

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL  
CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL – 17 DECEMBER 2019  
REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR (RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENT AND  
CULTURAL SERVICES)

INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENT PERMIT SCHEME, DOUBLE YELLOW LINES,  
VERGE AND FOOTWAY PROHIBITION AND CLEARWAY IN ALDYKES AREA,  
HATFIELD

**1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 In March 2018, Parking Services wrote to residents in the Aldykes area of Hatfield to seek their views on parking options in their area. This was partly based upon past and present requests we had received from some residents in the area who highlighted parking concerns from local workers and university. In addition, there was a need to provide suitable parking arrangements in the area to accommodate the construction of a multi-storey car park in Hatfield as displacement could occur into nearby roads when parking is limited. Initially 1,146 residences were consulted in 2018. The original consultation received less than 20% responses for some roads. In May 2018, residents were given a further opportunity to share their views. At this stage, we reminded residents that the Council were proposing to install double yellow lines as a safety measure on junctions to prevent dangerous and obstructive parking, and a verge and footway prohibition to address parking on footways and verges. Further to this, Parking Services identified a number of suitable locations which could be converted into additional parking space, which have been completed or planned to be completed by end of October 2019.

**2 Recommendation(s)**

- 2.1 Although the majority of responses opted for resident parking permit scheme to operate Monday to Saturday, the Council is recommending that the scheme operates Monday – Friday. This is due to the responses received to the adjacent Hatfield town centre car park amendment consultation, which proposes that the parking permit restrictions are applicable only Monday to Friday. Therefore it is recommended that Aldykes corresponds with the Hatfield town centre area and operates Monday – Friday 9am to 5pm.
- 2.2 That the Panel considers the objections received in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.27 and in particular the issues raised in Section 16, around equalities and diversity and having considered all the detailed issues within this report including any proposed mitigating actions, recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the amended proposals (**Appendix C**) and the creation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for all the reasons set out in this report.

**3 Explanation.**

- 3.1 In November 2018, residents were informed of the outcome of the consultation. Of the 1,146 residential properties consulted, 329 (29%) responded to our consultation or follow up letter. . 15% of responses wanted to see single yellow lines, while 54% wanted a resident permit scheme. The favoured operating days and times were Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm. In Dellfield Road, it was highlighted to Parking Services the demand for non-residential parking, due to the location of Burvill House Surgery and Gracemead House. It was recognised that the needs of these organisations needed to be balanced against the residents. We contacted both organisations to understand their parking requirements at the time. Both were advised there was suitable parking within the Town Centre car parks for visitors. Contact with the doctors' surgery highlighted the importance keeping the existing double yellow lines to limit congestion on Dellfield Road to allow for easy access for emergency vehicles attending the surgery.
- 3.2 Aldykes, Beech Close, Birch Drive, Briars Lane, Briars Wood, Cedar Road, Feather Dell, Haseldine Meadows, Hillcrest, Hill Ley, Oak Grove, Spring Glen and Sycamore Avenue supported a resident parking permit scheme. However, not all roads in the consultation area had shown majority support for a resident permit scheme. Experience of introducing new parking schemes, it is recommended to include all roads, as they will be vulnerable to parking displacement due to other nearby roads having parking permit restrictions. The roads which were not supportive of a permit scheme were Croft Field, Briars Close, Firs Close, Maple Close, Maryland, Grove Mead, Holliers Way, Veritys and Hillside.
- 3.3 Within the consultation period, concerns were raised that some residents in Woods Avenue have to park in Sycamore Avenue or Briars Lane due to no parking spaces near their property; as well as an influx of university parking within Woods Avenue. In March 2019, an additional consultation was carried out with the 54 Woods Avenue residential properties. This consultation, had 70% of responses voting in favour of a resident permit scheme.
- 3.4 Also within the initial consultation period, it was highlighted that Chantry Lane (the T-Junction section that runs behind Chantry Court) was subject to high levels of non-residential parking. This led to refuse vehicles being unable to collect, as well as pavement parking and high levels of littering. It is proposed to restrict this section of road with a Clearway and Verge and Footway prohibition.
- 3.5 This report sets out the results of the informal consultation, the statutory consultation and the recommended course of action. A total of 1200 properties have been consulted. 19 objections have been received and shown within this report. See **Appendix A** for copies of the objection letters.
- 3.6 The Council can amend proposals once advertised, as long as they make the scheme less restrictive. This can be done without having to re-advertise the Traffic Regulation Order.

## **4 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)**

- 4.1 On the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2019 the public notice proposing **“The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Aldykes, Hatfield) (Restriction of Waiting and**

**Permit Parking Zones) Order 2019, The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Aldykes, Hatfield) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verge or Footway) Order 2019 and The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Chantry Lane, Hatfield) (Clearway) Order 2019** was advertised in the Welwyn Hatfield Times. Notices were also erected in the lengths of roads affected. The closing date for formal objections was Friday 13<sup>th</sup> September 2019. See **Appendix B**

## **5 Objections**

- 5.1 There are two objections pertaining to Cedar Road, and the proposal for verge & footway prohibition, resident permit scheme and double yellow lines Orders. See **Appendix C and D** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) Neither the Council or Police seem to be able to do anything about inconsiderate and illegal parking on footpaths, grass verges and close to corners
- b) There are signs up advising that people parking on verges could be fined but I've never heard of anyone subject to this.
- c) You are now suggesting having parking restrictions except for permit holders from 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday, as I've mentioned before this shouldn't be necessary, could this not be a timed restriction from 8am to 10am and again 2pm to 4pm.
- d) Object to visitors to my house having to pay to park on the public road in front of it, or if needed to park on the road at any time although I do have parking on my property when we've already paid the road tax to use it.
- e) I know that neighbours do think likewise.
- f) ...anything that can stop parents taking their children to school from parking on the pavements in Cedar Road and junction with Elm Drive and grass verges.
- g) Why should we pay to stop these people that do not live in this area?
- h) Any repairs would be paid by our Council Tax.
- i) Simple solution is we suggest posts or bollards.

- 5.2 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for verge & footway prohibition, resident permit scheme and double yellow lines Orders are as follows:

### **5.2.1 Responses to 5.1**

- a) The purpose of the proposals for yellow lines on junctions and the verge and footway prohibition is to give the civil enforcement officers powers to enforce against vehicles who park in the manner raised, by issuing a penalty charge notice (PCN).
- b) The existing by-law indicated on signs around the borough is nearly impossible to enforce due to the caveat that an officer with the relevant powers has to witness a vehicle driving over a grass verge as opposed to be parked on it. The new TRO would give powers of enforcement to deal with parked vehicles without needing to witness the vehicle in motion. Parking enforcement would be seen to tackle this issue in an effective manner.
- c) The majority of responses across the consultation area voted in favour of Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm for resident parking permits. The proposals were based upon what was most favoured across the area in question.
- d) The Vehicle Excise Duty ("Road Tax") goes to Central Government's Consolidated Fund, but it does not fund parking restrictions. The cost of designing, introducing and maintaining a resident permit scheme is designed to be self-funding, partly by residents who will directly benefit from the removal of non-residents taking up parking space within the road(s).
- e) Only one other objection or contact was made by a resident from Cedar Road during the consultation stage, which does not indicate the view that other residents are objecting.
- f) These proposals relating to the verge and footway prohibition is designed for the purpose of giving officers powers to stop pavement parking.
- g) To prohibit non-residents from parking in residential roads, the best option is a resident permit scheme, as it still allows flexibility for residents and their visitors to park on the road. As mentioned in d) the cost of designing, introducing and maintaining a resident permit scheme is partly self-funding by residents who would get direct benefit from better availability of parking. Residents who have off street parking e.g. a driveway, would not necessarily require a permit as they can park off the road
- h) Council tax does not form part of direct funding for road repairs
- i) Hertfordshire County Council can look at posts or bollards, however an enforceable verge and footway prohibition would reduce or remove footway parking. Posts and bollards should be used as a last resort as it can make street scene look cluttered and uninviting making accessibility feel more difficult. This option also has ongoing maintenance costs.

5.3 There is one objection pertaining to Sycamore Avenue, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C and E (Clearway)** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) Sycamore Avenue should be considered on its own for parking permits issued to Sycamore Avenue residents only.
- b) Although permits will ease the problem between 8am and 6pm, outside of these hours we would still have parking problems.
- c) While welcoming the Clearway Order in Chantry Lane, I am concerned that this will push those who park there (many students) elsewhere and possibly into Sycamore Avenue outside of permit hours.
- d) Many of our parking problems are caused by non-residents e.g. residents from Woods Avenue

5.4 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

#### 5.4.1 Responses to 5.3

- a) To give better provision and availability for parking where some nearby roads may have less kerb side space, multiple roads are often included in zones to give better parking options. Most residents will want to park as close as possible to their home.
- b) Based upon assessing the area and feedback from other residents, the main cause of non-Sycamore Avenue resident parking in Sycamore Avenue is either by University students who will generally look for parking during the permit hours, or Woods Avenue residents who find they do not have enough parking in their road partly caused by University related parking.
- c) As mentioned, students would be seeking parking during the permit restriction times, it is considered unlikely that students will look for parking on a Sunday or after 6pm, as University mainly operates weekdays during daylight hours. A monitoring period after restrictions are introduced would look at any possible displacement.
- d) Woods Avenue residents are also local residents. Their address may not share the same road name, but also face the same parking issues. Some who live near the junction of Sycamore Avenue do not have the option to park outside their home either due to current University parking, or because of yellow lines placed for safety. Woods Avenue is also proposed to be part of the resident permit area, and those who have a permit are most likely park as close as possible to their home. When removing University parking in the permit area, it would make more parking available and may change the current parking habits of residents.

5.5 There is one objection pertaining to Beech Close, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) I disagree with having to pay for parking outside a house we also have to pay to live in.
- b) Parking in the street is fine, no one parks here unless they live here.
- c) If this goes ahead each house should get free permits as this wasn't our choice to have it.

5.6 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme and double yellow line Orders are as follows:

5.6.1 Responses to 5.5

- a) Residing in a home does not lead to an entitlement to park on the road outside of it.
- b) Beech Close was included, as if nearby roads have a resident permit scheme introduced, any residents from nearby roads who do not want to pay for permits or visitor vouchers will displace into Beech Close. The likelihood of displacement is high and could lead to Beech Close residents needing to park elsewhere.
- c) The system and cost for parking permits needs to be fair to all residents. We cannot provide free permits to households whose view differs from the majority who supported a permit scheme. A resident permit scheme directly benefits the residents who live within the affected area.

5.7 There is one objection pertaining to Elm Drive, and the proposal for resident permit scheme and verge and footway prohibition Orders. See **Appendix C and D** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) We trust the Council has not already signed a contract with the company which is to operate the scheme
- b) This area is not near enough Town Centre, Galleria, University or Railway Station to attract shoppers or commuters here.
- c) The scheme as currently framed will not make any of the vehicles that park in this area go away – they are mainly resident vehicles.
- d) People who have no parking space on their own property and have to park on the street will have to pay for the privilege.
- e) Residents who have parking on their property will on occasion need to park on the street while they cut the hedge or sweep the path, or a tradesperson to carry out work in the house. So even for occasional street parking, residents would need to pay for a whole year's parking permit for that car.
- f) The period proposed for the restrictions is inordinately long. A 2 hour period at some part of the day on weekdays only, would prevent parking for a whole day by anyone who lives outside the area.

- g) The only real problem is during school term times with parents dropping off and picking up school students. The parking scheme will not make such cars go away, only make life more difficult for the students and parents.....far better to increase the provision of school buses and for schools to encourage walking and/or use of bus services.
- h) If every house has to report to the Council the number plate of every visitor, it is very intrusive and poses a data security issue, especially if stored on a 3<sup>rd</sup> party website. There would be temptation for individuals, or even a company, to sell data for commercial gain.... It is also very inconvenient for residents if notification has to be done in advance, as has been proposed previously. Not all visits are known about in advance.
- i) If permits are to be introduced, a system of paper vouchers or scratchcards (which we understand already exist in some local areas) would be far less intrusive.
- j) It is unnecessarily restrictive to limit the number of visitor permits to 240 per year, less than one a day. Why should the Council be allowed to decree how many visitors a person is allowed to have?
- k) The elderly or families with young children, for example, might have friends and relative popping in each day to check on their wellbeing. Others might be having work done on their homes carried out over a long period and that would use up much of their allocation.
- l) If visitor permits are to be introduced, there should be a grace period of one hour before charging starts, so that people can drop off friends or children or deliver message without risking a penalty from a traffic warden.
- m) While a ban on parking on pavements and verges is a good idea in principal, a blanket ban will cause problems. Contractors (including Council contractors) currently park on verges while doing such jobs as roof repairs, housing work, hedge and tree cutting....For building work...permission should be sought to use the verges, and a permit given with the provisos not to use the verges for heavy vehicles during wet weather and that any damage is made good.
- n) It should not be necessary to obtain a visitor parking permit by every delivery van, window cleaner, repair person or trades person. Some kind of exemption or a grace period or a grace period of one hour.
- o) There should be an exemption for house moves, as there are difficult enough in themselves, without having to worry about parking permits
- p) It is absolutely scandalous that the Council is proposing to charge NHS workers and Carers for parking permits.

5.8 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme and verge and footway prohibition Orders are as follows:

### 5.8.1 Responses to 5.7

- a) Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council have an existing contract via our partnership with East Herts and Stevenage Councils with APCOA. The officers already patrol many areas across the borough where existing restrictions are. When we introduce additional parking restrictions, the new roads are added to the patrol area under the existing contract.
- b) There has been previous issues raised from residents from Elm Drive of local school parents parking within the road, as well as some University related parking. Resident's perceptions of parking issues can vary from one end of a road to another.
- c) Introducing a resident permit scheme in other nearby roads could lead to the likelihood of vehicles moving into roads not part of the permit scheme. When we consulted in 2018, the majority of responses from Elm Drive wanted a resident permit scheme to benefit residents.
- d) The cost of planning, introducing and maintaining a resident permit scheme is designed to be self-funding, partly by residents who will directly benefit from better parking availability from the removal of non-residents taking up parking space within the road(s).
- e) Residents do not need to buy an annual parking permit if they know their household vehicles will be mainly parked off road on a driveway. Residents can also link a visitor voucher to their vehicle for such occurrences, which cost 50p per daily voucher (these are discounted by 50% for residents on a state pension).
- f) During the initial survey, residents were given several options including shorter restriction times. The majority of responses across the consultation area voted in favour of Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm for resident parking permits. The proposals were based upon what was most favoured across the area in question.
- g) Hertfordshire County Council already have a programme in place run by the Active and Safer Travel team. They look at encouraging school pupils to walk to school. Bus service provision also comes under County Council and is based upon demand.
- h) The online permit system NSL Apply is provided by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party who do not sell on any permit data. Welwyn Hatfield Borough will only use information, including personal information, collected through the issuing of any permit for the enforcement of traffic contraventions and it may also be used for compatible purposes only. The information may be disclosed to London Councils, other enforcement agencies and third parties where it is necessary and lawful to do so e.g. for the prevention and detection of crime. All information will be processed in accordance under GDPR. We do not sell on any data relating to parking permits. Information kept on the system is limited, and enforcement officers can only see if the vehicle is allowed to park in that zone upon checking, not which property it links to or when it arrived. Online paperless vouchers can be activated either upon vehicle arrival, or in advance.



- i) The vast majority of permit applications are now managed via our online permit system for the convenience of our residents. It also allows online payments direct which reduces data handling for payments. The online system is a paperless system only. We do offer the option of paper visitor vouchers, as we understand some residents may not have access to the internet to manage visitor vouchers.
- j) Most English Councils who manage parking permits limit visitor vouchers to ensure the system cannot be misused. Recent checks, show we offer one of the highest number of permits per property, the equivalent of 40 weeks' worth. Many councils offer less than 20 weeks' worth per year.
- k) We acknowledge that some residents may rely upon family members to provide essential care, and in those instances we will assess the situation and provide a permit where required for family carers. Building works can also be covered under a parking dispensation sold and issued by our enforcement partners at East Herts Council, and dispensations does not come from the visitor voucher allowance.
- l) A grace period of one hour would be difficult to enforce, as it would lead to additional patrol time being used by officers who would need to come back to a road on repeated occasions to check if a vehicle was still in situ, which in turn would lead to either a rise in enforcement costs or a knock on effect of other areas not getting a regular enforcement service. Enforcement allows for a drop off or pick up of passengers.
- m) Verges and footways are not designed for vehicles to park on.  
  
Verge parking can lead to damage of utility cables and pipes, as well as tree roots.
- n) Delivery vehicles do not need a visitor voucher if simply carrying out loading and unloading activities as there is an exemption for vehicles to do so. Our enforcement officers would not issue a PCN if active loading activity can be seen.
- o) As with above, when an active loading or unloading activity is taking place, the enforcement officers would not issue a PCN, so a voucher would not be needed unless the removals team chooses to stop the loading for a period.
- p) As Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council already run many resident permit schemes across the borough, it is understood that healthcare professionals already hold our "All Zones" healthcare permit. The £20 charge is less than an annual resident permit and is charged accordingly to contribute to the administration of the permits, and does allow unfettered access to all permit schemes we manage.

5.9 There is one objection pertaining to Briars Wood, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) It will not bring any benefit to the residents in this area or any other area, come to that, if extra parking is not provided.
- b) I agree there should be no parking on the pavements...I thought there would be a law against this already. Parking within 10m of the corners is also wrong. I thought this was in the Highway Code.
- c) ...cannot park in other permit areas where do we park?
- d) There are places where extra parking could be provided and roads could be widened
- e) Where no. 25 has off street parking the council has included that in the verges therefore they won't be able to use an area that for more than 30 years has been used by no 23 and 25 for parking.
- f) The permits are for Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm, why?
- g) In your first letter your reason for introducing the scheme was because of people visiting the town centre may take our parking spaces. But since then it transpires it is due to the council building on or altering the parking available around the town centre that could cause the parking problems in our roads.
- h) Why not promote the park and ride scheme that was being created on Angleland, since it was built I have not seen any advertising.

5.10 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

#### 5.10.1 Responses to 5.9

- a) 50% of responses from Briars Wood voted in favour of a resident permit scheme, along with a majority from the wider area. As a majority of respondents wanted a permit area it was proposed. Locations for extra parking bays were identified in roads in the area and parking bays created where possible. To introduce extra parking bays, many factors had to be taken into account, including design specifications, location to junction or driveways, gradient and underground utilities.
- b) The only way of prohibiting parking on pavements in Welwyn Hatfield at the current time is to introduce a Verge and Footway Prohibition Order. Parking within 10 metres of a junction is mentioned in the Highway Code, however, Civil Enforcement Officers can only enforce against vehicles if there are yellow lines in situ.
- c) Briars Wood is contained within a multi road permit zone, where the permits will allow parking in any of the 16 roads in Zone B20. Multi road zones are designed to offer extra parking options for residents if parking in their road is full. Introducing a permit scheme is likely to reduce non-residents parking within the area increasing the availability of space. It may also encourage some residents who have access to a driveway or garage to use them instead of parking on the highway.

- d) As mentioned in point a) any areas that it was feasible to add extra parking bays has been created. To widen a road would be a costly exercise, as the public footpaths may need to be re-profiled or moved elsewhere to accommodate extra carriageway. Some sections of land within the area are to be kept green to allow leisure/play space. Removing all green space within the area would be a serious detriment to the street scene and change the characteristic of the area.
- e) Only the grass verge and public footway adjacent to 23 and 25 is subject to the verge and footway Order. The hardstanding area near 25 we would still allow parking on. We are not aware of residents regularly parking on the verge near 23/25.
- f) When we consulted the residents the majority of responses voted in favour of the scheme running for these days and times. It had been identified and from past experience, that the majority of demand for non-resident parking occurs during the day time, and depending on nearby facilities on Saturdays. By removing non-residents parking during the day, it would also prevent long term parking by non-permit holders, which would likely make more space available in the evenings as there would be no overlap of non-residents parking all day and residents coming home.
- g) We had previous requests from residents within this area before we started consultation highlighting non-residents parking. The area was subsequently prioritised as part of the Hatfield regeneration scheme, as the temporary reduction of spaces within the town could cause displacement into areas where parking is unrestricted.
- h) The Park and Ride scheme is not managed or operated by Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council. The scheme is operated by University of Hertfordshire for their students and staff. Internal advertising within University grounds promote this to whom it is designed for. The Park and Ride does not run to the Town Centre, and only operates Monday to Friday during university term time.

5.11 There is one objection pertaining to Briars Close, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) I can't see any benefit to the residents of this zone by imposing a Resident Permit Scheme. We do not have any problems with parking during the proposed hours that the restrictions will be in place.
- b) Every time we have a visitor or tradesperson we would have to submit to the online system to implement a visitor's pass.
- c) This zone also covers the Briars Wood Allotment Garden. Many of the plot holders do not live within the zone. If they are unable to park near the allotments, many of them would be forced to give up their plots.

- d) If this plan is put into place can we be assured that it will be a temporary measure until the new car park in the Town Centre has been completed.

5.12 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

5.12.1 Responses to 5.11

- a) Briars Close was included, as if nearby roads have a resident permit scheme introduced, any residents from nearby roads or their visitors who do not want to pay will displace into Briars Close. The likelihood of displacement is high and could lead to residents needing to park elsewhere.
- b) The online system provides a digital system for paperless vouchers. Once purchased, they can be activated online at any time using any internet webpage accessible device. To add a paperless voucher can be done before or as the visitor arrives and takes no longer than 1 minute to log in and add the registration. We do offer paper vouchers for residents who do not have access to the internet.
- c) In the case of allotment holders, we would allow plot holders to purchase an annual permit at £25 per annum upon proof of being plot holder and vehicle documents.
- d) A consultation for this area was planned for the future, however, the consultation was prioritised because of the construction of the multi-storey car park. However, the current cause of parking issues in this area has not originated from the multi-storey car park, so likely that parking issues would occur afterwards. The Council is taking a proactive approach to reduce rather than increase parking issues. Parking restrictions can be reviewed later; however, these proposals are not planned as a temporary measure.

5.13 There is one objection pertaining to Veritys, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) It is entirely unnecessary as the roads around here (Holliers Way, Maryland, Veritys, Hillside) are not congested except in the evening and weekend with the resident cars or with students but not all the time. Why do we residents have to pay the price for students who aren't here half the year?
- b) It is entirely unnecessary to have it all day. There is no chance or consideration for the locals to park one or two hours or to have visitors. Why can't it be restricted to couple of hours during the day like in The Ryde?
- c) It is especially unnecessary to restrict on a Saturday, the roads I have mentioned before are practically empty on the weekends as it is...it will greatly affect our social life if it applies on Saturdays as it will limit guests and visitors we can have.

- d) I have my mother come to look after my children 1 or 2 days a week so this will make things very difficult for us if we have to buy at least 140 vouchers for her in the year, it will be a great expense to us.

5.14 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

5.14.1 Responses to 5.13

- a) The majority of respondents to the consultation voted in favour of the permit scheme to run Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm, residents will have differing opinions on what restrictions are required and for when, which is why we will go with what the majority request.
- b) As mentioned above, the majority of responses from residents voted for Monday to Saturday. The option for Monday to Friday was available on the form also.
- c) Some residents do rely upon family members to carry out care duties, and may, in some cases, apply for a Family Care Permit. Each application needs to be made in writing with any supporting evidence of the requirement for the permit and will be assessed individually.

5.15 There is one objection pertaining to Haseldine Meadows, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) During the day when many residents are at work, parking is not an issue with plenty of spaces available and very little non-resident parking occurs.
- b) As the problem is Haseldine Meadows is simply insufficient parking capacity of the cars of residents, the only solution that will be effective is an increase in parking capacity. In Haseldine Meadows there are 4 areas where I think the capacity could be increased by adding some parking bays.
- c) I accept that there are probably some roads in the proposed area with a daytime parking issue....and after introduction some parking displacement may occur. My observation is that people aren't prepared to walk far from parking to their destination, so I would anticipate displacement parking would only occur in immediately adjacent roads.
- d) I am also in favour of double yellow lines at junctions.... I am surprised that the junction of Maryland and Bishops Rise has only single yellow lines as this is the busiest junction in the area with higher traffic speeds and is not proposed for double yellow lines.
- e) I would suggest that either councillors or council officers take a tour around the streets of the proposed area during the day and evening as this will simply show when and in which roads the parking issues are or are not.

5.16 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

5.16.1 Responses to 5.16

- a) Upon initial consultation, 57% of responses from Haseldine Meadows were in favour of a resident permit scheme being introduced within the road, with some feeding back that students are already parking within the road. Parking issues can fluctuate within the same road.
- b) The areas mentioned have already been investigated for parking bays/improvements. Not every green space within an area will meet criteria, as gradient of land, underground utilities, lampposts and other factors and make extra bays cost prohibitive or not meet county council design standards.
- c) By introducing resident permits to a select number of roads, displacement could be caused by residents who live within the edges of a permit area, but do not wish to pay and instead choose to park in nearby roads where there is no permit scheme. An example would be excluding Haseldine Meadows and residents from Maryland parking there instead of paying to park in their own road.
- d) It has been identified since the restrictions were advertised that this junction needs upgrading to double yellows. This will be included in the monitoring period and advertised in 2020.
- e) Parking Services officers have visited the roads on many occasions during the consultation period. It is often the case parking demand can differ from one end of a road to another. Within this area it had been noted that although there was some space available during the day time, it can differ dependant on conditions such as if the university is open and even the weather can cause an effect. To only introduce restrictions in selected roads could cause future displacement into adjacent roads excluded from a permit scheme. A pro-active approach needs to be taken to ensure we predict and stop and displacement.

5.17 There is one objection pertaining to Hillcrest, and the proposal for resident permit scheme, double yellow lines and verge and footway prohibition Orders. See **Appendix C and D** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) As the situation is poor at present, and since the introduction of the new parking bays, the parking situation has not eased.
- b) The bays have left the grass verge outside my house a mess of soil and weeds.
- c) The bays opposite my house is full of cars belonging to houses with runways and garages and rarely move.
- d) I am almost afraid to go out in the evening, I have a temporary walking problem and know that if I do go out I will have problems finding a

parking space on my return, the street lighting is poor and ceases completely at midnight.

- e) I understand the residents of Sorrel Close plus some houses in Briars Lane will be directed to park in Hillcrest.
- f) Should you go ahead and paint yellow lines and disallow parking partly on the pavement in Hillside I fail to see where people will be able to park....painting yellow lines on junctions where there really is no precedence to encourage them.

5.18 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme, double yellow lines and verge and footway prohibition Orders are as follows:

#### 5.18.1 Responses to 5.17

- a) The introduction of a resident permit scheme may reduce the amount vehicles parking in the road as permit holders and their visitors would only be able to park there during the day time.
- b) The verge was repaired in that location and grass seed placed. The verge has not recovered well, partly due to vehicles continuing to park on the verge, not giving it time to recover and seed. The verge and footway order would give powers to prohibit verge parking, allowing verges to recover.
- c) Introducing the resident permit scheme may encourage those residents who have driveways and garages to use their off street parking
- d) The creation of the additional parking bays in this road was to increase parking capacity. It is likely that by introducing a resident permit scheme, it would remove long term parking by non-residents vehicles, and often has the effect that parking availability increases past the restriction times (e.g. evenings). If residents in nearby roads are able to park closer to their home compared to now they would do so. The street lighting is controlled by Hertfordshire County Council (HCC).
- e) Residents of Sorrel Close will not be eligible at this time to buy resident permits or visitor vouchers as they have dedicated off street parking available at their properties. If displacement is caused into Sorrell Close and reducing parking for those residents we would review accordingly. A minor change has been made where the 3 properties located in Briars Lane and junction of Hillcrest will be eligible for permits for Zone B21 (Briars Lane/Trees area) and would not have permits to park in Hillcrest.
- f) Many residents responded during the consultation period highlighting parking on footways being an issue. Footways are not designed for vehicles to be parked upon, and vehicles cause damage to footways.

5.19 There are three objections pertaining to Dellfield Road, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) The change to no parking at the southern kerb at the end of Dellfield Road means the patients for the doctor's surgery at Burvill House will no longer have anywhere to park at all.
- b) It would be easily resolved by allowing an hour's parking (or 90 minutes) on the southern side at the end of Dellfield Road between the corner and the current double yellows by the surgery.
- c) There must be provision for Gracemead staff to park in Link Drive car park.
- d) I am not aware of any consultation with the various charities which occupy Gracemead House.
- e) Whilst we have some car parking, it has always been insufficient for the staff based there.
- f) An hour's parking for just 100 metres would make all the difference (to those who carry the "food parcels" we give out)
- g) Can you please ensure that we get the chance to apply for permits at the same time as other local businesses?
- h) Parking at Gracemead House is already an issue as the doctors does not have any patients parking and therefore they park on Dellfield Road or more often than not in our car park.
- i) How you plan to manage the doctors parking situation

5.20 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

#### 5.20.1 Responses to 5.19

- a) Patients to the doctor's surgery will have parking made available to them from the town centre car parks, the nearest being Dog Kennel Lane. Previous conversations with the practice manager of the doctors indicated their preference for patients to use the nearby car parks rather than parking in a residential road. Several residents replied during the consultation to highlight the parking issues caused by patients using this small road for parking. The change would restrict parking to resident permit holders only. Those permit holders being residents who live in Dellfield Road.
- b) In our initial conversations with the doctor's surgery, a similar idea was proposed, however the surgery agreed that the majority of patients do not require direct parking outside, those who cannot walk could be offered home visits, and very ill patients who cannot walk may admit to hospital. The proposal was removed from our initial designs. As part of the monitoring period, we will assess the amount of available space after permit introduction and listen to public feedback we can revisit the idea of creating some 1 hour parking bays. Residents would need to be



re-consulted on changing some of the permit area to a 1 hour parking area.

- c) Part of the change within the town centre car parks, we are proposing Link Drive car park during the works to make available to local workers a business permit scheme. All businesses at Gracemead will be eligible and permits sold on a first come first served basis.
- d) Every effort was made, with the consultation letters addressed to the occupier of Gracemead House. It is possible that the information was not shared by each of the organisations.
- e) As mentioned in c) all workers at Gracemead House will be eligible to purchase a business permit to park in Link Drive car park upon its introduction.
- f) Gracemead House has an off-street car park, which could be utilised for short-term pickups. The idea of creating 1 hour free parking can be revisited during the monitoring period. The possible creation of 1 hour spaces would be left for any driver to use, so may not guarantee it will be solely used for the visitors of Gracemead or the Doctors Surgery.
- g) The Council will endeavour to make all local businesses aware.
- h) It is a private car park, with a lockable barrier.
- i) The staff who work at the doctors would be allowed to also apply for business permits in Link Drive car park; it could release space in the doctors' car park for patients if they choose to do so.

5.21 There are two objections pertaining to Maryland, and the proposal for resident permit scheme and double yellow lines Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) I would like to ask why the restrictions proposed in this area (I live in Maryland) are between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday, while Cecil Crescent, which is by the station, operates Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.
- b) The proposed parking restrictions were being looked at because of the proximity to the town centre while the new car park is being built. I cannot believe anyone will park around this area to visit the town centre whilst buying a large amount of shopping to carry back to their car.
- c) It might not be so bad if you either gave householders one or two permits for free and visitor permits had to be purchased or even the other way round. It seems that they also have to be purchased annually. Could it just to be another way of the council making more money out of people who already pay their council and car taxes.

- d) Even with a disabled bay not far from our home, we can still never get parked as residents ignore the disabled bay.
- e) We have repeatedly contacted the council about buying the land next to our house with a view of making it a driveway, but for over a year Hatfield Council and Herts County Council couldn't decide who the land belongs to, we are in the process of trying again. But if you put double yellow lines on the bend then this is where our potential drive would be.
- f) We are a 1 car household, yet one neighbour has 5 cars and many have 2 or 3 cars as they are student houses, the only parking available is on the grass verges.
- g) We are concerned about the reduced parking that double yellow lines will cause and the possibility of having to park streets away from our own home with a disabled child.
- h) We would be happy to pay for a parking permit if we were allocated a parking space as I'm sure other households would too.
- i) The notices attached to the lampposts do not include our house number for getting permits

5.22 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme and double yellow lines Order are as follows:

#### 5.22.1 Responses to 5.21

- a) The majority of respondents to the consultation voted in favour of the permit scheme to run Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm. Residents in Cecil Crescent were included on a previous consultation where the majority voted for the current operational hours.
- b) A consultation for this area was planned for the future, however, the consultation was prioritised because of the construction of the multi-storey car park. However, the current cause of some parking issues in this area has not originated from the multi-storey car park, so likely that parking issues would occur afterwards. The Council is taking a proactive approach to reduce increasing parking issues. Some parking may occur by local town centre workers rather than shoppers. It has been noted commuters will park further if they are requiring all day parking.
- c) The system and cost for parking permits needs to be fair to all residents. We cannot grant free permits to households whose view differs from the majority who voted for it. A resident permit scheme directly benefits the residents who live within the area. The costs for permits is to contribute to the creation and running of the resident permit scheme, any excess monies from parking is reinvested into further parking improvements across the borough. As of October 2019, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council have one of the lowest charges for on street resident permits across Hertfordshire. The Vehicle Excise Duty ("Road Tax") goes to Central Government's Consolidated Fund, but it does not fund parking restrictions.

- d) With the introduction of a resident permit scheme, non-residents vehicles would be removed in the area and may lead to residents parking habits changing (e.g. residents not parking in the disabled bay, as there could be better availability of parking). The disabled bay in question is an advisory bay; marked out to advise road users that someone nearby requires access for parking. We are unable to enforce advisory bays.
- e) If the land was purchased, and subject to approval (as the land is located on a junction and may not meet design specifications for a driveway), then the double yellow lines or verge and footway order would not apply to private land, only the highway next to it.
- f) Introducing the resident permit scheme may lead to a reduction of number of vehicles by residents in some circumstances, as those residents would need to purchase a permit for each vehicle planned to park on the highway. All permit applications would require proof being supplied that the vehicle is insured or registered at the permit address.
- g) The double yellow lines being proposed is for junction safety and is the equivalent of 2 vehicles in each part. The section of Maryland referred to in this objection has 4 lengths of yellow lines on junctions only. This would equate to 8 vehicles, which should not in the first place be parking on the junction causing visual obstruction to drivers. The introduction of a resident permit scheme would remove non-residents vehicles and allow better parking to be available for residents. A disabled badge allows a vehicle to park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours, which may assist in pick up or drop off for this resident.
- h) Allocated parking spaces is not possible on the public highway in Hertfordshire. The multi road permit area is offered, as there is more option available of where to park. Residents will naturally park on the nearest section of road to their home.
- i) A publishing error had occurred when the notices were placed, which has since been rectified. It was our intention from the start to allow all properties within this road to be eligible to purchase parking permits. As increasing the properties eligible makes it less restrictive we can make this minor change without the need of formally advertising the Order again.

5.23 There is one objection pertaining to Oak Grove, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) As residents of Oak Grove we are concerned that the new parking implementation will greatly affect our ability to park. Due to the fact that both myself and my wife work late it is already challenging to find free parking spaces. Limiting the ability of residents to park in neighbouring roads will increase the demand to use our parking spaces.

- b) We propose creating more parking spaces in the area. For instance, we believe it would be possible to add an extra row of parking spaces on Oak Grove and neighbouring roads by eliminating part of the greenery surrounding our current parking. Without extra parking spaces and solely relying on parking permits will prevent many residents from parking near their homes due to lack of available parking spaces.

5.24 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

5.24.1 Responses to 5.23

- a) Oak Grove would be part of a multi road resident permit area. The nearest road that is part of a different permit area would be nearly half a mile from this property. They would be able to park in neighbouring roads if they have a resident permit for that zone. By removing non-residents parking vehicles long term in this road, it could lead to better availability at night-time. By introducing permits, it may also encourage some residents who have driveways and garages to park off road more often.
- b) As mentioned elsewhere in this report, all green spaces were looked at to see if it was feasible to create extra parking bays. In many areas, it is not possible due to various factors such as gradient of land, ownership of land, and design specifications set out by County Council. Due to high kerb demand in some areas, such as where blocks of flats are located, and many properties having multiple vehicles, it is not possible for every resident to park directly by their home.

5.25 There is one objection from Rickfield Close, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix F** for the road location in relation to the proposals.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) I live in Rickfield Close and permits are not being issued for this road even though it is only just off Woods Avenue. I feel that if the permits go ahead it will push people to park in the car parking area for our close...it will just push student parking into our road....as Woods Avenue will be permitted so where will the residents of Rickfield Close park then?

5.26 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

5.26.1 Responses to 5.25

- a) Rickfield Close will be added into the monitoring period after restrictions are introduced in Woods Avenue and Chantry Lane. Any displacement identified can be looked at and a further consultation could take place with Rickfield Close residents in Early 2020. Upon scheme introduction, we would allow discretionary permits to be purchased by Rickfield Close residents who wish to utilise the permit area within Woods Avenue until a further consultation had been completed.

5.27 There are two objections from Martin Close, and the proposal for resident permit scheme Order. See **Appendix F** for the road location in relation to the proposals.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) We are concerned that we live in the Birds area of Hatfield and the impact on the current parking in this area is going to be increased with the proposal and restrictions of the parking on the other side of Woods Avenue. Parking is very difficult in the Martin Close area with a number of students from the university who leave their cars in our Close for most of the day during term time.
- b) Perhaps consideration has to be given to a permit system in the Birds area as well, not that we are pro permits but that appears to be the Council's approach.
- c) My son, who lives with us applied for a garage over a year ago....he has not received acknowledgement of his application for a garage, telephone calls and emails are not replied to.
- d) I object strongly to the proposal to have resident parking permit zones in the suggested areas, unless there is also a resident parking permit zone in the Birds area of Hatfield.

5.28 The reasons for moving forward with the proposals for resident permit scheme Order are as follows:

#### 5.28.1 Responses to 5.27

- a) This area is on the investigation list for consideration to be included in a future work programme.
- b) When University of Hertfordshire looked to expand in the mid 2000's, funding was provided for a parking consultation to offer residents a resident permit scheme. The consultation in approx. 2007 did not deliver a majority in favour of parking restrictions, and only small sections of yellow lines were introduced in some roads to improve passing space for vehicles.
- c) An application for a garage had been previously made, but was not accepted, as the household in question already rented a garage from WHBC. Priority is given to other households in the area who apply to ensure every household in the area has a fair opportunity to rent a garage.
- d) Any future consultation we carry out in the Birds area would require the majority of responses from residents to be in favour of such an introduction of parking restrictions. We are unable to include extra roads into these Traffic Regulation Orders being put forward to this committee. This area is on the investigation list for consideration to be included in a future work programme.

## 6 **Legal Implication(s)**

6.1 TROs are created under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Consultations follow a statutory legal process as set out in The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders

(Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. No other legal implications are inherent in relation in to the proposals in this report.

## **7 Financial Implication(s)**

- 7.1 The cost of TRO works recommended in this report will be funded through existing Parking Services revenue and capital budgets.
- 7.2 It is standard procedure to monitor new parking restrictions for the first 6 months after they are implemented. During this period all reports of safety issues or parking displacement will be recorded. If any significant safety issues are discovered during the monitoring period, the Council will investigate and carry out the appropriate remedial action.

## **8 Risk Management Implications**

- 8.1 Changing the parking conditions in the above-mentioned roads could generate negative publicity. Some parking may be displaced into nearby roads.
- 8.2 It is standard procedure to monitor new parking restrictions for the first 6 months after they are implemented. During this period, all reports of safety issues or parking displacement will be recorded. If any significant safety issues are discovered during the monitoring period, Parking Services where possible will investigate and carry out the appropriate remedial action.
- 8.3 The amount of yellow lining and parking control continues to increase, and this increase may in due course require additional budget to ensure lining and signage is appropriate for enforcement.

## **9 Security & Terrorism Implications**

- 9.1 There are no security & terrorism implications inherent in relation to the proposals in this report.

## **10 Human Resources**

- 9.1 There are no known Human Resources implications in relation to the proposals in this report.

## **11 Communication and Engagement**

- 11.1 When making any changes to parking restrictions there is a statutory consultation process set out in the Local Authority Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 which the Council needs to adhere to.
- 11.2 This includes consulting directly with all affected parties and a number of statutory consultees the county councillor, Police and Hertfordshire County Council.
- 11.3 The Ward councillors have been consulted at every stage of the consultation. They have been made aware of the recommendations in this report and no objections have been received.

11.4 In addition, Notices are required to be erected within all roads affected and as per the 1996 Regulations to advertise in the local newspaper, in this case the Welwyn Hatfield Times.

11.5 This process has been carried out and there are no known implications in relation to the proposals in this report.

## **12 Health and Wellbeing**

11.1 There are no known Health and Wellbeing implications in relation to the proposals in this report

## **13 Procurement Implications**

13.1 There are no procurement implications inherent in relation to the proposals in this report.

## **14 Climate Change Implication(s)**

14.1 There are no climate change implications inherent in relation to the proposals in this report.

## **15 Link to Corporate Priorities**

15.1 The subject of this report is linked to the Council's Corporate Priority Protect and Enhance the Environment, and specifically to the achievement to Deliver Effective Parking Services

- Protect and enhance the environment and deliver effective parking services;
- Engage with our communities and provide value for money

## **16 Equality and Diversity**

16.1 I confirm that an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out.

16.2 The EqIA found that there is potential for negative impacts on Age, Pregnancy and Disability. The double yellow lines will prevent parking where parking is not encouraged due to visibility issues, which may force some motorists to park further away from their destination. Parking Services believe however that the benefits gained from double yellow lines far outweigh any dis-benefits as it enhances the safe navigation of the highway for all. There is a positive impact for all by the creation of a resident permit scheme in roads could make more parking available closer to their destination.

16.3 Disabled drivers with a valid blue badge are however allowed to park on double yellow lines without a loading prohibition for up to 3 hrs where it is safe to do so without causing obstruction to traffic. Disabled badge holders can also park without time limit in any resident permit area. This could be a benefit to badge

holders who need to visit the doctors' surgery or Gracemead House, as well as visiting any resident within the permit areas.

- 16.4 During the monitoring period should any unintended impacts become known, Parking Services will where possible investigate and carry out the appropriate remedial action.

Name of author	Matthew McCann 01707 357304
Title	Parking Services Officer
Date	10 <sup>th</sup> October 2019

Background papers to be listed (if applicable)