

Meeting:	The Executive Member for Transport Decision Session
Meeting date:	28/04/2026
Report of:	Garry Taylor
Portfolio of:	Cllr. Ravilious. Executive Member for Transport

Decision Report: Consideration of representations received during the Statutory Consultation for the proposed amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

Subject of Report

1. Consideration of representations received, in support or objection, to the advertised proposals to amend the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) detailed in Annexes A to P, which have been considered as part of the annual review process.
2. A decision on each proposal is important as it will provide the Council with the approval for an outcome and ensure the appropriate changes are made to the traffic restrictions to address the concerns raised if required.

Benefits and Challenges

3. The benefit provided from the annual review process are that the Council have listened to the issues and safety concerns that the residents have raised and considered the views of the wider area through the consultation process.
4. The challenges of the process are that the decisions made will not be the desired results of all residents and may create other issues for residents.

Policy Basis for Decision

5. The proposals have been brought forward following safety issues and concerns about parking. The proposals look to resolve the safety issues, which in some areas were creating issues with vehicles parking on footpaths and removing accessible safe routes, plus obstructing bus routes. The proposals also look to re-enforce the Highway Code and to support City of York Council's Transport Strategy, with particular attention applied to our transport hierarchy.

Financial Strategy Implications

7. The annual review process is undertaken to reduce the cost associated with an amendment to Traffic Regulation Orders by batching the works together. The Council has been able to advertise the proposed amendments of 87 different restrictions across the city, which has reduced the costs of press adverts (statutory requirement) and officer time through the creation of one report for all the proposal.

Recommendation and Reasons

8. It is recommended that the Executive Member consider the original proposals for each issue together with representations received and make a decision from the options given on the Ward/individual Annexes.
 - a) Implement as Advertised
 - b) Uphold the objections and take no further action
 - c) Implement a lesser restriction than advertised; for example a shorter length of restrictions
 - d) Other options relevant to the proposal and representations received

Reason: To ensure that appropriate changes are made to traffic restrictions to address concerns raised.

Background

9. The Council receives a number of non-urgent requests for changes to the TRO each year. Typically, these are for additional “no waiting at any time” (double yellow line) restrictions or minor changes to Residents’ Priority Parking (ResPark) Schemes. These requests are considered together on an annual basis; this saves officer time and money, because any changes can all be advertised at the same time, which helps to ensure parity of treatment. In each case site visits are carried out to determine to what extent there is a traffic management or safety problem.
10. The approval to advertise the proposed changes to the TRO was received under the officer decision and granted by the Director of Environmental and Regulatory Services. The Notice of Proposal was advertised on the 31st October 2025, providing a consultation period of 3 weeks to provide representations on the proposals. As part of the consultation the Council posted copies of the Notice of Proposal on the affected streets and in the local newspaper and also hand delivered letters to properties in the immediate vicinity to make them aware of the proposal. The local Ward Cllrs and Parish Council also received copies of the proposals for their areas.
11. During the consultation period the Council received objections to 42 of the 85 proposals advertised, all of which are contained within this report. The 43 areas that did not receive any representations in objection have already been progressed to implementation.

Consultation Analysis

12. The Notice of Proposal was advertised on the 31st October 2025, which allowed the required 3 week statutory consultation period.
13. The representations received in response to the consultation period are all contained within the Annexes to the report, within the relevant ward, which also contains officer analysis of the consultation responses for each proposal. In addition, a representation received that included suggested alternatives in relation to Front Street, Naburn(Annex P, item 2) are included as Annexes.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

14. The analysis of the options and recommendations for the Executive Member decision are all contained in the Annexes to this report within the relevant Ward for the proposal.

Organisational Impact and Implications

- 15.
- **Financial**, None, the implementation of any approved restriction will be covered by the signs and lines budget.
 - **Human Resources (HR)**, None, any enforcement of approved restrictions will fall to the Civil Enforcement Officers necessitating an extra area onto their work load, although they are already receiving reports of vehicles parked in the area and not currently able to enforce, which is creating work.
 - **Legal**, The proposals require amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Order 2014: Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 apply.

The statutory consultation process for Traffic Regulation Orders requires public advertisement through the placing of public notices within the local press and on-street. It is a requirement for the Council to consider any formal objections received within the statutory advertisement period of 21 days. Formal notification of the public advertisement is given to key stakeholders including local Ward Members, Town and Parish Councils, Police and other affected parties.

The Council, as Highway Authority, is required to consider any objections received after formal statutory consultation, and a subsequent report will include any such objections or comments, for consideration.

The Council has discretion to amend its original proposals if considered desirable, whether or not, in the light of any objections or comments received, as a result of such statutory consultation. If any objections received are accepted, in part or whole, and/or a decision is made to modify the original

proposals, if such a modification is considered to be substantial, then steps must be taken for those affected by the proposed modifications to be further consulted.

When considering whether to make or amend a TRO, CYC as the Traffic Authority needs to consider all duly made objections received and not withdrawn before it can proceed with making an order.

A TRO may be made where it appears expedient to the Council to do so for the reasons set out in section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act. These are:

(a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or

(b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or

(c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or

(d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or

(e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or

(f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs or

(g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

In deciding whether to make a TRO, the Council must have regard to its duty as set out in section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) as well as the provision of suitable and

adequate parking facilities on and off the highway so far as practicable while having regard to the matters specified below:

(a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;

(b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;

(bb) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy)

(c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and

(d) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

The Council is under a duty contained in section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage their road network with a view to securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network, so far as may be reasonably practicable while having regard to their other obligations, policies, and objectives. This is called the network management duty and includes any actions the Council may take in performing that duty which contribute for securing the more efficient use of their road network or for the avoidance, elimination, or reduction of road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. It may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or coordinate the uses made of any road (or part of a road) in its road network.

- **Procurement**, Any public works contracts required at each of the sites as a result of a change to the TRO (e.g. signage, road markings, etc.) must be commissioned in accordance with a robust procurement strategy that complies with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and (where applicable) the Public Contract Regulations 2015. Advice should be sought from both the Procurement and Legal Services Teams where appropriate.).
- **Health and Wellbeing**, There are no Health and Wellbeing implications.

- **Environment and Climate action**, There are no Environment and Climate Action implications.
- **Affordability**, There are no Affordability implications.
- **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 – Positive, the introduction of parking restrictions will remove obstructive parking and conflict of movement, which will make a safer environment for all road users;
 - Disability – Positive, the introduction of parking restrictions will remove obstructive parking and increase the available area for use by all user, whilst the introduction of 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions would allow for vehicles displaying a Blue Badge to park to park for 3 hours;
 - 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
- **Data Protection and Privacy**, The response to the proposal have been received by residents, Ward Cllrs and Parish Council but the report does not contain any personable information.
- **Communications**, There are no communications implications.
- **Economy**, There are no Economy implications.

Risks and Mitigations

16. No detrimental risks have been identified

Wards Impacted

17. Acomb, Bishopthorpe, Clifton, Dringhouses & Woodthorpe, Fulford & Heslington, Guildhall, Haxby & Wigginton, Heworth Without, Holgate, Huntington & New Earswick, Micklegate, Rawcliffe & Clifton Without, Rural West, Strensall, Westfield and Wheldrake.

Contact details

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

Author

Name:	Garry Taylor
Job Title:	Director of City Development
Service Area:	Place
Telephone:	01904 552547
Report approved:	Yes/No
Date:	DD/MM/YYYY

Co-author

Name:	Geoff Holmes
Job Title:	Traffic Projects Officer
Service Area:	Place
Telephone:	01904 551475
Report approved:	Yes/No
Date:	DD/MM/YYYY

Background papers

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7541>

Annexes

Annex A, Acomb Ward

Annex B, Bishopthorpe Ward

Annex C, Clifton Ward

Annex D, Dringhouses & Woodthorpe Ward

Annex E, Fulford & Heslington Ward

Annex F, Guildhall Ward

Annex G, Haxby & Wigginton Ward

Annex H, Heworth Without

Annex I, Holgate Ward

Annex J, Huntington & New Earswick Ward

Annex K, Micklegate Ward

Annex L, Rawcliffe & Clifton Without

Annex M, Rural West Ward

Annex N, Strensall Ward

Annex O, Westfield Ward

Annex P, Wheldrake Ward

Annex P1a, Suggestion received for Front Street Naburn

Annex P1b, Front Street Naburn Alt Plan 1

Annex P1c, Front Street Naburn Alt Plan 2