

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL 10 MARCH 2022
REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEME, AND OTHER
WAITING RESTRICTIONS, IN VARIOUS ROADS, ELLENBROOK, HATFIELD
VILLAGES

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 In May 2020, the Council undertook a parking survey with residents and businesses in Ellenbrook, Hatfield. The purpose of the survey was to engage with residents and businesses in seeking their views on parking options for the area.
- 1.2 Owing to the location of the area being within proximity of The University of Hertfordshire it was divided into 2 separate areas: Ashbury Close and the remaining roads of Ellenbrook.
- 1.3 It is now established practice that with all new parking restrictions, the Council monitor any reports as to their effectiveness for the first 6 months following their implementation. Should the Council receive reports requesting changes or amendments to the new restrictions, then a review of the restrictions would take place which may result in further recommendations.
- 1.4 This report sets out the results of the informal consultation pertaining to proposed traffic regulation orders for **Ellenbrook, Hatfield Villages area**, the statutory consultation, and the recommended course of action.
- 1.5 Several objections have been received relating to the proposed order(s) which are set out below in Section 4. A full list of the objections is contained within **Appendix A**.

2 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 For the proposed traffic regulation orders “**The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Ellenbrook, Hatfield) (Restriction of Waiting and Permit Parking Zones) Order 2022**” and “The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Ellenbrook, Hatfield) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verge or Footway) Order 2022” that:
 - a) the Panel considers the objections received in paragraph 5, in addition to the issues raised in paragraph 16 around equalities and diversity, and recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation orders as advertised;
 - b) the Panel note that the Executive Member for Resources may exercise their delegated powers to authorise the creation of the traffic regulation orders as advertised, subject to unanimous recommendation of the Panel.

3 **Explanation**

- 3.1 Following on from a parking survey carried out in May 2020 for the Ellenbrook area, residents were asked to comment on parking proposals. The number of responses in Ellenbrook was generally good, with most respondents voting for some form of parking restriction to be introduced.
- 3.2 507 properties were consulted of which 218 responded (excluding duplicate household responses). Parking Services only accepted the first response from a household to ensure every household had an equal say within the informal consultation. Members of the same household would most likely share the same view/opinion. **Appendix D** shows the response data showing how each restriction was voted for. It should be noted that 2 respondents who voted for no parking restrictions also commented that they would like parking permits for residents.
- 3.3 Most residents were in favour of a Resident Permit Scheme in: Ashbury Close, Haltside, Poplars Close, Selwyn Avenue, Selwyn Crescent, Selwyn Drive.
- 3.4 Residents were in equal favour of Resident Permit Scheme/Single Yellow Line: Bramble Road, St Albans Road West.
- 3.5 Most residents were in favour of a single yellow line: Brookside, Poplar Avenue.
- 3.6 Most residents were in favour of keeping Double Yellow Lines in: Ellenbrook Crescent, Ellenbrook Lane, Wilkins Green Lane
- 3.7 Most residents were in favour of no restrictions in: The Sidings
- 3.8 Residents were in equal favour of Resident permit scheme/no restrictions in: Crossbrook
- 3.9 Following the review of the survey results and their supporting comments, it is recommended to proceed with the creation of Resident Permit Parking Schemes as outlined in this report as follows:
- 3.10 Zone B23 being solely Ashbury Close timed Monday to Sunday 7am to 9pm. This is due to the road's proximity to the University and student accommodation whilst taking into consideration requests from residents to make the restriction as long as possible to reduce student parking.
- 3.11 Zone B24 covering St Albans Road West 323 - 357, Selwyn Avenue, Selwyn Drive, Selwyn Crescent. This is based on the feedback from the survey where most of the residents voted in favour of a resident permit scheme. We received comments from some resident's family members who highlighted the current single yellow line provision did not allow daytime parking on the road when there was a reduced or lack of off street parking.
- 3.12 Zone B25 Monday to Friday 10am to 4pm covering Poplars Close, Poplar Avenue, Bramble Road and St Albans Road West 359 – 403. Although Poplar Avenue and this section of St Albans Road West voted in small favour of keeping single yellow lines, a permit scheme in the adjoining roads could cause parking displacement. The introduction of a verge and footway prohibition may lead to a reduction of off-carriageway parking as parking on grass verges and footways will be prohibited and this prohibition includes vehicle crossover which are a part of the public highway. The crossover is in place to enable vehicles to drive over the public footway not park upon it. Private off-road parking spaces will not be affected and residents parking on the hardstanding/forecourt of a private property

will not be required to purchase a parking permit to park on their own drives. A permit scheme will allow residents and their visitors who do not have off-street parking to park close to their homes at all times which is currently prohibited between 9am and 4pm.

- 3.13 After reviewing further responses received from residents of Crossbrook, Haltside and The Sidings, a Residents Parking Scheme will not be proposed in the area at this time due to the majority wishing to see no change and because this cluster of 3 roads sit very separately from the other sections of Ellenbrook, separated by the Alban Way, and are unlikely to suffer from any displacement parking. However, any complaints relating to displacement will be monitored during the 6-month review period.
- 3.14 The current Single Yellow Line restriction in Brookside will be amended to Monday to Friday 10am to 4pm and covers all weeks of the year to ensure no parking displacement from nearby permit zones as well as the park from Ellenbrook Lane. Residents from this road mainly indicated that they have sufficient parking off the highway. In the survey stage, some residents highlighted that the yellow line should be operational every week to ensure there was no parking displacement.
- 3.15 Verge and Footway Prohibition Order (VFPO) was proposed as residents raised concerns regarding the damage caused to grass verges or the obstruction of the footway because of parking. Therefore, the Council will proceed with its plan to introduce a Verge and Footway Prohibition Order, which would prohibit this practice. One section of St Albans Road West – the portion between Poplars Close and Wilkins Green Lane was not proposed as the width of the carriageway was too narrow to allow parked vehicles.

4 Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)

- 4.1 On the 12 January 2022, a public Notice of Intention proposing the below orders was advertised in the Welwyn Hatfield Times (See Appendix B).
- (1) **“The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Ellenbrook, Hatfield) (Restriction of Waiting and Permit Parking Zones) Order 2022”**
 - (2) **“The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Ellenbrook, Hatfield) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verge or Footway) Order 2022”**
- 4.2 Notices were erected in the affected length of roads and letters delivered to residents and businesses. Plans illustrating the proposals for each Order are attached to this report. (See Appendix C).

5 Objections

- 5.1 There are nine objectors, two objectors are from the same household and two objections that were received from two separate individuals were entirely identical. (See Appendix A).
- 5.2 Below is a summary of the grounds for objection and reasons for moving forward with the proposed restrictions as advertised.

| Objection | Response |
|--|--|
| The term "Parts of Selwyn Drive" (or any other road) is not at all accurate. Perhaps you mean that double yellow lines will remain. | The term 'Parts of Selwyn Drive' is accurate in as far as it only refers to the part of the road(s) where the Residents Permit Parking Scheme would be implemented. The remaining parts of the road either have double or single yellow lines already in place or the proposed verge and footway prohibition. To describe it as "all of Selwyn Drive" would infer the restriction in question would apply to the whole road including verge and footway. |
| I do not understand how the proposed restrictions are better than those currently existing. | They will allow family and friends to park when displaying a valid visitor voucher, the current yellow lines forbid this. |
| For no apparent reason the proposed restrictions are an hour less each day than the current restrictions. | The proposed timings were from feedback collected during the initial consultation, the "one hour less" in this case is where a restriction currently applies 9am to 4pm. The proposed permit scheme would still have the effect of stopping non-residents parking for the majority of daylight hours when non-resident demand is reported to be highest. By operating across Ellenbrook as a 10am to 4pm restriction (Ashbury Close an exception), we can provide a more cohesive enforcement service within the same area. At the current time, single yellow lines in operation across Ellenbrook run at various times making it difficult for enforcement to visit at one planned time. |
| The increased restricted hours for Ashbury Close will result in more students' cars parking in Selwyn Drive. | The proposed permit scheme in Selwyn Drive of 10am to 4pm Mon-Fri would tackle the main daytime student parking issue. Any unintended impact will be monitored during the review period. |
| The proposed restrictions do not protect residents from 'non-resident' parking outside of restricted hours, when we are used as a car park for students, walkers, 'cyclists', sports field and Ellenbrook Fields visitors and Galleria shoppers. | Aside from Ashbury Close, residents did not indicate they were in favour of a longer restriction. The scheme will be monitored during the review period. |
| The first three houses in Selwyn Drive are often prevented from entering or exiting their properties without driving on the grass verge, if at all. Double Yellow lines need to be extended on the first part of the east side of Selwyn Drive and dropped kerbs need to be protected. | The issues around parking in front of driveways was not raised in the initial consultation survey however it is already an offence to park over a dropped kerb even without yellow lines in situ. This illegal parking should be reported to East Herts Parking Services who can send an enforcement officer to attend and issue to any vehicle with wheels adjacent to the dropped kerb of a driveway. |
| The permission given to motorists to park on the pavement along part of the St. Albans Road West allows them to block the pavement. How can pedestrians access houses, bus stops, Ellenbrook Fields or the post box, if the pavement is blocked (as it sometimes is already & forces us to walk in the road). | Due to the width of the road, it was not feasible to include this part of St Albans Road West within the Verge Prohibition Order as parked vehicles would force passing vehicles onto the grass verge. Parking Services deem any carriageways under 4.5m to be less suitable to a VFPO. An alternative public footway also runs alongside the main section of St Albans Road West to go in either direction for pedestrians. |
| Why are emergencies not catered for. Emergencies cannot be planned. | Marked emergency vehicles such as Police, Fire and Ambulances have a default exemption to park on a parking restriction when attending an emergency. |
| Over twenty years ago the Council said that the students would be prevented from bringing cars into Hatfield and did not listen to the residents telling them that this could not be done. Unbelievably, the same lame explanation was used when residents raised objections to the "Fusion" development at the Comet Hotel. | The University advises residents not to bring a vehicle where possible. The proposed scheme is designed to provide parking for residents near their homes and in line with legislation, 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. |

| Objection | Response |
|--|---|
| Why do residents have to pay when the situation has been caused by the Council. | |
| Double yellow lines at all the road junctions are very poor. Surely each double line should be extended to provide a clear site of the road for all vehicle drivers. This would improve road safety, especially for children | Double yellow lines are placed at junctions for safety reasons and are a designated length of 10m which allows a visibility splay when leaving or entering a junction. This is in line with the Highway Code which states parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction. Hertfordshire County Council or The Police has not indicated any requirements to extend double yellow lines further based upon safety concerns, and we are not aware of any accidents or safety issues beyond the junctions aside from this objector. |
| Dropped kerbs should be made much more visible and be included with the double line policy - this should prevent cars parking across these vital accesses, allowing much more safety for our children and elderly persons who rely on this for road crossing. | It is already an offence to park over a dropped kerb. This illegal parking should be reported to East Herts Parking Services. A vehicular dropped kerb is provided for the basis of letting a vehicle crossover a public footway onto a private section of land. It is not designed for pedestrians, and mirroring dropped kerbs are already placed in strategic locations in roads such as near junctions where pedestrians are most likely to cross. We would not perceive a default double yellow line policy in front of all driveways to be widely accepted by residents, as many householders give permission for friends and family to park in front of their dropped kerbs for ease of pedestrian access. If an all year-round permit scheme is introduced, this parking near driveways occurrence is less likely to occur as parking would be very much dominated by residents and their visitors. |
| No parking problem. The only reason we have lines currently is to deter student parking. There is nearly always adequate off-road parking for residents and visitors when current restrictions are in force. On the odd occasion that we need road space for a short while above driveway space we borrow a neighbour's driveway. Cooperation between neighbours removes any parking issue at a stroke. | Term time dates never remained the same every year. The Easter Bank Holiday dates varied every year. With the variation of these dates, it meant the enforcement was inconsistent. The proposed restrictions would allow family and friends to park when displaying a valid visitor voucher, the current yellow lines forbid this. Although it is acknowledged that some residents may be able to use their neighbours' driveways, the results from the survey shows that some residents are still relying on parking on public roads. |
| Restrictions are currently tied to approximately University semester time – 4 January to 30 March, 15 April to 30th June, 15 September to 15 December. This leaves maximum flexibility for homeowners and visitors as all holiday periods free. It does not make sense to replace a scheme that covers specific periods to one that operates all year round when there is no problem outside these periods to address. | The current restriction timings differ year on year due to the change of Easter Bank Holiday dates. A Resident Permit Scheme will still allow flexibility for homeowners and visitors allowing greater periods of on-street parking, albeit at a small cost but at the same time stopping non-residents parking which some residents indicate does not just come from university students. |
| It incurs an unnecessary cost to implement a new scheme – capital and then running costs to manage it by the Council, plus a cost to all householders and visitors if they wish to park on the roadway. | 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 require a permit if they plan to park off road. |
| All residents have road parking for at least one vehicle – some 2 or 3 or more, so in most cases during the day there is no need for extra parking. In fact, many work weekdays so there is more than enough off road parking for most visitors. In other | Requests have been received from relatives unable to park due to the current single yellow line who provide daily care for elderly residents. Comments received indicate some people are parking and walking up to a mile home because the current restriction stops them parking on the road outside their property. Although the |

| Objection | Response |
|---|--|
| words, there is hardly any need for road parking at all during the restrictions. | objector may assume that all households have enough off street parking, many who responded in our survey said otherwise. |
| It is by no means clear cut that there is a mandate for change. The Consultation was just that – not a voting system. Indeed, from replies you received from Bramble Road were split 50-50, hardly a mandate. And in my own road, Selwyn Crescent 15 wanted permits, but this is only 15 out of 55 households. Overall, I suspect that less than half the householders responded and less than half of those voted in favour. | The voting outcome in some roads was close, but the decision was made to progress with a Resident Parking Permit Scheme, after comments received indicated how restrictive the current yellow line is and with visitors being unable to park during the day. We cannot make responding to the consultation compulsory, and we act upon majority of responses. In the roads where it was 50/50, a decision based upon comments from residents who did want a permit scheme indicated a desperate need to be able to park closer to home. By keeping the single yellow line introduced over 12 years ago would not give suitable provision to residents who do lack parking options. Residents who have driveway space for 1 car <u>currently</u> have to park their second car up to a mile away during the daytime under the current scheme. |
| Given that your attendants are sensible when it comes to commercial, utility and emergency services.... | Utility and emergency service vehicles are covered under parking legislation exemptions in certain circumstances. |
| I suspect the law may not include carers but I suspect that it does not preclude them either. I am sure local discretion can be applied. | In terms of yellow lines, there is no provision to allow such an idea and cannot offer a local discretion upon choice. A resident permit scheme does allow us to be able to provide parking permits for professional health carers as well as family members who may need to carry out regular or occasional visits. |
| The current restrictions were originally put in place solely to prevent student parking during the day, not for any other reason. They have worked very well for the majority of households in the area so what has changed? The proposed RPPS seems to me to be an answer chasing a problem which does not exist for most residents. "If it ain't broke don't fix it". | The proposed restrictions would allow family and friends to park during the daytime when displaying a valid visitor voucher, the current yellow lines forbid this. Many residents in the first survey indicated they were struggling to park during the daytime. |
| What was/were the reasons for the survey in the first place? Was it at the request of some residents or was it driven by the Council? In my opinion the tone of the correspondence suggests that the decision to impose an RPPS has already been taken and it is just a question of dotting the 'Is' and crossing the 'Ts'. | The consultation took place as many reports of parking issues and lack of on street parking for residents during the day led to the area being included on the 2020-22 works programme. The Council had received requests from family members unable to park on the road whilst caring for their elderly relatives. No decision has been made yet hence this report for members to consider all objections. |
| In the survey only 20% of households in the area were in favour of an RPPS on a total response from only 43%. In the Selwyn's some 38% of households were in favour of permits BUT 62% were not or it doesn't affect them. In the Crescent only 27% were in favour. This is clearly undemocratic. The existing scheme has worked very well, certainly in the Selwyn's and particularly the Crescent, so why the need to change? Can Selwyn Crescent remain restricted as it is now with a single yellow line? If not why not? Other parts of the area have been able to retain their existing status. | The majority is counted based upon responses received. We cannot make an assumption that a lack of response from a resident means they do or do not want change. The Council had received requests from residents within Selwyn's area where family members were unable to park whilst caring for their elderly relatives as well as those who may wish to receive visitors during the daytime. Now more people are working from home than ever before, the new proposals would also allow residents more daytime parking. The proposal of a permit scheme broadly has the same effect in that it stops non-residents being able to park but crucially would allow residents to park upon the road during daytime hours by way of a permit or voucher. Any residents who do not wish to buy a parking permit could continue to park as they are likely to now due to the single yellow line – on |

| Objection | Response |
|--|--|
| | their driveway or in garage. |
| Notwithstanding that the amended proposals have changed the time of restrictions to between 10am to 4pm Mon-Fri they are for 52 weeks of the year. Why can they not be left as they are in term time only as the change still represents a 17% increase in the time the restrictions are in place which seems to be totally unnecessary? | Some respondents in the initial survey from Brookside indicated a long-term issue where the “outside term time” lack of enforcement led to an increase in on street demand from non-residents visiting the Alban Way or play area. By providing the restriction each week of the year would give a consistent approach to enforcement and reduce the likelihood of parking displacement during certain times of the year. Term time dates never remained the same every year. The Easter Bank Holiday dates varied every year. With the variation of these dates, it meant the enforcement was previously inconsistent. |
| I am led to believe that it is possible for people providing care or personal type services such as chiropody to obtain a Borough wide permit allowing them to park in restricted areas when necessary for a small fee. Is this correct? | Yes, the Council offer professional health carers permit priced lower than a resident permit which enables carers to park across any of our resident permit schemes. The carers permit does not however allow parking on any yellow line restriction, it only allows parking within a Residents Permit parking scheme. This has in the past caused issues for carers not being able to park within the Ellenbrook area daytime when the existing single yellow line is in operation |
| The letter states that within parking legislation you do not have provision to issue a permit to park on a yellow line. So how come trades people, builders etc are able to park on yellow lines when carrying out work on property in the area? I assume they have paid a fee which enables a dispensation to park on a yellow line to be issued. Is that the case? | Trades people and workers are able to obtain a parking dispensation allowing them to park on yellow line restrictions, this comes at a higher cost than a visitor voucher. Dispensations must be booked in advance via East Herts Council. For reference, a dispensation currently costs £15 per week for up to 3 vehicle registrations, where a visitor voucher is currently priced at 52p per day per voucher. Under parking legislation, dispensations should only be issued under exceptional circumstances such as when building works occur and heavy items need to be loaded or unloaded from a vehicle and should not be used to accommodate everyday parking circumstances. |
| There is nothing wrong with the existing restrictions effective during University term times. | Term time dates never remained the same every year. The Easter Bank Holiday dates varied every year. With the variation of these dates, it meant the enforcement was inconsistent and could lead to the area not being enforced at all when students were at university. |
| Why do you now propose to penalise all residents with an unnecessary charge all year round. | Residents with their own driveway who do not wish to park on the road will not be required to purchase a permit. The proposal of a permit scheme is there to enable residents and their visitors who do not have any or much off street parking to be able to park close to their home during the daytime. |
| The response to the September survey was very low and mainly from a small minority of new residents. | The survey took place in March to May 2021. Responding to the consultation is not compulsory. Parking Services proceed on proposals if more than 25% of residents within the consultation area respond and take into consideration the majority of respondents. All residents are given the same opportunity to comment and give their preferences. The September letter was an update along with inviting residents to make any additional comments. Parking Services do not foresee the survey was completed by new residents only, it was open for all residents to respond regardless of how long they may have lived at their address. |
| The consultation did not ask if we could | The original consultation was to gauge peoples’ thoughts |

| Objection | Response |
|--|--|
| keep the existing restrictions which achieved the original objective and have worked well. | and views on any parking issues they faced daily and give them the opportunity to help shape future parking proposals. There was an option to “do nothing” e.g. not change things. The majority of responses from the proposed permit areas indicated a preference for a resident permit scheme. |
| In addition, the consultation gave no indication of the likely charges and restrictions you are now proposing to bring in. | At the consultation stage it is unknown what the outcome would be so the consultation focused on getting resident feedback and comments. We do direct residents to our website where details of our fees and charges for permits are displayed. Any fees and charges that are being proposed are also listed on the public notice as per the regulations. |
| I am also concerned that the Ellenbrook Residents Association no longer reflects the views of the residents and has become a closed shop. They refuse to tell us who our street rep is and have no contact list available. | The parking consultation was carried out by Parking Services at Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council and each resident had a choice to respond to the survey with their own individual views. |
| Please note that zone numbering used is that designated in your Notice of Intent and Statement of Reasons which is inconsistent with the zone designations given on your website | There was a typing error on the website which had the incorrect zonal code listed. This was corrected when noticed. The Public Notice, TRO and statement of reasons had the correct proposed zone code which is assigned upon restriction creation for administration of the zones in question. |
| In your latest communication you have finally acknowledged that the residents of this zone REJECTED the proposals with a 20% majority (hardly “small”). Why undertake a consultation and then ignore the result? | Parking Services also took into consideration the changing ways in which residents will be working in a post-COVID world, with many more people having the option of working from home for at least some of their work week, there is a high probability that there will be less movement of residents’ vehicles. During lockdown, we received contact from residents from the Ellenbrook area who had no option to park closer to home during the daytime due to the current single yellow line provision. The wording from our latest communication is “2nd Zone Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm covering Poplars Close, Poplar Avenue, Bramble Road and St Albans Road West 359 – 403 –although Poplar Avenue and this section of St Albans Road West voted in small favour of keeping single yellow lines, a permit scheme in the adjoining roads could cause parking displacement. We noted comments that residents in Poplar Avenue wanted to keep the single yellow on the basis they did not want to pay for a permit. A permit is only required to be purchased if parking on the road during the restricted times, and a permit is not required if parking on the hardstanding/forecourt of a private property. Therefore, making a permit scheme would have the same effect as now with non-residents being unable to park but giving residents as well as future residents and visiting trades people the option to park within the permit zone” |
| The imposition of a permit scheme to enforce identical restrictions is ridiculous, it provides no benefit without a financial burden on residents – a concern specifically raised by residents, to quote your own copy “We noted comments that residents in Poplar Avenue wanted to keep the single yellow on the basis they did not want to pay for a permit” | A resident permit scheme is not identical restrictions. In this proposal, it will enable residents and their visitors to park on the road if they choose. Under the current single yellow line arrangement this option is not available. Residents who have off street parking e.g., a driveway would not require a permit if they plan to park off road. We have also received comments on how restrictive the current yellow lines are for those visiting family or providing care to elderly relatives. Poplar Avenue was |

| Objection | Response |
|--|--|
| | included to reduce the impact of parking displacement and offers opportunity to residents (as well as future residents) to park on the road if they choose to buy a permit or voucher to do so. |
| Administration of a permit scheme is also a burden on the council that is funded by us, the council tax payers, in this case that expense is unnecessary and unwanted. | 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 require to purchase a permit if they plan to park off road. As the majority of respondents to the survey indicated they wanted a permit scheme it is in effect wanted, though not all residents will of course want or agree to the concept. |
| You suggest that the permit scheme allows residents the option to park on the carriageway during restricted hours, while this is true at a price, it is of no real benefit in an area where EVERY property has two or more existing off road parking spaces. | Should any resident have more visitors than driveway space then the option of visitors vouchers would be available for them to purchase. Not all households within Ellenbrook has access to two or more off street parking spaces. |
| This information was highly disingenuous, as you are undoubtedly aware there is a system of 'dispensations' administered for you by East Herts that allows such issues to be dealt with in very much the same way as the proposed scheme | Trades people and workers are able to obtain a parking dispensation allowing them to park on yellow line restrictions, this comes at a higher cost than a visitor voucher and parking dispensations should only be issued under exceptional circumstances such as when building works occur and heavy items need to be loaded or unloaded from a vehicle and should not be used to accommodate everyday parking circumstances. |
| Additionally the existing parking restrictions contribute greatly to the uncluttered and tranquil appearance of the area. While this is a subjective benefit it is certainly of a type that your colleagues in planning acknowledge and consider on a regular basis and is not to be dismissed lightly. | This is a subjective comment. There would be very little extra street fixtures installed as existing lamp columns and posts would be used where possible to display the relevant parking signage. The permit scheme would not come with painted parking bays to limit the amount of paint on the surface. By removing the single yellow lines would reduce the paint seen on the road. |
| <p>With regard to the VFPO:</p> <p>I do not object to this in principle. However the detail needs to be carefully examined. In my road residents park partially on the pavement because the carriageway is not wide enough to pass large vehicles eg. refuse collection trucks, alongside vehicles parked entirely on the carriageway.</p> <p>If on road parking is increased this will become a regular problem where the VFPO will be the direct cause of regular damage to the verges by virtue of large vehicles being forced to drive on the verge.</p> | The VFPO is not being applied to this part of St Albans Road West due to the width of the road as shown the proposal maps. It will only apply to the large grass verge and allow vehicles to part partly on the footway as is the current practice. The objector in this case has misunderstood this part of the proposals. |
| facilities/means to purchase visitors/trades permits generally have very wholly inadequate opening hours, cannot be purchased by any other than the resident and take up to two weeks to obtain. | Visitor vouchers can be purchased in advance in blocks of 20 day vouchers online, and for residents who do not have internet access via postal paper application form. Residents in existing permit zones would buy vouchers in advance in readiness of any visitors who need to park on the road. |
| You sent 507 surveys and only received 103 responses in specific favour of a permit scheme, in what world does just over 20% form any kind of majority or | Parking Services offer all residents within the consultation area the same opportunity to respond to the survey. Once 25% of residents or more have responded, the majority of responses are looked at. A resident who |

| Objection | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>general consensus? Even if we ignore the 288 households that did not respond (although any psychologist would indicate a nil response to a proposal is broadly a negative)</p> | <p>has not voted within the survey simply has not given their opinion and is not an assumption they do or do not want anything. The majority mentioned is based upon responses. Parking Services received 218 household responses in the survey stage, however, some roads such as Ellenbrook Lane are not suitable for parking permits. Parking Services looked at the roads that had existing single yellow lines where the majority did vote in favour of a permit scheme.</p> |
| <p>Parking restrictions were only ever introduced to counter the threat of nuisance parking by University of Hertfordshire students and hence only applied during their term time</p> | <p>Some respondents in the initial survey from Brookside indicated a long-term issue where the “outside term time” lack of enforcement led to an increased on street demand from non-residents visiting the Alban Way or play area. By providing the restriction each week of the year would give a consistent approach to enforcement and reduce the likelihood of parking displacement during certain times of the year. Term time dates never remained the same every year. The Easter Bank Holiday dates varied every year. With the variation of these dates, it meant the enforcement was previously inconsistent.</p> |

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 (and amended by The Traffic Orders Procedure (Coronavirus) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020). No other legal implications are inherent in relation into the proposals in this report.
- 6.2 The Council can amend proposals once advertised. Any proposals that are less restrictive can be done without having to re-advertise the Traffic Regulation Order.
- 6.3 Through the Agency Agreement with Hertfordshire County Council, Welwyn Hatfield can implement restrictions on any road and links in with Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 powers to make certain Orders.

7 Financial Implication(s)

- 7.1 The cost of TRO and Parking Improvement works recommended in this report will be funded through existing Parking Services revenue and capital budgets. Ongoing costs associated with enforcement activities will be funded through the income generated from parking fees (eg resident permits).

8 Risk Management Implications

- 8.1 Changing the parking conditions could generate negative publicity. Some parking may be displaced into nearby roads where no restrictions exist.
- 8.2 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.

9 Security & Terrorism Implications

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

10 Human Resources

- 10.1 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. This includes consulting directly with all affected parties and a number of statutory consultees, such as the Police and Hertfordshire County Council. Formal objections can be made only during this period stating the grounds on which they are being made.
- 11.2 Ward Members as well as emergency services and Hertfordshire County Council have been consulted as part of this process and no objections have been received relating to the proposals recommended in this report.
- 11.3 In addition, Public Notices are required to be erected within all affected roads and advertised in the local newspaper, in this case the Welwyn Hatfield Times.
- 11.4 This process has been carried out and there are no known implications in relation to the proposals in this report.

12 Health and Wellbeing

- 12.1 There are no known Health and Wellbeing implications in relation to proposals in this report.

13 Procurement Implications

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

14 Climate Change Implication(s)

- 14.1 There are no known negative climate change implications in relation to the proposals in this report. Residential permit zones will restrict parking within the zone and this may decrease the number of vehicles driving through the zone from other locations in order to park. Therefore, there is a potential for a positive climate change implication.

15 Link to Corporate Priorities

- 15.1 This report is linked to the Council's Corporate Priorities to engage with our communities and deliver 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 both positive and negative impacts on Age, Disability, Pregnancy and Maternity. No issues were raised from any of these characteristic groups during the course of the consultation process; however, the use of yellow lines to prevent parking on junctions may have an effect on these groups in that they might have to park further away.

In mitigation there are statutory exemptions contained within the Order which allow for the unloading and loading of goods and passengers while parked on

yellow lines. Blue badge holders can also park on double yellow line restrictions for up to 3 hrs. The introduction of resident permit parking will free up additional capacity which will allow these groups better opportunities to park closer to home. Visitor permits may be purchased at a 50% discounted rate for those persons in receipt of a state pension. Parking close to junctions creates a hazard in that it reduces visibility on entry and exit. The benefits accrued to the new restrictions outweigh the above-mentioned risks.

- 16.3 Parking Services believe that the benefits gained from double yellow lines far outweigh any drawbacks as it enhances the safe navigation of the highway for all.
- 16.4 In addition, during the monitoring period, should any unintended negative impacts arise Parking Services will, where possible, investigate and carry out the appropriate remedial action.

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Name of author | Andy Clarke |
| Title | Parking Services Officer |
| Date | 11 February 2022 |

Background papers:

Ellenbrook Objections – Appendix A

Ellenbrook Notice of intention – Appendix B

Ellenbrook Plans – Appendix C