small section of Fordlands Road between Main Street and Thornton Road in Fulford.

1. **There is no other on-street parking nearby for the few of us that live on Main Street near that intersection.** We local residents really need those few parking spaces, particularly for when we have visitors or guests.
2. **There is little traffic on that part of Fordlands Road going to the houses and care home nearby.** These are the only properties that really need to use that section of Fordlands Road, and the small number of cars that come to these properties do not have traffic problems in passing the parked cars.
3. **The main problem here is that cars use this part of Fordlands Road as a cut-through to Thornton Road and the Germany Beck properties, and often do not do this safely.** Instead of going into Thornton Road at the Main Street traffic light immediately past Fordlands Road, some cars going to Germany Beck zoom down this short section of Fordlands Road—often without even signalling that they are turning. We strongly believe that the traffic going to Germany Beck should use the traffic signal turning as planned.
4. **Prohibiting parking on this small section of Fordlands Road will likely cause more traffic problems.** If this small section of Fordlands Road effectively becomes wider as parking is restricted, we believe this will attract more people from the Germany Beck development to turn into Fordlands Road rather than use the Thornton Road turning at the traffic lights. This would make this part of the Fordlands Road busier, louder and harder to navigate for the local neighbours and care home visitors.
5. **We suggest that the most effective approach here would be to close off the end of this part of Fordlands Road where it meets Thornton Road.** This would not only maintain the on-street parking for local residents and care home visitors, but would also eliminate the traffic and risks from cars turning at speed off of Main Street onto Fordlands Road to get to Germany Beck.

Please let us know if you have any questions or would like any more information. We have discussed this with our neighbours on Main Street, and we all would like to see the on-street parking on this section of Fordlands Road continue.

Yours sincerely, Allen & Karen Dixon

E2 – G and R Kumar:

Formal Objection: Proposed Parking Restrictions – Fordlands Road, Fulford

I am writing to formally object to the proposed introduction of double yellow lines on Fordlands Road, Fulford, as outlined in the recent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) proposals.

As a resident of the immediate area, I believe these restrictions will have a detrimental impact on our community for the following reasons:

1. Severe Loss of Resident Parking

Parking is already extremely sparse in this part of Fulford. Many of the properties here do not have off-street parking. Removing these spaces will make it nearly impossible for residents to park within a reasonable distance of their homes.

2. Displacement Issues

These restrictions will not reduce the number of cars; they will simply displace them into neighboring streets like Germany Lane and Crosslands Road. These streets are even narrower and less suited to increased parking volume, which will likely lead to further congestion and access issues for emergency services.

3. Road Safety and Speeding

Currently, parked vehicles on Fordlands Road act as a natural traffic calming measure. I am concerned that clearing the road will lead to increased vehicle speeds, making the road less safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

4. Impact on Daily Life

The removal of these spaces will cause significant hardship for families with young children and elderly residents who rely on being able to park close to their front doors for accessibility and safety.

I urge the council to reconsider these plans and instead look at alternative solutions, such as more limited time restrictions or improved residential parking schemes, that address safety without penalising the people who in this area.

Regards

Gavin and Rachel Kumar

E2 – N and P Ross:

My husband Paul and I are unable to attend the public permissions meeting in person .

We are writing to express our strong support for the proposed parking restrictions, and our concerns regarding the two objections that have been submitted.

Heslington Lane is a busy commuter route and regularly experiences significant traffic volumes, particularly at peak times with queues building through Fulford. In its current state, parking—particularly under the existing single yellow line restrictions—creates clear safety issues.

From our experience, the current restrictions are not effective. Vehicles continue to park in ways that reduce visibility and narrow the road considerably. Turning right onto or from Heslington Lane is often extremely difficult due to poor sight lines, and cars and buses are frequently forced into the middle of the road to pass. This creates unnecessary risk for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists.

We have also witnessed a child being knocked over on this road, which highlights the very real safety concerns associated with the current situation.

Double yellow lines would significantly improve the safety of students and children accessing St Oswald's and Fulford School.

With no manned crossing at the Fulford Gate junction to Fulford school, clear visibility is essential and this is currently compromised by parked vehicles.

Whilst we understand the pressures raised by a small number of residents in terms of parking, the need to accommodate multiple vehicles should not come at the expense of safety—particularly for children, pedestrians, and cyclists using what is one of the busiest roads in Fulford. Heslington Lane serves a much wider community and the safety of all road users should be the primary consideration.

We have attached photographs which show the current situation and demonstrate how the existing single yellow line approach is not working in practice. We feel any extension of this would be ineffective as shown in these photos.

In our view, parking would be more safely accommodated on surrounding side streets rather than on Heslington Lane itself, where it interferes with visibility and traffic flow. Parking on quieter streets would present fewer risks to pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you for taking the time to include our statement in the meeting .

Kind regards, Natalie and Paul Ross





I1 – A Thomas:

I received an email concerning this meeting as a response to my previous objection.

I am unable to commit to the meeting for personal reasons but I wanted to email to assure you and the panel that my absence is not a lack of care or enthusiasm.

In fact as a local resident I will not be more reliant on getting a parking space so assist getting car seats and prams put of the car. So losing the spots outside the church will have a knock on effect for the entire community.

I am also a Brownie leader using the hall weekly. I see the drop off and pick up, and m can anticipate how disruptive the new restrictions would be.

I of course hope the outcome is a rejection. But I look forward to the reasoning in any case.

My key worries are that I cannot understand the arguments for the change. I recognise there is an effort to make that area or road safe for pedestrians, but this "solution" seems to complicate that, as I believe people will still park, especially for pick up/drop off. This makes the area less predictable.

I am a design engineer and have spent my career finding solutions, where the first question should always be "what is the true problem, and does this solution address the risks properly" rather than just appear to do something.

I strongly believe that the proposed solution does not address the issue, and in fact introduces more risk.

In order to actually make the road safer an alternative crossing methods, and even extending the parking area towards the junction or Murray Street. If the desire is safety crossing, then why stop short of putting a safe crossing method in? (Of course I recognise yellow paint is cheaper)

That became longer than I expected. I hope that translates to care, and i would be hugely grateful if my position could be explored during consultation.

I look forward to the decision and reasoning.

Many thanks

Alice Thomas