

**Decision Session – Executive Member for  
Transport**

**11 May 2021**

Report of the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning

**Consideration of results from the consultation on the potential implementation of Residents Priority Parking in Slingsby Grove, Royal Chase, Regency Mews, Kensington Court, 64-90A Tadcaster Road and St. Edwards Close.**

**Summary**

1. To report the results following a consultation undertaken in January 2021 for all residential and business properties, and the affected properties that have frontages/access onto the proposed area. Then determine what action is deemed appropriate (plan of consultation area included in Annex A).

**Recommendation**

2. (1) It is recommended that approval be given to take no further action towards the implementation of Residents Priority parking on Slingsby Grove, Royal Chase, Regency Mews, Kensington Court and 64-90A Tadcaster Road, and remove the consulted area from the Residents Parking waiting list.

Reason: 66% of the respondents from the above properties were against the proposed scheme.

- (2) It is recommended that approval be given to implement Residents Priority parking on St. Edwards Close with times of operation being 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.

Reason: 89% of respondents from St. Edwards Close were in favour of the proposed scheme and the preferred times of operation were 24/7.

## Background

3. (1) Following a survey undertaken by the residents of Slingsby Grove we received a petition to add Slingsby Grove to the waiting list for Residents Priority parking. The request was reported to the Executive Member for Transport on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2019.  
  
(2) Following a survey undertaken by the residents of St. Edwards Close we received a petition to add St. Edwards Close to the waiting list for Residents Priority parking. The request was reported to the Executive Member for Transport on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020.
4. The Executive Member gave approval to consult with residents when the areas reached the top of the waiting list. Due to the close proximity of the two requests it was decided to undertake both consultations at the same time.
5. In order to try and prevent any displacement of parking issues from Slingsby Grove to neighbouring streets the decision was taken to widen the proposed boundary of the scheme to include Royal Chase, Regency Mews and Kensington Court as they are in very close proximity to Slingsby Grove. The businesses and residential properties of 64-90A Tadcaster were also included in the consultation as any scheme implemented would have a direct affect upon their businesses and were sited within the petition of Slingsby Grove as being a contributing factor to the current parking issues.
6. The consultation documentation (Annex C) was hand delivered on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2021 requesting residents return their preferences on the questionnaire sheet in the freepost envelope or by email to [highway.regulation@york.gov.uk](mailto:highway.regulation@york.gov.uk) by 15<sup>th</sup> February.
7. A further letter was hand delivered to the business properties of 68-90 Tadcaster Road (Annex D) to provide information regarding business permits they would be permitted to purchase should the scheme be implemented, and costs of the permits. The letter also advised that if the proposed scheme was implemented there would be a recommendation to change the restrictions of the parking bay on the eastern side of Tadcaster Road, opposite the businesses, from being unrestricted parking to a maximum of 3 hours parking

with no return within 1 hour. The letter advised this would allow visitors to the businesses to park locally and provide them with enough time to access products and services.

### Consultation Results (for full details see Annex E)

8. In total 109 properties were consulted and asked to return their questionnaires. 73 properties returned their votes for or against the proposed scheme.

	TOTAL	Returned	% For	% Against
Slingsby Grove	<b>34</b>	24(71%)	42%	58%
Royal Chase	<b>14</b>	11(78%)	36%	64%
Kensington Court	<b>13</b>	12(92%)	50%	50%
Regency Mews	<b>16</b>	8(50%)	25%	75%
Tadcaster Road	<b>19</b>	9(47%)	0%	100%
Results	<b>96</b>	64(66%)	34%	66%

	TOTAL	Returned	% For	% Against
St. Edwards Close	<b>13</b>	9(69%)	89%	11%

### Preferred Times of Operation (for full details see Annex E)

9. Of the 64 respondents of Slingsby Grove, Royal Chase, Regency Mews, Kensington Court and 64-90A Tadcaster Road 12 respondents (19%) preferred 24/7, 28(44%) preferred Mon-Fri 9am to 5pm and a combined 24(37%) preferred 'other' times of operation or provided no preference on the returned questionnaires.
10. Of the 9 respondents of St. Edwards Close 7(78%) of respondents preferred 24/7, 1(11%) preferred Mon-Fri 9am to 5pm and 1(11%) preferred an 'other' time of operation as '10am to 11am/2pm to 3pm and all race days'.

### Residents Comments (see Annex E for full details)

11. The most common comments across all residents, who were for or against Residents Priority parking, suggested the problems on Slingsby Grove were being caused by customers of the businesses

of Tadcaster Road parking for short periods on the double yellow lines located at the junction of Slingsby Grove/Tadcaster Road, employees of the businesses of Tadcaster Road parking on Slingsby Grove leading to a reduction of on-street parking amenity and non-residents parking on Slingsby Grove in order to use the bus service between York and Leeds.

## Options

12. The available options are:

- A. Take no further action at this time towards the implementation of Residents Priority parking on Slingsby Grove, Royal Chase, Regency Mews, Kensington Court and 64-90A Tadcaster Road, and take forward the formal advertisement of the TRO process for St. Edwards Close only(recommended).

This option is recommended as from the votes we received 66% were registered against the proposed scheme for Slingsby Grove, Royal Chase, Regency Mews, Kensington Court and 64-90A Tadcaster Road and 89% of the votes registered from residents of St. Edwards Close were in favour of the scheme to be implemented on St. Edwards Close.

- B. Take no further action at this time towards the implementation of Residents Priority parking across the whole of the consulted area as 59% voted against the scheme(not recommended)

This option is not recommended as we received two separate petitions, at separate times, from residents of Slingsby Grove and St. Edwards Close with votes being in favour of implementing Residents Priority parking on St. Edwards Close.

- C. Take forward the formal advertisement of the TRO process for the whole of the consulted area(not recommended)

This option is not recommended as from the whole number of votes registered 59% were against the implementation of the scheme.

## Council Plan

13. The Council Plan has Eight Key Outcomes:

- Well-paid jobs and an inclusive economy
- A greener and cleaner city
- Getting around sustainably
- Good health and wellbeing
- Safe communities and culture for all
- Creating homes and world-class infrastructure
- A better start for children and young people
- An open and effective council

14. The recommended proposal contributes to the Council being open and effective as it responds to the request of the residents to solve the problems they are experiencing.

## Implications

15. The report has the following implications:

**Financial-** If the recommended option is not agreed then the following would apply: Residents parking schemes are self-financing once in operation. The £5k allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking schemes.

**Human Resources-** If a scheme was implemented, enforcement would fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load.

**Legal** – If the recommended option is not agreed then any proposals implemented would require amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014. Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 apply.

**Crime and Disorder-** None

**Information Technology-** None

**Land-** None

**Other-** None

**Risk Management-** There is an acceptable level of risk with the recommended option.

## Contact Details

**Authors:**

Geoff Holmes  
Traffic Projects Officer

Tel: 01904 551475

**Chief Officer responsible for the report:**

James Gilchrist  
Director of Environment, Transport and  
Planning

**Approved date** 28.04.21

**Annexes:**

Annex A: Plan of Consultation Area

Annex B: Cover Letter

Annex C: Consultation Documents and Questionnaire

Annex D: Business Permits Clarification Letter

Annex E: Consultation Results

Annex F: Residents Comments