

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL – 2 JULY 2020
REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR (RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENT AND
CULTURAL SERVICES)

INTRODUCTION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND VERGE AND FOOTWAY
PROHIBITION IN VARIOUS ROADS, SALISBURY VILLAGE, HATFIELD

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 Salisbury Village is a predominantly residential area encircled by the Ellenbrook Fields sports and leisure area, the University of Hertfordshire de Havilland Campus and the Hatfield Business Park. There are a half-dozen small businesses listed within residences and two care homes based in Nimrod Drive. Salisbury Village contains 355 known, confirmed Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and student accommodation properties. The true number may be larger. This leads to a high-turnover, partially transient population.
- 1.2 Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) are currently working on plans to adopt the highway in this area. There are currently some parking controls within some roads in this area, however, once the highway is adopted, all private parking restrictions on public highways would cease immediately. This includes all permit schemes or yellow lines that currently sit within Salisbury Village.
- 1.3 On 19th February 2020 residents were invited to a drop-in surgery at the Howe Dell community hall. This session was open to all interested parties. The turnout for the event was good in comparison to other drop-in sessions we have held in Hatfield, with at least a dozen varied requests arising. Most queries were based around requesting changes to the technical drawings near their own properties and the costs of permits the council provides. There have been several comments relating to the current restrictions which are operational 24/7 and why this cannot be considered. You may be aware the council's parking enforcement contract covers the period Monday – Saturday 8am-6pm with three days of later finishes of 7pm and Sundays 10am-5pm. Therefore, we would not be able to accommodate this request.
- 1.4 In March 2020, parking survey forms along with a covering letter and a self-addressed envelope (SAE) were sent to all properties within the Salisbury Village area (**Appendix A**). The survey was also available online using SurveyMonkey. Residents were offered several options such as a resident permit scheme, single yellow line or nothing. Junction protection in the form of double yellow lines and a verge protection order (VPO) was also consulted on. Due to a low response rate, both online and postal returns, the survey was sent again with a covering letter encouraging residents to complete the form and return it in the SAE (**Appendix B**). The online survey was also available. Each survey was

accompanied by the relevant maps. As is standard practice all documents posted to residents are available on the WHBC website.

- 1.5 This report sets out the results of the informal consultation. A total of 1515 properties and all landlords of properties have been consulted. Of which, 355 properties are listed and registered as being HMOs and/or occupied by students.

2 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 The Panel consider the results of the survey objections, and to progress the consultation to the next stage, to advertise proposals to introduce resident permit scheme operating Monday – Friday, 8am – 6pm. Proposals to formalise existing double yellow lines which are already in situ on the highway in order for civil enforcement officers to be able to carry out enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004 would progress on grounds of safety. And in particular the issues raised in Section 15 around equality and diversity and having considered all the detailed issues in this report including any proposed mitigating actions, recommends to Cabinet to proceed to the next stage (**Appendix C**) and advertise the draft proposals of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for all the reasons set out in this report.

3 Explanation

- 3.1 Unique responses refers to properties having one vote counted toward the total. This ensures there are no duplications of votes. Unique responses have been used as this also removes the issue of landlords of more than one property having more than one vote, ensuring fairness. For example, the raw data included two landlords who had voted eighteen times. The unique responses cover both surveys, this means they are only counted once even if they responded to both surveys.
- 3.2 Across both surveys 218 unique responses were received from 1515 properties consulted, equal to **14.38%**. However, there are variables which affect the results. One variable, for instance, is the 355 properties listed and registered as being HMOs and/or occupied by students. It is often the case, when consulting, many properties occupied by transient residents, such as students, we are less likely to get a response, likely due to the tenant not having long term interest in any future changes to the area. When these 355 properties are removed the response rate jumps to **18.79%**. A second variable is that Royal Mail returned 41 surveys for reasons including the address being inaccessible, unsafe or having 'gone away'. With these postal returns deducted from the total number of properties the response rate again jumps to **19.48%**.
- 3.3 Finally, there are an estimated fifty properties in the outer reaches of Salisbury Village situated on single-width roads. These roads are only for accessing these periphery properties. The roads are too narrow for a vehicle to park on without blocking the carriageway. These access roads have been omitted from the proposals due to the width of the carriageway. If the proposals do go ahead the areas will be monitored to ensure any negative impacts are rectified or mitigated. When removing these properties from the expected respondents the response rate sits at **20.39%**.

- 3.4 **86%** of the responses opted for either a single yellow line or a resident permit scheme. Of those responses **79%** opted for a permit scheme. Of those voting for a permit scheme **43%** voted for Monday – Friday. Of those voting for a permit scheme **49%** wanted an 8am start time and **51%** wanted a 6pm finish time. All percentages are a majority in their fields.
- 3.5 As part of the ongoing works programme, Parking Services look to introduce junction protection (in the form of double yellow lines) in every consultation area to improve road safety and visibility and to formalise what is already within the highway code – not to park within 10 metres of a junction. Parking Services are also looking to introduce a VPO, which covers the footways, verges and other green spaces.
- 3.5 In addition to the above proposals Chipmunk Chase has been highlighted as a possible location to increase parking provision by removing sections of green, see **(Appendix D)**. This could provide an additional 30 parking spaces for residents and their visitors. There are a number of approvals which will need to be obtained by HCC as the Highway Authority and with the developers in the area before these could proceed.

4 Legal Implication(s)

- 4.1 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 into the proposals in this report.
- 4.2 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.
- 4.3 Through the Agency Agreement with HCC, Welwyn Hatfield can implement restrictions on any 'road' and links in with Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 powers to make certain Orders. Therefore, whether the roads have been adopted or not isn't the overriding factor. As long as the public have had free and unfettered access to the area, there are no signs or barriers preventing access then WHBC can introduce restrictions with the consent of the landowner if this is not Public Highway. An example of this would be Brookmans Avenue, Brookmans Park in which the Council in consultation with the residents introduced a resident parking permit scheme in 2016.

5 Financial Implication(s)

- 5.1 The cost of TRO works and relevant advertising of proposals recommended in this report will be funded through existing Parking Services revenue and capital budgets.

6 Risk Management Implications

- 6.1 Changing the parking conditions in the above mentioned roads could generate negative publicity. Some parking may be displaced into nearby roads where no restrictions exist.

- 6.2 It is standard procedure to monitor new parking restrictions for the first 6 months after any 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 will investigate and carry out the appropriate remedial action.

7 Security & Terrorism Implications

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

8 Human Resources

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

9 Communication and Engagement

- 9.1 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. This includes consulting directly with all affected parties and a number of statutory consultees, such as the Police and Hertfordshire County Council.
- 9.2 In addition, Notices are required to be erected within all roads affected and advertised in the local newspaper, in this case the Welwyn Hatfield Times.
- 9.3 Ward and County Councillors have been consulted and no objections have been received regarding these proposals.
- 9.4 The relevant developers have also been consulted and informed of the proposals. No objections have been received.
- 9.5 This process has been carried out and there are no known implications in relation to the proposals in this report.

10 Health and Wellbeing

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

11 Procurement Implications

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

12 Climate Change Implication(s)

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

13 Link to Corporate Priorities

13.1 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

14 Equality and Diversity

14.1 I confirm that an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has not been carried out. This will be completed as part of the formal consultation process.

Name of author	Daniel Genn
Title	Parking Services Officer
Date	18/06/2020

Background papers to be listed (if applicable)