

Meeting:	Executive Member Decision Session
Meeting date:	20/01/2025
Report of:	James Gilchrist
Portfolio of:	Cllr. Ravilious. Executive Member for Transport

Decision Report: Consideration of results received from the informal consultation to implement Residents Priority Parking in the Huntington Road area to be known as ‘R67: Huntington Road’.

Subject of Report

1. To report the results of the informal consultation and representations received from residents in response to a proposal to implement Resident’s Priority Parking scheme (Respark). The Respark area to be known as R67: Huntington Road, which is proposed to include properties on Huntington Road, Kitchener Street, Oakville Street, Ashville Street, Oakville Court and Yearsley Crescent to determine if the Respark proposal should progress to statutory consultation following the responses received from the informal consultation. The report also considers the representations received from residents of Haleys Terrace and Somerset Road regarding their views on being added to the proposed scheme if it were to be progressed.

Benefits and Challenges

2. The benefits are we have met our obligation to consult with relevant stakeholders providing them with the opportunity to provide comments either in favour or against the proposed scheme and take those responses into consideration when recommending if the proposal should move to the Statutory Consultation stage.

3. The challenges of the process are that the decision made will not be the desired results of all residents and may create other issues for residents. Had we not consulted we would not have provided ourselves with an opportunity to consider the views of the affected residents prior to statutory consultation been undertaken.

Policy Basis for Decision

4. The recommendation not to take the proposed scheme to Statutory Consultation is in line with officers' current approach of not recommending progressing Resident's Priority Parking schemes if a 50% response rate is not achieved.
5. However, should the decision be made to progress to Statutory Consultation and following the further consultation the scheme is implemented this will comply with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) objective of "*the transfer of inward commuting and visitor trips to the Park & Ride service, combined with restricting the availability of city centre parking, will remain a key strategy for reducing trips in the urban area*". Including reducing vehicle miles and creating high quality public realm for residents.

Financial Strategy Implications

6. The recommended option within the report has no future financial implications.
7. If the proposal is progressed to Statutory Consultation, then the cost of advertisement will be funded from the core transport budget.

Recommendation and Reasons

8. It is recommended that approval be given to take no further action at the current time and remove the area from the resident's parking consultation waiting list.
9. The recommended option is in response to the low response rate received from the residents within the proposed scheme's boundary area. It is acknowledged the responses received were in favour of the proposed scheme. However, the level of responses received in favour in comparison to the overall number of properties consulted does not indicate support for the scheme.

Background

10. A petition was received in December 2019 which included signatures from residents on Yearsley Crescent. The petition included 31 signatures.
11. In addition, a further separate petition was received in October 2020 from residents of Kitchener Street. The petition included 19 signatures.
12. The two petitions requested we consider implementing a Resident's Priority Parking scheme to prevent commuter parking in both areas. The receipt of the petitions was acknowledged by York Council and approval granted for the two streets to be added to the Resident Parking waiting list for consultation.
13. As the streets are in close proximity, it was proposed to progress the consultation as one area, as restricting parking in one street would affect parking in the nearby areas. Due to the impact of the introduction on the nearby area the informal consultation was expanded to include all properties on Oakville Street, Ashville Street, Oakville Court and properties No's 75-143 and 94-166 on Huntington Road. Oakville Court is located on a private unadopted access road with limited off-street parking amenity. Oakville Court was included in the consultation as residents of, and visitors to, these properties may need to park on Huntington Road and would require permits to do so. As such a boundary plan for a wider area was created. The boundary plan is detailed in Annex B.
14. We hand delivered all the relevant consultation documentation to all properties within the proposed area on 22nd August 2024 and requested residents and businesses return their questionnaires by email wherever possible or to the freepost address provided by 19th September 2024. All consultation documents, including the consultation letter, boundary plan, Respark information including current costs and questionnaire sheet are detailed in Annex A.
15. As restricting parking in a Respark zone can lead to a displacement of parking in to surrounding areas it was also deemed appropriate to consult with the residents and businesses of Haleys Terrace and Somerset Road to determine if they would like us to consider including these areas in the Respark scheme if it were to be taken forward. The letter sent to the residents and

businesses of Haleys Terrace and Somerset Road is detailed in Annex B.

Consultation Analysis

16. A total of 267 properties within the proposed boundary received the consultation documentation. 63 responses were received and of this total 38 were in favour of the proposed scheme and 25 were against any scheme being implemented. Of the 63 responses, when asked if a scheme was to be implemented, 34 preferred a full time restriction. A full table of the results is detailed in Annex C.
17. Of the 38 responses received in favour, 12 provided further written representation with the majority expressing concerns regarding commuter parking and the number of HMO's (all from Yearsley Crescent) leading to an increase in cars per household. All representations received in favour are detailed in Annex D.
18. Of the 25 responses received against the proposed scheme, 7 provided further written representations with the majority expressing concerns regarding the cost of permits and the financial impact when managing a limited budget. All representations received against the proposed scheme are detailed in Annex E.
19. In response to the 21 letters delivered to the residents and businesses of Haley's Terrace we received 4 responses requesting we add it to the scheme if taken forward. No residents of Somerset Road responded to the consultation.
20. If approval to progress to Statutory Consultation is granted, which is not the recommended option, further consultation would be conducted. This would include Notices of Proposal placed on street, in the press and copies of the notice would be delivered to all properties within the affected area. A letter would also be delivered with the notice to advise residents how they can provide representation on the proposal, which would be considered at a further decision session, where a final decision would be made on if the scheme should be implemented or not.
21. It is acknowledged that from the response received, 60% were in favour of the proposal. However, the consultation did provide a low response rate, of 267 properties consulted only 63 (23.59%) responded. Therefore the percentage of properties in favour of the

proposal from the proposed area is only 14.2%. There was no response from 76.4% of the proposed area of Respark, which constitutes a large proportion of residents who have decided not to engage on the matter.

22. Following the consultation, we received representations from all ward Councillors, who expressed their support of the scheme progressing to the Statutory Consultation stage.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

Option 1 (Recommended Option)

23. To take no further action and remove the area from the waiting list.
24. This is the recommended option as it is in line with officers' current policy when assessing informal consultation results for proposed Respark restrictions and not progressing them to the next stage of Statutory Consultation when a very low response rate is received.

Option 2 (Not Recommended)

25. To advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce new Resident's Priority Parking restrictions to the whole consultation area, known to be R67 Huntington Road and to operate 24 hours Monday to Sunday.
26. This is not the recommended option as it is against current officer policy due to the low response rate received from the consulted area.

Option 3 (Not Recommended)

27. To advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce new Resident's Priority Parking restrictions to the whole consultation area and to also include Haleys Terrace within the proposed scheme, and to operate 24 hours Monday to Sunday. A boundary plan for this option is detailed in Annex F.
28. This is not the recommended option as it is against current officer policy due to the low response rate received from the consulted area.

Organisational Impact and Implications

29. This report has the following implications:

30.

- **Financial:** If the recommended option is approved there is no financial implication. Should approval be given to progress to advertisement then funds allocated within the core transport budget will be used to progress the proposed residents parking scheme to legal advertisement. If the scheme is then implemented the ongoing enforcement and administrative management of the additional residents parking provision will need to be resourced from the department's budget, funded through income generated by the new restrictions.
- **Human Resources (HR):** If restrictions are progressed to advertisement and implemented on street, enforcement will fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers adding a new Resident Parking area and limited waiting restrictions. New zones/areas also impact on the Business Support Administrative services as well as Parking Services. Provision will need to be made from the income generated from new schemes to increase resources in these areas as well as within the Civil Enforcement Team as and when required.
- **Legal:** The recommended option would not have any Legal implications.
If the option to progress to Statutory Consultation is approved, then a proposal to amend the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014 would be required to be advertised.
The Council regulates traffic by means of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which can prohibit, restrict, or regulate the use of a road, or any part of the width of a road, by vehicular traffic. In making decisions on TROs, the Council must consider the criteria within Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and, in particular, the duty to make decisions to secure the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

The balance between these considerations must come to the appropriate decision.

When considering any parking restrictions proposed, the Traffic Authority has to consider its duty (as stated above) against the factors mentioned in Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the implementation of the Local Transport Plan's objective of restricting commuter and visitor parking close to the city centre to encourage the use of Park & Ride and sustainable modes of transport in the urban area.

- **Procurement:** As the recommended option is to take no further action, there will be no requirement for any procurement.
- **Health and Wellbeing:** As the recommendation is to take no further action the health and wellbeing of residents will remain neutral.
- **Environment and Climate action:** As the recommendation is to take no further action the environment and climate actions will remain neutral. However, if the area is being utilised by commuters then implementing residents parking restrictions will restrict the number of vehicle movements looking to find on street parking and encourage the use of more sustainable transport modes for non-residents by reducing the opportunities to park in or close to the city centre, in line with Local Transport Plan objectives.
- **Affordability:** As the recommendation is to take no further action the affordability on residents will remain unchanged. Should any restrictions progress residents requiring on street parking will be required to pay to purchase a resident parking permit (or other permit as applicable) along with any visitor permits which would also be required. The impact on residents is likely to be high as the area consists of terraced streets with no access to off street parking. In addition, businesses on Huntington Road would lose their ability to park unrestricted and remove any access to all day parking for staff.

The drivers which may currently park to utilise free on street parking for commuting purposes would have to find somewhere else to park, possibly at a cost (car parks, pay and display bays or Park & Ride), change transport mode or change destination.
- **Equalities and Human Rights:** The Council recognises its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate

discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions). The impact of the recommendation on protected characteristics has been considered as follows:

- Age – Neutral.
- Disability – Neutral, as Blue Badge holders can park in Residents parking zones free of charge for unlimited durations.
- Gender – Neutral;
- Gender reassignment – Neutral;
- Marriage and civil partnership– Neutral;
- Pregnancy and maternity - Neutral;
- Race – Neutral;
- Religion and belief – Neutral;
- Sexual orientation – Neutral;
- Other socio-economic groups including :
 - Carer - Neutral;
 - Low income groups – Neutral;
 - Veterans, Armed Forces Community– Neutral

It is recognised that individual traffic regulation order requests may impact protected characteristics in different ways according to the specific nature of the traffic regulation order being considered. The process of consulting on the recommendations in this report will identify any equalities implications on a case-by-case basis which may lead to an individual Equalities Impact Assessment being carried out in due course.

- **Data Protection and Privacy:** No issues have been identified.
- **Communications:** No issues have been identified.
- **Economy:** No issues have been identified.

Risks and Mitigations

31. No detrimental risks have been identified

Wards Impacted

32. Heworth

Contact details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

Author

Name:	James Gilchrist
Job Title:	Director of Environment, Transport and Planning
Service Area:	Place
Telephone:	01904 552547
Report approved:	Yes/No
Date:	09/01/2025

Co-author

Name:	Geoff Holmes
Job Title:	Traffic Project Officer
Service Area:	Environment, Transport and Planning
Telephone:	01904 551475
Report approved:	Yes
Date:	07/01/2025

Background papers

Annexes

- Annex A- All consultation documents, including the consultation letter, boundary plan, Respark information and costs and questionnaire sheet.
- Annex B- Letter sent to residents and businesses of Haleys terrace and Somerset Road.
- Annex C- Table of consultation results.
- Annex D- Representations received in favour of the proposal.
- Annex E- Representations received against the proposal.

- Annex F- R67 proposed boundary plan including Haleys Terrace.