

Decision making  
level**Officer in Consultation**    **Date** 13 Feb 2014**Micklegate Ward Traffic Regulation Order Requests****Decision Requested**

Approval is requested to advertise the Traffic Regulation Orders required to propose the introduction of a Resident parking scheme in Nunthorpe Drive, Nunthorpe Crescent, Nunthorpe Gardens and Nunthorpe View following consultation with residents. In addition, if there are no objections raised approval is requested to implement the Traffic Regulation Order.

**Reason**

To improve traffic management in areas where problems are occurring on a regular basis throughout the day.

**Background Information**

Background information is provided in Annex A along with the results of the resident ballot.

**Consultation Process**

The proposals have to be advertised in the local press giving 3 weeks for people to make representation. In addition, notices will be put up on street and all properties in the affected streets will receive details. Any objections received to the proposals will be brought back to a subsequent Officer in Consultation meeting for a decision on how to proceed.

**Statutory Powers**

Road Traffic Regulation Act Sections 1,2,3, 32, 35 and 37

**Ward Members and Political Party Views**

See Annex B

**Financial Programme Implications**

The cost of advertising and implementing these proposals would be in the region of £2000, but if grouped with other similar items significant cost saving can be achieved.

## Options

The options available are:

- A. Approve the Resident Parking Scheme for advertising, or not, as outlined in the plan in Annex D.
- B. Defer for further information to be brought back to a subsequent Officer in Consultation meeting.
- C. Amend the proposals depending on circumstances.

## Level of Risk

1-3 Acceptable	✓	16-20 Action Plan	
4-8 Regular Monitoring		21-25 Registered as a corporate risk	
9-15 Constant Monitoring			

## Internal Consultation

The additional lengths of restriction will have to be included in the rounds made by the parking attendants, but this will not require additional staff. There are no legal, financial, sustainability, equalities, property, crime and disorder or other implications.

## Implementation Status

Consultation to commence	April 2014
Work in progress	May & June 2014
Work completed	July & August 2014

## Recommendations

- Option A; Resident Parking Scheme to be advertised as set out in Annex D.
- Approve the implementation of the proposals if no objections are received. Any objections received will to be brought back to a subsequent Officer in Consultation meeting for resolving.

## Contact Details

Author:  
Sue Gill  
Traffic Technician  
Network Management  
Tel No. (55)1497

Manager Responsible for the Report:  
Alistair Briggs  
Traffic Network Manager

Report  
Approved



Date

Date

07/02/2014

**Wards Affected:** Micklegate

All

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

### **Background Information**

A petition was received from residents in the above mentioned streets signed by 76 households (72% of properties) requesting action be taken to resolve parking issues created by inconsiderate drivers parking in the north turning head and others parking close to and opposite driveways. It was alleged the majority of the parking was non-residential. Options were considered at a Cabinet Member decision session on the 17<sup>th</sup> October 2013 where it was resolved to consult with residents on their preferred options. The results of the consultation process were non-conclusive with a split between residents who preferred resident parking with other preferring no action at all to be taken.

### **Consultation Results**

Information and a ballot form was hand delivered to all residents on the 11<sup>th</sup> December June. I have attached the documentation pack sent to residents (Annex C).

77 letters were hand delivered to all properties

52 (67%) Ballot forms were returned, of these;

1 did not express a preference

4 were in favour of Option One (Double yellow lines in the North turning head only)

2 were in favour of Option Two (Double yellow lines in the North turning head and one side of the street including Nunthorpe Gardens and Nunthorpe View)

23 were in favour of Resident Parking

22 were in favour of taking No Action

### **Comments from Residents**

Some residents added comments to the ballot sheets, A précis and range of comments is given below:

#### **Those in favour of Residents Parking**

- It would be great to see fewer cars on the Crescent.
- Hopefully this would see an end to ridiculous congestion with parking on pavements and verges
- There have been times when emergency and refuse vehicles cannot negotiate the slalom effect created by parked cars
- Additional yellow lines at the entrance to Nunthorpe View would be good, options one and two are pointless.
- We think we should try a Mon-Fri scheme to give more flexibility for residents.
- We would prefer restricted parking 9am to 5pm, Mon to Fri as on Maple Grove

### **Those in favour of No Action**

- When you live near to the city centre parking is to be expected
- Would only push cars into Nunthorpe Grove and South Bank; the consultation is inaccurate in the way Option 2 is presented; we would like to see prompt enforcement of highway code violations such as parking too close to driveways and junctions; Resident Parking too expensive and I object to paying more for an older car when its carbon footprint had been created long before such schemes were mooted.
- We do not see a big problem. We have a drive. Any kind of proposed action will greatly affect visitors to our house which will be frustrating when there is not a big problem
- We are absolutely against Resident Parking. Problems not created by residents so why should we be financially penalised to resolve the issue. Each of the other options only cause further problems for the residents
- I suggest marked parking bays in the turning head so cars park more considerately. The options given are of no advantage to us as each one includes the restrictions in the turning head area.
- We live in the thick of this situation but none of the option would help and resident parking is simply a way for the council to make money from us and we should not be expected to pay for the right to a safe street and access etc. Permits should be free to every household and at least one guest pass allocated to each house.

### **Those in favour of other options:**

- It is the inconvenience and cost for visitor parking that concerns me for ResPark. I live at the South West of the Crescent and do not perceive a serious problem in my section. (resident preferred option one)
- We recognise there is an issue at the northern end of the street and any action should be in relation to turning head only; we definitely do not want resident parking.
- I can't blame residents of this area and workers for parking in nearby streets when parking charges are so high.

### **Form returned with no specified option**

- None of the options are helpful; all options penalise residents; problem worse since CyC introduced Resident Parking in nearby areas which just pushes the problem elsewhere and does not address the issue; why can't we have a rising bollard like Victoria Bar? Alternatively you should restrict access to residents only at no cost to them.

**Officer Comments:**

A small majority of residents are in favour of some action rather than no action. There were strong objections expressed by adjacent residents to the proposed no waiting at any time restrictions in the north turning head. The main objections expressed to Resident Parking were on the financial cost to residents.

Our recommended option is to propose a residents parking scheme, Monday to Friday between 9am and 5pm without any further no waiting restrictions being introduced. This will remove commuter parking from the turning head area during the working week when it is most needed for the use of deliveries, tradesmen and refuse vehicles. If the ResPark scheme is implemented and this area is still proving problematic we could revisit the issue at a later date.

Most residents have off street parking amenity and may not have to finance an on-street parking permit for their own vehicles. A Mon to Fri scheme may be more acceptable.

**Recommended Option**

**Option A** – Advertise Resident Parking scheme as outlined within Annex D and the consultation documents sent to residents to operate between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday.

All objections would be brought back to an OIC or Cabinet Member decision session for resolution.

**Ward Members and Political Party Comments**

**Ward Councillors Comments**

**Councillor D Merrett** – No Comments Received

**Councillor J Gunnell** – No Comments Received

**Councillor S Fraser** – No comments received

**Political Party Comments**

**Councillor D Merrett** – No comments received

**Councillor A D'Agorne** – No comments received

**Councillor C Steward** – No Comments received

**Councillor A Reid** –

Although we have no objections to the Officer recommendations for a Mon – Fri Respark scheme we are a little concerned about the actual level of support. Only 23 out of 77 households are in favour of Respark, only slightly more than 50% of the returns but only about a third of the total residents and only 1 more than those wanting no action.

If you feel that overall residents will support the recommendations then we would not object.

Ann Reid, Lib Dem spokesperson