

Representations of Support	
1.	We are very much in support of the proposal to extend residents priority parking to Rosedale Street and Grange Garth where these street are currently hosting many regular free parking cars on a daily basis. We would ask you to resist any objections to the Scheme, on the grounds that if not fully implemented, the present problem we have will continue and get worse.
2.	As a recent arrival to Grange Garth I'm delighted by the forthcoming residents parking scheme. I write because I don't understand the need to maintain the no waiting area in the corners..... At the weekend I can park on the single yellow closest to my home and taking up no one else's parking, however that's not possible on a weekday. I'm not sure why, as the parking there doesn't block any access / cause difficulties on the road. So I would ask the council to reconsider the no waiting restriction proposed in the plans and allow the corner to be residents parking.
3.experience difficulties accessing my garage, tradesmen working on his property have been unable to park nearby. Grange Garth is used for free parking for people who work locally or in town and use the river path and residents of Grange Street who refuse to pay for permits. I will happily pay for permits to avoid the current stress and inconvenience. I thought the outcome of the survey with 61% of residents of Grange Garth opting for residents parking was a pretty clear and democratic indication. What type of objection would result in the Executive Member overruling the decision made by the majority of residents?
4.	With 12 signatures: I would like to once again give my support to the scheme. If Rosedale Street get Respark and not Grange Garth it will push more cars into Grange Garth as why buy a permit when you can park for free. I have lived here for 31 years and parking has got worse. Vehicles block your drive. A guest house nearby send guests to park here as they have more bedrooms than parking. The Dental Practice staff all park their cars. What is wrong with Park & Ride? We get people who park for 10 days to 3 weeks. Grange Garth is already Resident Parking at the top end, so why not the rest of it? We are wedged between New Walk Terrace and

	Grange Street – making us an overflow for free parking.
	Representations of Objection
5.	<p>I would like to register my objection to resident's parking being extended to cover Grange Garth for the following reasons: Only 19 households out of 46 want the scheme, which means that most people in the street either do NOT want it or do not care either way.</p> <p>At least one person who voted for the scheme (number 18 Grange Garth) has sold their house and no longer lives in the street. Many houses do not have any off street parking and so residents will have to pay to park in their own street (if they can indeed get a parking place).</p> <p>Only 8 out of 46 households wanted the scheme to apply 24 hours 7 days a week, whereas 19 people do NOT want it to be full time (12 who didn't want it at all plus the 7 who wanted it 9-50, so, if it has to go ahead, could it at least be weekdays only so that anyone visiting us at the weekend can park in the street? I feel that we are being bulldozed into this by what amounts to less than 20% of the residents.</p>
6.	<p>The majority of people who voted across the whole area considered for this scheme were against the proposal . The very reason the Rosedale residents complain about , the overflow parking from a res parking area (Grange st) will be visited upon the good burghers of Hartoft and farndale streets . How can this be sensible or democratic ?</p> <p>The most simple solution would be to lift the res parking in Grange street allowing those residents who won't / can't pay for parking in their own street , to park there . If there is a council agenda to raise funds through these schemes then let's see this benefit in these streets</p>
7.	<p>I am writing to register my objection, as a resident of Levisham Street, to the proposed extension of the Residents Parking Scheme to Grange Garth and Rosedale Street. At the time of consultation on the extension of this scheme, residents were given the impression that the scheme would be extended to all or none of the streets consulted based on majority vote. The current proposal to extend the scheme to two streets seems the worst of both worlds - the proposal reduces the number of parking spaces available to these streets as well as restricting them to permit holders, meaning that any visitor traffic and any residents of Rosedale Street and Grange Garth who prefer not to pay for</p>

	<p>permits will simply park in one of the remaining four streets instead. The proposal thus seems to disregard the majority opinion against the implementation of a ResPark scheme in the area as a whole. I have yet to see any evidence of non-resident parking causing problems - the streets are relatively clear during the daytime, and parking is generally more difficult in the evenings, because the volume of cars comes largely from residents and will not therefore be eased by the scheme.</p>
8.	<p>As a Resident of Farndale Street I wish to formally object to any extension of the respark scheme in our area, on the following grounds.</p> <p>The scheme as proposed originally was for an area vote, not individual streets, 63% said no.</p> <p>Myself & other residents could not attend the Public Decision Session as several work long hours & some were on the wrong shift.</p> <p>There is no need as there is no issue getting parked area at any time, I go to work at 5-30 every morning & since the original proposal have been counting spaces available in the streets. I return gone 18-30 in the evening & the situation is the same.</p> <p>There have always been plenty of spaces available in all streets in the scheme area, the exception being between Hartoft & Grange Street.</p> <p>Grange Street which is in the current respark scheme does not use a half of the places allocated, the reason for this is that a lot of the resident from Grange Street park in the streets where the new restriction are proposed. Removing the current scheme from Grange Street would stop this.</p> <p>The original request was from a selfish few residents from Rosedale Street all of which are new to the area, they will end up with personal bays for there properties & Farndale Street & Hartoft Street as well as Levisham will have the displaced vehicles parking down there streets.</p> <p>You will be creating a problem by trying to solve one that doesn't exist</p>
9.	<p>As residents of Farndale Street we are writing to strongly object to the Respark proposals currently under review for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 The present situation works well for the vast majority of the</p>

	<p>time. We have lived on Farndale Street for 24 years and although problems arise from time to time, they are quite rare.</p> <p>2 The number of parking spaces on Rosedale Street will be halved from 16 to 8, thereby putting greater pressure on available space elsewhere.</p> <p>3 Only FIVE people on Rosedale Street voted for the scheme.</p> <p>4 The vast majority of residents on Grange Garth have OFF STREET PARKING, why do they have a vote on ON STREET PARKING?</p> <p>5 If there is a Respark scheme on Rosedale Street, commuters, B&B customers, City Centre Shoppers and residents of Grange Street who do not pay for their space will park in Farndale Street and Hartoft Street. This would put more pressure on space on these streets. Therefore the area under review must be treated as ONE AREA under the vote. Single streets should not be allowed to sway the vote.</p> <p>6 The scheme is an unnecessary expense and inconvenience for Streets that voted overwhelmingly AGAINST the proposal.</p> <p>I do have sympathy for the residents of Rosedale Street who are under greater pressure of space availability than we are on Farndale Street. However, having to park a few yards around the corner is not a great inconvenience.</p>
10.	<p>I would like to OBJECT to the proposal in relation to Rosedale Street (YO10). My objection does not relate to the design of the scheme rather than the annual fees that are associated with it.</p> <p>Household parking permit application form https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/12936/household_parking_permit_application_form Assuming standard VED (Group D to I) - a charge of £99.95 per annum is applied (Car No.1)</p> <p>Where households have two cars an additional charge is levied.</p> <p>Additional household parking permit application form https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/12937/additional_household_parking_permit_application_form Additional permit is £182.50 per annum (Car No. 2)</p> <p>Therefore, in relation to our situation (two working adults with two cars) an additional annual premium (to park near our house) will be</p>

	<p>£282.45. This equates to adding 20% on to our Council tax bill.</p> <p>Please can you explain why Harrogate Borough Council only charge a flat £30/annum per car? https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/downloads/file/1334/resident_permit_terms_and_conditions</p> <p>I appreciate you want to incentivise residents not to (1) have a car and (2) not have more than one car but the fees associated with the York scheme appear disproportionate (dare I say it looks like profiteering). It is unclear how the 'excessive' fees are required to run the scheme when nearby Harrogate are able to do that charging £30 per car/per annum. Can the administrative charges between York and Harrogate be that different?</p> <p>In addition, once we have the scheme in place there is nothing to stop York Council doubling the charges (or worse)...fait accompli.</p>
11.	<p>Is it too late to object to the Rosedale proposals? I hadn't appreciated that other residents could object! It seems a big impact on the local area to please what seem to be about 8 houses, and from what I can see there is always space to park on that street.</p>
12.	<p>I write to you to fully oppose the parking restriction proposal around Rosedale Street and Grange Garth.</p>
13.	<p>I am writing to register my objection to the proposal to extend the R20 residents' parking area to include Rosedale Street and Grange Garth. Were this scheme to go ahead the whole of the surrounding area will be affected. As a Hartoft Street resident I am thankful that there is <u>just</u> enough parking in the area at present for us all to be able to find somewhere to park on our own street or very close by. I am all too aware that the restriction on numbers of places that the scheme will introduce in Rosedale Street will inevitably 'knock on' to other streets in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Looking at the figures in the consultation results it is clear that the overwhelming majority of responses were against the proposal. I note that most of the votes in favour were from Grange Garth, where ironically enough residents all have their own driveways and many also have garages.</p> <p>This scheme will potentially have a huge impact way beyond the</p>

	<p>delineated area, and I trust that the interests of the neighbourhood as a whole will be the primary consideration in this case.</p>
14.	<p>I would like to record my objection to reduce, by two metres, the double yellow lines at the junction of Grange Street and Rosedale Street. My reasons are for safety. These lines were placed to prevent vehicles parking too close to the junction. The need for them has not changed, it is not a safety improvement to shorten them.</p> <p>Many drivers take this corner too quickly and to avoid vehicles travelling in the other direction have to pull left to avoid a collision. The loss of those two metres will make a difference to the thinking and reaction times when these incidents occur.</p> <p>Having a vehicle two metres closer to the junction will create difficulties for larger HGV to manoeuvre the junction.</p> <p>The wiser course would be to extend the existing double yellow lines to the gated alleyway adjacent to 1 Rosedale Street and urge you to do so.</p>
15.	<p>I object to the proposed resident parking scheme recently voted for and the impact it will have on the parking on Levisham Street. An alternative solution should be explored.</p>
16.	<p>We are against the scheme as proposed for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Grange Garth -The vast majority of properties have driveways and garages and residents cars could be parked there, only those 6 properties facing the river not having that facility. In making the whole street residents parking at all times it will inevitably displace other vehicles or those of residents, who do not choose to pay for a permit for all their vehicles, onto the neighbouring streets namely Levisham, Hartoft and Farndale Streets, particularly during the day.</p> <p>Rosedale Street - There are only 8 properties on this street and residents parking bays for 8 vehicles could be provided on the east side of the street between the corner of Grange Street and Rosedale Street. Of those 8 properties Nos 4 and 11 already have space for off street parking and No 1 could provide it by parking in their backyard accessed by the gated alley at the side of the property.</p> <p>The rest of the street should be left with parking available to anyone including vehicles displaced from Grange Garth.</p> <p>The proposal to introduce "no waiting at any time" on the parts of the street without parking bays will lead to an increase in vehicle speeds and will further exacerbate the parking problems on</p>

	<p>Levisham, Hartoft and Farndale Streets.</p> <p>It is undemocratic in the extreme when 63% of the returns received from the area as a whole are against the scheme and yet the wishes of a clear minority will prevail , if this traffic order in its current form is passed, having a disadvantageous effect on that majority, particularly in the 3 streets where residents parking will not be introduced.</p>
17.	<p>I'm submitting an objection to the permit parking proposal on Rosedale Street. My concerns are, the permit will push cars to park in the neighbouring streets, including Hartoft and Levisham Street. Grange Street is currently permit parking, with some residents not paying for a permit and parking on the neighbouring streets. I imagine this will be the case too with Rosedale if the permit goes ahead.</p>
18.	<p>I would like to register my objections regarding the Respark proposals for Grange Garth.</p> <p>The proposal is for full time limitations. This is based on this preference receiving the most votes, with, I assume, only those that voted YES to Respark stating a preference. Since votes for the full time proposal were 3 fewer than those voting for part-time or responding with 'don't know', I request that whole street is asked to vote on the timescale issue once again before it is finalised.</p> <p>Together the pro-part-time, 'don't know', the NO voters and the abstainers make up a sizable majority, so this is a very reasonable request.</p> <p>On cost, I object most strongly. I am very unhappy for implementation to go ahead without more transparency of costs/income to CYC, and a full public justification of the cost of the respark scheme.</p> <p>The cost is extremely high and the banding of vehicles based on emission rates both requires justification, as it (1) unfairly impacts low income households who cannot afford a new car, and (2) does not take into account miles driven. A low emission car driven regularly may make more emissions overall than it's counterpart driven infrequently.</p> <p>Further, Leeds respark schemes are provided at no cost to the resident.</p> <p>https://www.leeds.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/parking/parking-schemes-and-permits/resident-parking-permits</p> <p>Shame on York for not doing so for its citizens. So, CYC is clearly using this as an easy source of income.</p>

	<p>Please provide answers to the following questions for 2017/18 year end:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of Traffic Enforcement Officers • Any other costs associated with the implementation of the schemes - my assumption being that these would be one off costs, but since the new policy is apparently to only use signage (and not marked bays) then these should be less than in previous years • Income raised from penalty charge notices • Income raised from the respark scheme. <p>If these are even close to break-even, and certainly if CYC shows a profit in these matters, then there is no justification for current costs.</p> <p>You, as CYC, could of course implement a congestion charge, which would have benefits for residents city-wide. However, your transport policy-makers lack the courage to annoy businesses rather than make changes to benefit the people for whom they are elected to serve.</p> <p>As an addendum, I would like to ask the following as the more pertinent question;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the costs of Traffic Enforcement Officers, reduced PRO RATA for the amount of time they are scheduled to spend monitoring ResPark streets. <p>This, as I'm sure you understand, will give a better view of the cost vs income directly related to respark. I would assume this figure is easy to calculate based on their agreed working schedules. I would imagine the majority of officers time is spent around the excessive number of city centre car parks!</p>
19.	<p>I OBJECT to the costs to residents to park in their own street. I already pay my council tax although there is no street lighting on my section of road, no green bin for my garden waste, no wheelie bin for landfill waste for which I supply my own plastic bags and the road surface is overdue for resurfacing.</p> <p>The York Respark permits are expensive and compare unfavourably with other towns and cities i.e. Wythenshaw Manchester Free; Leeds Free; Islington London - low CO2</p>

	<p>emissions car £18.20 pa; Chester 1st car £60 2nd car £90; Harrogate £30pa per car; Slough 1st car £25 -2nd car £50pa. Admittedly some councils charge morebut I was surprised to find charges vary from city to city and wonder how City of York Council chose it's levy.</p> <p>I realise administration fees need to be paid by those using the scheme but if Harrogate can manage by charging £30 per car whether it's a first car or second then surely York can do the same? Maybe look at Andy D'Agorne's suggestion of a blanket charge of £50 or preferably less per car pa?</p> <p>Once we are in the scheme could the council increase the charge year on year?</p>
20.	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Rosedale Street. The proposed scheme reduces parking in Rosedale Street by at least 50%. Vehicles normally parking in that street will move to Farndale Street, Hartoft Street, Levisham Street or Grange Garth which are always fully parked at busy times. The proposed scheme will make the situation significantly worse, not better, for residents in all these streets.</p>
21.	<p>I object to the ResPark on Grange Garth on the grounds that the residents there have driveways and are able to park their cars off the road. However, on Hartoft Street, where the majority of the residents do not want a ResPark scheme do not have driveways. I am very concerned that there will be displacement as a result of the ResPark scheme from Grange Garth (where there are driveways) to Hartoft Street (where there aren't driveways). As a result of this, the residents of Hartoft Street may either have to adopt the ResPark scheme (which the street on the whole does not want to do) or may have difficulties parking (which is not a problem at present). I also think there is a financial inequality here: the houses on Grange Garth are more expensive and thus presumably owned by higher earners who may be more able to afford the ResPark scheme than those on Hartoft Street. It does not seem just that those with driveways are able to institute a parking scheme that may result in either parking problems or forced adoption of a parking scheme on a neighbouring street without</p>

	<p>driveways and whose residents are on the whole may be on a lower income. I fully support the ResPark scheme on Rosedale Street as these houses do not have driveways and I appreciate the problems with parking that arise for the residents of this street.</p>
22.	<p>R20 extension REPRESENTATIONS TO THE REPORT GRANGE GARTH</p> <p>I have two initial comments:</p> <p>Firstly it seems bizarre that while we're asked to address ourselves to the Director of Economy and Place <i>no name</i> for this person is given anywhere on the papers that have been delivered to our houses (some residents still say they never received one or both sets of papers despite protestations to the contrary). We do know the Executive Member's and the Project Officer's names, so why not the HoD?</p> <p>Secondly, the use of English in the 'documents' is very unhelpful at various junctures, and the details are woolly, making it extremely difficult for most people to get a clear idea of the options, and costs; this would make their decisions informed and meaningful, and allow them to make logical constructive suggestions at this juncture. A cynic might suggest this is the aim.</p> <p>The clarity problems are as follows in no particular order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual eventual cost to us is clear as mud. • The annual charges are not even in 'numerical totals' order • I have tried to Google DVLA classes A-M to try to understand costs to residents to no avail. A link could have been included. • At no point <i>anywhere</i> in the papers does it state clearly that parking will be bay-free. I have just had to reskim every side of the 14 to eventually rest on the 2 maps which actually have different information re this. • Again nowhere in the paperwork does it clearly indicate an amendment that means that the bays at the start of Grange Garth will be, by implication, repainted & retained, and the entrance signage will only (& sensibly) begin on approach to the right hand bend around no8, where new restrictions start. <i>Surely this should be printed clearly in the text for residents to understand?</i> I think this is definitely preferable to signs

at the Fishergate/Fulford Rd/ New Walk junction [too complex, status quo remains].

- At no point *anywhere* in the papers does it state clearly that **the first permit is household not vehicle specific**. We have fought against the res pk scheme x3 before. One of the prohibitive factors is the **cost** (for the right to park in our own street). Again although I have received 2 assurances that the first Res Pk permit is HOUSEHOLD NOT VEHICLE SPECIFIC **A) from AnnMarie Howath**, your department, 25th June “....the first Household Permit is not vehicle specific to **allow it to be used for any vehicle in or at the household**”. **B) from Andy D’Agorne** 5th July “As currently organised there is provision for the [1st] permit to be transferable between vehicles.” There is no clear statement of this. **It is the ONLY WAY we’d find this scheme tenable as we park first on the drive & second on the road (or vice versa) according to who arrives home first etc.** Many of our neighbours feel likewise.
- The worst **culprit for confusion** and one would argue ‘unfairness’ is the **table of figures**. Taking Grange Garth alone 67% voted (although overall only 52% did making it feel somewhat Brexit-like). The decision to have **restrictions 24/7** as opposed to 9-5 Mon –Fri was taken by 8/15 of those who stated a preference BUT NOT BY +50% of those who voted. Indeed it could be argued that the 1 person who suggested an alternative actually voted with those who were against 24/7; that **makes it ‘a tie’**. Interestingly 4 people did not state a preference (this may have been oversight, uncertainty, lack of time to process all the woolly info etc. **So only 8/19 voted for the much more prohibitive 24/7 restrictions** which will be more problematic on many levels including 2-car households, evening visitors, weekend guests, though admittedly allowing some infiltration from outsiders. **THIS IS NOT A MAJORITY**. And one might indeed ask **WHY is the 8.30am – 8pm** not offered as an option which would resolve most of the outside encroachment *giving residents an easier set of restrictions with which to live*. **We ask that these options be looked at again by the whole street now the outcome is up for final consideration.**

There are many other loosely defined or hard to find issues that are difficult to understand properly

- The info re Household Authority Cards & visitor permits is pretty hard to grasp meaningfully as it appears in 2 places
- Having been told categorically that 1st permit household not vehicle specific [the only semi-acceptable format for many of us] from more than one source, **none** of how this would work is explained
- Some of us occasionally park across our own drives – no outsider has ever done this, neighbours have understandings with neighbours re being asked to move if there is a problem etc. We had been told verbally that we could continue to park as we are used to but there is a phrase in your own paperwork “...not parked..across a dropped kerb”. Again woolly information did not offer a sound basis to our voting
- No mention is made of the amount entailed in finer should one (or guests) slip up during getting used to a new set up. It is a pertinent piece of information. The term Civil Enforcement Team for traffic wardens rings faintly of Orwell’s Double Speak. Indeed the whole document might do well to adhere to Gower’s Plain (& comprehension-enabling) English, I respectfully suggest.

Finally I would like to speak on behalf of myself & near neighbours when we say that we feel rather like we are paying for the privilege of an official coming to ‘catch people out’ to provide another incomes stream for our council.

We particularly object to the amount we are charged here in York when compared to say Harrogate or Scarborough, indeed most places in N Yorkshire; I have just found this re Leeds ‘There is no charge for a resident permit’!! **We would like to support Cllr D’Argorne’s request for a scrutiny review on Res Parking Schemes.**