

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
CABINET HOUSING AND PLANNING PANEL COMMITTEE – 14 JULY 2016
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (FINANCE AND OPERATIONS)

THE RYDE AREA – PROPOSED RESIDENT PARKING PERMIT SCHEME AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 A parking study was carried out in Hatfield in March 2012 to identify the key parking problems and possible solutions. Subsequent to this, in 2014 over 5,000 residents and businesses in Hatfield Central and East Wards received parking questionnaires. Over 1000 completed questionnaires were returned and this information has been collated and analysed.
- 1.2 In April 2015, the Council decided to split both wards into five separate areas and prioritise these. Residents and businesses in The Ryde and surrounding roads were the first to be consulted.
- 1.3 This report sets out the results of the informal consultation, the formal consultation and the recommended course of action. A total of 402 properties were included in the consultation and the Council has received six letters of objection to the formal proposals.

2 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 That the Panel consider the objections received and recommends to the Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the amended Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) named in item 3.7 for the reasons outlined in items 3.10 – 3.12.

3 Explanation

- 3.1 On 5th August 2015, letters with proposals were sent to residents and businesses (including The Ryde School) for their comment. 57% of all properties returned completed forms, of those 66% requested a restriction. Although 41% requested a single yellow line a significant number (34%) requested a resident parking permit scheme. The majority of the resident's responses opted for the restriction to operate Monday-Friday, between 10-11am.
- 3.2 There were four roads in which the majority of residents who responded to the consultation stated they were happy with the proposed double yellow lines at the junctions, but didn't want any additional restrictions outside of their property:
- Bull Stag Green
 - Burleigh Mead
 - Mount Pleasant Close
 - Mount Pleasant Lane

Letters dated the 3rd November 2015 were sent to the above residents providing a second opportunity to be included in the residents parking permit scheme, which was proposed for the rest of The Ryde the area.

- 3.3 A total of thirty residents in Bull Stag Green and Burleigh Mead responded to this second consultation, twenty of which opted to be included in the resident parking permit scheme.
- 3.4 Less than 50% of residents in Mount Pleasant Close and Mount Pleasant Lane responded to this second consultation and of those 58% opted not to be included in the resident parking permit scheme, although the majority of responses were in favour of the double yellow lines at the junctions.
- 3.5 During the initial consultation in August, the Head at The Ryde School expressed concerns about the number of staff and visitors which currently park on Pleasant Rise. This was due to the lack of spaces available in the school car park. Therefore, the Council amended the proposals by adding a single yellow line to a section of the road. The Head suggested the line be operational Monday-Friday, 3.30-4.30pm. This would allow school staff/visitors to park there during their working day, but still prevent long term parking by commuters.
- 3.6 Letters were sent to all properties outlining the final scheme and how the proposed restrictions would impact them.
- 3.7 On the 25th May 2016, **The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Hatfield) (Restriction of Waiting and Permit Parking Zone) Order 2016** (Appendix A) was advertised in the Welwyn Hatfield Times with notices erected in the affected roads. Letters were also sent to all the residents and the Head at The Ryde School.
- 3.8 Six formal objections have been received to the proposed TRO (Appendix B). Below is a summary of grounds for their objection:
 1. *The restrictions are not needed or there are no current parking problems in this part of the estate*
 2. *The area proposed is excessively extensive. Current commuter parking does not appear to extend further than Fawn Court and they would not park and walk this far to the station*
 3. *Many residents are retired and need to employ tradesman to assist in the up keep of their property*
 4. *If elderly residents need carers, they would suffer from the restrictions or charges*
 5. *The Ryde hall (affiliated with the Cockaigne Group) has many activities and should be prevented from providing these activities for its guests*
 6. *Parking opposite junction should be restricted for 24/7 and not only for 1 hour a day*
 7. *No parking problems at the junctions, why add yellow lines*

8. *Why should I have to pay to park outside my own house? If this is not a money making exercise for the Council then why haven't they reduce the residents council tax charge?*
 9. *The charges are the station car park are extortionate when compared to other parking options*
 10. *Pleasant Rise, 15.30-16.30 - Imposing a restriction at this location will also affect parking for after school activities and events, which would regularly coincide with this proposed restriction plus the school's parents evenings and school plays, which run through the times of this proposed restriction.*
 11. *There is no justification for the single yellow line, which as it differs from all the others will either be costly to enforce or will not be enforced, bringing it into disrepute.*
 12. *I object to the proposed 'at any time' restrictions on Pleasant Rise in the vicinity of Greenfields as I have not seen anyone park in this vicinity in all the time that I have lived here. At this point the road makes a 90 degree bend and there is a traffic island which effectively makes parking impossible anyway.*
 13. *The restrictions should only be placed outside the properties of those residents who have requested them*
- 3.9 The Council has amended the proposals in response to an objection received during the formal stage. The double yellow lines at the bell mouth of Mount Pleasant Lane, Mount Pleasant Close and Lowlands have been removed and this area will be monitored for a period of six months. If needed they can be introduced as part of that process (Appendix C). The double yellow lines on Mount Pleasant Lane opposite Mount Pleasant Close will remain as they were requested by a resident.
- 3.10 The reasons for moving forward with the amended proposals are as follows:
1. *The majority of responses from residents suggests that there are parking issues, particularly with long term parking by non-residents*
 2. *Experience has proven that new restrictions displace vehicles to other areas. If the restrictions were only introduced in part of the The Ryde commuters are likely to walk the additional few metres rather than pay for parking at the station*
 3. *The proposals are for 1 hour, Monday – Friday. Arrangements could be made for tradesmen to work outside of these times. Alternatively there is the option for residents to purchase visitor vouchers which residents in receipt of a state pension are eligible for a 50% discount*
 4. *If elderly residents need a carer there are a number of options:*
 - *They could visit outside of the 1 hour restriction*
 - *If they are family members they could apply for a free 'Carers' permit*
 - *Practices already purchase Doctor/Health Visitor permits for their staff and these can be used in all of the Council's permit areas*

5. *The Ryde Hall (affiliated with the Cockaigne Group) have been involved in the consultation process and are aware of their options during the proposed days and times of the restriction*
6. *In most cases this would mean putting a double yellow line outside of a number of resident's properties, this would restrict everyone parking there at anytime including residents. The Council would be reluctant to use double yellow lines at this time. If the proposed one hour restrictions were introduced, this would be monitored for six months and if necessary double yellow lines at a later stage.*
7. *No-one should be parking within 10 metres of a junction, but without the yellow lines it is difficult to enforce. In most cases the proposals are for the minimum length of line (10 metres) however in some areas this has been extended on request from residents*
8. *The Council does not make a profit from parking restrictions. The permit charges contribute to the cost of the administration and enforcement of a resident parking permit scheme.*
9. *Hatfield station car park is not managed by Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council. The Council has suggested to the rail company about the possibility of matching the daily car parking charge of £5.00 which is available in Welwyn Garden City but they have not amended their charges to reflect this*
10. *The Head at The Ryde School has been involved with the proposals and she specifically requested that the single yellow line operates between 15.30-16.30. There is a car park on the school grounds, but there is not enough room for all staff, the timing of this restrictions means it will not impact on their working day. The permit scheme in the remainder of Pleasant Rise and surrounding roads is proposed to be operational 10-11am, so if staff or visitors need to park during 15.30-16.30 there are a number of options available.*
11. *Single yellow lines cost less to enforce than a resident permit scheme. When the enforcement team patrol during the restriction times, as this restriction applies to everyone they know that when they stop they are likely to issue a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN). In a resident parking permit scheme, each vehicle has a permit/voucher displayed, therefore the enforcement team need to walk the route and check every vehicle before establishing if a PCN needs to be issued.*
12. *Although the Council appreciates that no-one at this time is parking in this location, if the remainder of the restrictions proposed were introduced this would leave this part of the road unrestricted. The Council would prefer to add this in as a preventative measure, due to the safety implications if this was to be left unrestricted.*
13. *It would be impractical to stop and start the permit scheme. This would mean marking out parking bays in the locations which the restriction is operational and increase the amount of signage required to enforce such a scheme. Also as mentioned in 3.10.2 parking displacement will move to the unrestricted areas. The Council looks at restrictions using the majority of responses from residents. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to design a scheme that will please everyone.*

- 3.11 Albeit the majority of responses (41%) to the initial consultation opted for a single yellow line, it is assumed that those residents would therefore not need to park on the road during the hours of the restriction. However, a significant number of residents (34%) did opt for a resident parking permit scheme. Therefore, the proposals to recommend a resident parking permit scheme would not impact on those residents who opted for the single yellow line
- 3.12 *The people most likely to benefit from these proposals are residents and their visitors. Only a resident parking permit scheme has the benefit of allowing residents and their visitors to park on the road during the hour(s) of the restriction. Parking Services are therefore recommending this scheme to proceed and be implemented with the suggested amendments in 3.9*

Implications

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 in to the proposals in this report.

5 Financial Implication(s)

The cost of TRO works recommended in this report will be funded through existing Parking Services revenue budgets.

6 Risk Management Implications

- 6.1 The risks related to this proposal are:

Changing the parking conditions in the above mentioned roads could generate negative publicity. The risk is likely but any significant safety issues will be reviewed and dealt with following the six month monitoring period.

7 Security & Terrorism Implication(s)

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

8 Procurement Implication(s)

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

9 Climate Change Implication(s)

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

10 Link to Corporate Priorities

- 10.1 The subject of this report is linked to the following Council's Corporate Priorities:

- Protect and enhance the environment – Deliver effective parking services;

- Engage with our communities and provide value for money

11 Equality and Diversity

11.1 I confirm that an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out. No significant differential impacts were found.

- Age – Elderly residents may benefit from a less congested environment, with improved access to and egress from their properties. Residents in receipt of a state pension are eligible for 50% discount when purchasing visitor vouchers.
- Disability – Disabled residents may feel encouraged to use their vehicle in a less congested environment. Residents with a valid blue badge receive their first permit free of charge.

Name of author (*Vikki Hatfield*)
Title (*Parking and Cemetery Services Manager*)
Date (*1st July 2016*)

Background papers to be listed (if applicable)