Part I Item No: 9

Main author: Vikki Hatfield

Executive Member: Helen Bromley

All Wards

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL CABINET HOUSING AND PLANNING PANEL COMMITTEE – 18 FEBRUARY 2016 REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (FINANCE AND OPERATIONS)

IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY – JUNCTION PROTECTION IN VARIOUS LOCATIONS

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 Parking Services receive requests for parking restrictions through a number of different channels. These requests are considered when the Council is in the area; this is defined by the work programme which is approved each year by the Council's Cabinet.
- 1.2 Car ownership and the need for parking have dramatically increased in the last five years. Vehicle owners are running out of carriageway and are now parking close too, or on junctions. This can obstruct other roads users, as well as the waste and recycling collection vehicles and emergency vehicles.
- 1.3 This Council project is specifically to look at improving accessibility for waste and recycling collections. If approved and implemented, this would have a positive impact by improving visibility and access for all road users, including emergency services, community buses, delivery vehicles, buses etc, as well as providing pedestrians a safer place to cross.

2 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 The Panel recommends the inclusion of this project to the Parking Services 2016/17 and 2017/18 work programmes as outlined in Appendix A.
- 2.2 The Panel recommends the method of implementation, as outlined in item 3.4 and 3.6

3 **Explanation**

- 3.1 Although the Highway Code specifically states parking should not take place within 10 metres of a junction, without a restriction (generally in the form of double yellow lines, otherwise known as junction protection) the Civil Enforcement Officers are unable to issue a penalty charge notice (parking ticket) to vehicles parking in such areas.
- 3.2 The Council when consulting on proposed parking restrictions normally apply two stages of consultation, Informal and Formal. This is because in most cases parking restrictions can directly impact residents and/or businesses. The informal stage is to ascertain the extent of such restrictions. Once a majority of the respondents have agreed a potential solution, the proposals are then formally advertised. This is done by an advert in the Welwyn Hatfield Times and erecting notices in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions.

- 3.3 The roads proposed in Appendix A, have been highlighted by either the service provider (Serco) or a Council Officer. The introduction of junction protection can affect residents and/or businesses; however junction protection is predominantly a safety improvement. Because of this, Parking Services are proposing to move straight to the Formal stage of the consultation.
- 3.4 All aspects of the Formal consultation will still be followed. Statutory consultees who include Hertfordshire County Council and the Police will have their approval sought. Residents in each of the roads will be notified by letter, of the Councils intention to introduce junction protection with the intention to improve accessibility and safety for all roads users and pedestrians. Depending on the location, the double yellow lines may exceed 10 metres, in order to ensure access aims.

3.5 The following roads have been suggested for this project:

Road	Town
Beauchamps	Welwyn Garden City
Bullrush Close	Hatfield
Cheviots	Hatfield
Church Lane	Northaw
Chennells	Hatfield
Holly Close	Hatfield
Indells	Hatfield
Melbourne Court	Welwyn Garden City
Roe Hill Close	Hatfield
The Croft	Welwyn Garden City

3.6 Any objections received, would still be considered by the relevant Council Committee, and their recommendations would still go through to Cabinet for approval.

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 <u>Financial Implication(s)</u>

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

6 Risk Management Implications

The risks related to this proposal are:

6.1 A risk assessment has not been prepared in relation to the proposals in this report as there are no new significant risks inherent in the proposals.

- 6.2 There is a potential for adverse or positive risk for the Council with regards public opinion for the management or introduction of new parking restrictions.
- 6.3 The amount of yellow lining and parking control within the borough continues to increase, and this increase may in due course require additional budget to ensure lining and signage is appropriate for enforcement.

7 Security & Terrorism Implication(s)

7.1 There are no known security & terrorism implications associated with the content of 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 Key climate factors have been considered and are not thought to be applicable for this report.

10 <u>Link to Corporate Priorities</u>

- 10.1 I confirm that the subject of this report is linked to three of the 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 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has not been carried out. The creation of Traffic Regulation Orders requires further statutory consultation. An EIA will be completed during this process.

Name of author (*Vikki Hatfield – 01707 357555*)

Title (Parking and Cemetery Services Manager)

Date (27 January 2015)