

ANNEX B - Objections

Objection A

I objected to the proposal for residents parking originally, because our on-site parking is restricted to one car. Our drive is accessed from Westfield Drive as we are on the corner.

If we have residents parking it will cause a problem when people visit us and if we have our daughters visit us who live away, we will need to have these parking tickets all the time, as we cannot accommodate their vehicles on site, whereas other properties on Broadway West have long drive ways plus a cross over on the verge which means they do not have problems when people visit.

Why is our frontage on Westfield Drive included in this resident's zone? We need that frontage for parking for visitors. This zone is Westfield Drive and should not be included.

The reason for people in Westfield Drive objecting to residents parking is they have restricted on-site parking and need unfettered parking on the road even though the road width is restricted.

I would therefore ask that our section of Westfield Drive is removed from the Broadway West scheme

Recommendation (3) to alter the zone boundary to exclude all of Westfield Drive.

Objection B

I am writing to raise an objection to the proposed boundaries of the new ResPark scheme on Broadway West. The proposed boundary extends some considerable way along Westfield Drive and will significantly limit the amount of on-street parking. This is a particular concern as the street will likely be affected by increased non-resident parking with the implementation of resident-only parking on all neighbouring streets, and many houses on Westfield Drive do not have off-street parking. Moreover, the drawing of this boundary does not appear to be consistent with how the scheme has been implemented in existing areas on Danesmead Estate and Fulford Cross, where the boundary runs to the end of the road, rather than following house boundaries. I presume that the proposed boundary may relate to the usage of existing poles. However this does not

seem to me a significantly justified reason for something which will impact considerably on the parking available to residents of the Westfield Drive

Recommendation (3) to alter the zone boundary to exclude all of Westfield Drive.

Objection C

'I was informed by a neighbour that Broadway West will become residents only parking soon. I wanted to ask if this was right, and, if it is, when it would come into effect.

'Also, if this change is going to take place, would it be possible to apply for a residents permit? My house is (on) Fulford Road, meaning Broadway West is adjacent and the nearest public road to my house. We are literally 4 or 5 doors away. We typically park there as it is the closest and safest place to park and get two small children out of the car. There is no parking on Fulford Road itself.'

Properties front a section of Fulford Road that is subject to no waiting at any time, within the approach to the traffic lights. They do have a rear service road (from ST Oswald's Road).

Recommendation (4) to alter the zone boundary to include properties within the Qualifying Zone for obtaining permits.

Objection D

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposal to restrict parking in Broadway West to residents only.

1. Like many people I enjoy access to the parkland, riverside and woodland at the end of Broadway West. My wife and I are pensioners and will shortly be of an age when like many others we will be able to access this amenity only by driving to the end of Broadway West.

2. A glance at the map shows that Broadway and Broadway West were originally laid out as major thoroughfares at right angles to Fulford Road and not simply as residential streets. The clue is in the name "Broadway". The proposal will limit access.
3. The properties on either side of Broadway West have driveways and garages. The residents have no need of resident- only privileges.
4. Other nearby streets (such as Moorland Road) will bear the brunt of additional visitors who can no longer park in Broadway West and (a) those streets are narrower and it is more difficult to accommodate parking for non-residents (unlike Broadway West) and (b) in the case of Moorland Road and others, there is no off street driveways or garages for the use of residents.

This objection was acknowledged.

Objection E

This was a long documents with the following headings:

1. Majority Vote is not a valid reason for implementing the Scheme
2. The continual expansion of ResPark does not reflect a "listening Council"
3. The vote of residents was influenced by the Executive Member for Transport
4. Verge Access Parking restrictions
5. Displacement Parking
6. Additional car movements
7. Loss of green spaces
8. York Council should first implement a clear, valid ResPark policy

9. Lack of investigation / monitoring / consideration into whether the Scheme is justified
10. The Scheme is not justified
11. Requirement to secure the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities
12. Use of Council funds
13. Aims of the LTP and Council Plan
14. Equalities
15. Alternative Means of Dealing with Alleged obstruction
16. CONCLUSION

This begins with 'In my view, once the statutory and public law requirements are taken into account and the matter is objectively analysed, I do not believe that it is reasonable, rational or proportionate to implement the Scheme, and that it clearly leads to far worse issues than it solves. I also believe that a proper consideration of the matters required by the Road Traffic Regulation Act would lead to the Scheme not proceeding. The benefits of the Scheme are very limited. They seem to be:

- It reflects what the Residents have voted for (although they were not asked to vote on alternatives and, as shown in 2018, were actually against ResPark being implemented in the area at all, and the actual benefit to those Residents appears slight given that they are presumably the majority of Residents who do not park on the street in any case) - It may assist in alleged obstruction issues (although those are disputed, unverified and at worst minor and infrequent issues and can be addressed by alternative strategies that do not give rise to the list of negative impacts below) The negative impacts of the Scheme include: - Leaving one of the most suitable streets for parking in either Fishergate Ward or Fulford and Heslington Ward near-empty, thereby hogging prime parking stock - Displacing parking to streets that are clearly less suitable to take that parking, likely to cause greater obstruction and traffic management issues and greater issues of pressure for parking than currently exist in the area - Prejudicing Westfield Drive due to a scheme it has voted against twice - Criminalising slight errors in the use of Verge Access parking - Damaging community relationships if the Parking Hotline

Number is used to report those minor infringements - Impacting on the flexibility of residents, their guests and tradesman to use the street for parking - Creating financial and administrative burden for Residents - Creating the burden of egress issues for households with multiple cars - Worsening emissions, due to those egress issues and displaced cars manoeuvring and looking for the best parking spots on less suitable roads - Encouraging Residents to pave over green areas in front gardens, making for a less green and attractive street that absorbs less carbon dioxide - Creating additional risks for pedestrians and cyclists by encouraging Residents to park off-road, thereby creating additional vehicle movements over the pavement and additional reversing manoeuvres over the pavement and into the road - Closing Broadway West off as a location for EV charge points - Making access to public amenities like Millennium Fields, Millennium Bridge, Danesmead Wood and Rowntree Park more difficult - Will come at significant cost to public funds, in a manner not compliant with the Council's LTP policy - Discriminating against multi-occupancy households (indirectly age), part time workers or persons on maternity leave (sex and pregnancy/maternity) and persons of certain faiths (religious).