

Part I

Item No: 0

Main author: Patrick Bepura

Executive Member: Cllr. Sandreni Bonfante

Ward: Welham Green & Hatfield South,
Hatfield South West and Hatfield East

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL – 18 FEBRUARY 2025
REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT)

INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES, AND OTHER WAITING
RESTRICTIONS, IN VARIOUS ROADS, HATFIELD SOUTH AND EAST, HATFIELD

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This consultation was added to the 2022/24 Works Programme due to thirty-six requests submitted from within the area between 2013 and 2022, as well as taking into consideration other adjacent area parking consultations over the last six years which led to some displacement.
- 1.2 In July 2023, Parking Services undertook a parking survey with 1882 residents and business properties in parts of Hatfield South and East wards including Welham Green and South Hatfield and parts of Hatfield South West. The extent of the consultation area is from Woods Avenue, following Travellers Lane southwards to sections of Bullens Green Lane and Tollgate Road.
- 1.3 The purpose of the survey was to engage with residents and businesses in seeking their views in relation to parking in the area. Historically, Parking Services have received requests from residents highlighting parking issues caused by, non-residents, university students as well as motor traders leaving vehicles parked upon the highway for extended periods reducing parking availability for residents.

A follow up letter was also sent to remind residents to partake in the survey to ensure a good response rate. Parking Services also sent a letter in February 2024 with draft ideas relating to the parking restrictions to gather further feedback.
- 1.4 Owing to the number of roads and locations, the area was grouped into five parts according to the proximity between locations.
- 1.5 This report sets out the results of the consultation survey, and feedback received pertaining to Hatfield South and East that commenced in June 2023, the statutory consultation including objections.
- 1.6 This report also sets out the results of the review period, and feedback received pertaining to High Dells and Hilltop parking restrictions, the statutory consultation including objections and the recommended course of action.
- 1.7 A total of fifty-one objections have been received relating to the proposed orders which are set out in Appendixes D, E and F. These objections include forty-four from the Hatfield South and East consultation area (total of 1,882 properties) and four from the High Dells and Hilltop parking restrictions review. Three objections were from the same households and one objection came from outside of the consultation area. A full list of the objections is contained within **Appendix A**.

- 1.8 Parking Services advertised proposals for three permit zones in this area. Two permit zones, zone B21 and zone B30 restrictions to operate Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm based upon the indicative survey results. These two are extensions of the existing zones and only two objections were received from these areas both citing lack of parking spaces. This report sets out Parking Services recommendation to proceed with the proposals as advertised.
- 1.9 Parking Services also advertised the proposals for further double yellow line restrictions following the High Dells and Hilltop parking restrictions review responses. Four objections including two from the same household were received.
- 1.10 A standard approach is adopted for junctions within consultation areas, of installing ten metres of double yellow lines to improve road safety by aiding visibility in exit and entry. Proposals set to replace existing single yellow lines at junctions with double yellow lines.
- 1.11 The Council can amend proposals once advertised. Objections under consultation regulations (The Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996) must be duly considered. Any amendment to proposals that are less restrictive can be done without having to re-advertise the Traffic Regulation Order.
- 1.12 It is now established practice that with all new parking restrictions introduced, the Council monitor any reports as to their effectiveness for the first six months following their implementation. Should the Council receive reports requesting changes or amendments to the new restrictions, a review of the restrictions would take place which may result in further recommendations or consultation.

2 Recommendation(s)

2.1 "The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Hatfield South and East, Hatfield) (Restriction of Waiting and Permit Parking Zones) Order 202X"

That the Panel considers the objections received in Section 7 in addition to the issues raised in Section 18 around equalities and diversity and recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised; and to note the delegated powers conferred to Executive Member for Environment to sign an executive member decision to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised, subject to unanimous recommendation of the Panel.

2.2 "The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Hatfield South and East, Hatfield) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verge or Footway) Order 202X"

That the Panel considers the objections received in Section 7 in addition to the issues raised in Section 18 around equalities and diversity and recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised; and to note the delegated powers conferred to Executive Member for Environment to sign an executive member decision to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised, subject to unanimous recommendation of the Panel.

3 Explanation

Hatfield South and East

- 3.1 Following a survey conducted by the Parking Services in July 2023, residents were asked to comment on parking issues and 615 properties (excluding duplicate household responses) responded. The number of responses in the area was 32.7%

although there were sections of those being in favour for some form of parking restrictions to be introduced and those not in favour of any changes.

- 3.2 Of the 852 responses received during the survey, 237 were from the same household. 615 were considered and out of these, 44% indicated they would like to see restrictions introduced and 28% were in favour of a residents permit parking scheme. **(Appendix B)**
- 3.3 In February 2024, Parking Services set out an idea in a letter to residents based upon survey results and officer knowledge in the extension of four permits zones, namely B21, B28, B29 and B30 **(Appendix G)**. The idea was to improve cohesion of parking availability between adjacent interlinking roads. For example, extension of B29 into Cherry Way which backs onto Acacia Street which is already within Zone B29 and some Cherry Way properties being nearer to Acacia Street than their postal road. Ninety five out of 1882 properties responded to our ideas letter, forty-three agreed with the ideas set out, forty-eight disagreed. In relation specifically to roads where a permit extension was suggested, Parking Services received sixty-three comments, twenty-five agreed, thirty-five disagreed. Of the ones who disagreed, fifteen were specifically relating to wanting longer permit hours, the rest disagreeing with the general idea of permits.
- 3.4 After the feedback was collated and received, further conversations were held with ward councillors in July 2024 who requested Parking Services extended the permit hours for the proposed permit areas to run later into the evening (excluding Travellers Lane/The Pastures & Oxlease Drive) to better control parking by commercial vehicles and improve parking availability for residents when returning home from daytime work hours. It was agreed considering the feedback and initial survey data to continue with the suggested extension of Zone B21 into Oxlease Drive and The Pastures, and Zone B30 into Travellers Lane. However, the suggested extension of B28 and B29 was merged into a new proposed Zone B05 to consider a new time of Monday to Friday 8am to 8pm. As the times are different to the adjacent zones, and to provide clarity to drivers, it would not be practical to extend the existing zones. This would allow any potential B05 permit holders to park within thirteen roads in the immediate southern section of Hatfield and prevent permit holders from adjacent roads/zones such as Hazel Grove and Southdown Road to park within the new proposed zone.
- 3.5 From the responses received after survey and feedback and in conversation with ward councillors and considering the geographical layout of the ward, it was determined that the most efficient way of progressing with the consultation was to group the area into separate zones, Zone B05, Zone B21 and Zone B30, with the latter two being extensions of existing permit zones.
- 3.6 The proposed Zones B21 and B30 to operate as per the existing zones, Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm covering Oxlease Drive and The Pastures (B21) and Travellers Lane (Between Woods Ave/Oxlease Roundabout & Drakes Way) as B30. This would give additional opportunity for those roads to have access to an existing permit zone and improving parking availability to permit holders.
- 3.7 The proposed Zone B05 to operate Monday to Friday 8am to 8pm covering thirteen roads.
- 3.8 Although residents in Zone B21 extension and B30 extension were in favour of various times for parking restrictions to start and finish, the survey evidenced that most residents preferred restrictions that would match the existing zones Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.

- 3.9 For residents in Zone B05, survey results demonstrated that most respondents preferred the restrictions to run from 8am to 8pm Monday to Sunday. However, in the initial ideas set out to residents, as mentioned in 1.8 and 1.9, Parking Services suggested Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm to allow extensions of existing permit zones, before additional feedback with ward councillors led to the zone to be proposed Monday to Friday 8am to 8pm.
- 3.10 In Zone B05, Cloverland residents were not in favour of any parking restrictions, and upon reviewing further responses received and including a petition they submitted during initial feedback, a Residents Parking Scheme was not proposed in the road due to the majority wishing to see no change. The proposal however contained double yellow lines on the junction and a Verge and Footway Prohibition Order (VFPO) verge/footway prohibition to improve highway safety measures to protect pedestrians.
- 3.11 There was a low response from Bullens Green Lane residents, however Parking Services proposed to introduce a section of double yellow lines due to road obstruction issues highlighted by some residents, which will also consider future housing development in the area.
- 3.12 Due to the ongoing parking issues in Woods Avenue by the schools, a section of additional double yellow lines was proposed to be introduced to improve highway access.
- 3.13 A Verge and Footway Prohibition Order (VFPO) was proposed as 39% of residents raised concerns regarding the damage caused to grass verges or the obstruction of the footway because of parking. Such introduction would prohibit this practice. In Otter Gardens, Lamb Close, Kingsmill Court, Allen Court, Hamilton Court, Lime Tree Court and Lilac Close, the VFPO was not proposed as the width of the carriageway was too narrow to allow vehicles to be parked fully upon the carriageway. Verges and footways are not designed to withstand the weight of parked vehicles long term.

4 High Dells and Hilltop Review

The review period was open from 18 September 2023 until 31 December 2023, via a feedback form on the Council's parking webpage, following the introduction of resident permit zones B26, B28, B29 and B30, as well as double yellow lines and VFPO in June 2023

Forty-eight residents from 1529 properties submitted their feedback as well as twenty-five duplicates/invalid. This equates to 3.1% response rate.

- 4.1 Eleven replies stated the restrictions had improved parking conditions, twelve stated it stayed the same (likely due to the permits replicating the previous single yellow line days and times in some roads), and twenty-four said it had got worse. **(Appendix C)**
- 4.2 Following the review of the survey results, it was proposed to install additional double yellow lines to sections of Chantry Lane and Bishops Rise as well as High Dells garage forecourt to consider access issues raised, as well as a significant safety issue raised in Bishops Rise as a result of the introduction of the permit zone.
- 4.3 Four objections were received two from properties in High Dells and two from the same household in Chantry Lane

5 Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO)

- 5.1 On 30 October 2024, Public Notices of Intention proposing the below Orders was advertised in the Welwyn Hatfield Times. **(Appendix D)**.

- 1) **THE BOROUGH OF WELWYN HATFIELD (VARIOUS ROADS, HATFIELD SOUTH AND EAST, HATFIELD) (RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND PERMIT PARKING ZONES) ORDER 202X**
- 2) **THE BOROUGH OF WELWYN HATFIELD (VARIOUS ROADS, HATFIELD SOUTH AND EAST, HATFIELD) (PROHIBITION OF STOPPING AND WAITING ON VERGE OR FOOTWAY) ORDER 202X**

- 5.2 Notices were erected in the affected length of roads and letters delivered to residents. Plans illustrating the proposals for each Order are attached to this report. (**Appendix E and Appendix F**).
- 5.3 A 21-day objection period in line with statutory requirements was open to submit an objection.

6 Objections

- 6.1 **Fifty-one** objections have been received pertaining to the proposed order(s) which are set out below in Section 7. To note, three households made two objections. We also received one objection from outside of the consultation area. This would equate to **forty-seven** households within the consultation area that objected overall. A full list of the objections is contained within **Appendix A**.
- 7** All objections were considered however for the purpose of this report, objections received on the same grounds were consolidated into one objections point and the table below shows objections points and the officer's comment.

| Hatfield South And East Objections | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>“We are all for Permit parking, but if we pay for it and then come home from work and unable to park what happens.? There are a lot of cars + vans that park on the grass so they will be parking in the laybys, and we will not be able to park. There is just not a lot of laybys to park in.”</p> | <p>Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) have constructed more parking bays and extended some existing ones in Bishops Rise, and they are also considering constructing more parking bays in this area. This TRO proposal also includes a provision of additional parking spaces in the former bus turning area as HCC confirmed the former bus turning area is no longer required at the location. While it cannot be guaranteed that residents will always get a desired parking spaces, the proposed residents permit scheme intends to address the issues relating to non-resident parking as raised by the residents and allow available parking spaces for residents and their visitors only. By removing the non-resident parking, it would in turn free up parking space giving residents better options to park closer to their homes.</p> |
| <p>“This will severely impact people's access to this historic building for very important life events and their opportunities of worship.”</p> <p>“We live at East lodge the only residence on this stretch of road and... so this proposal only affects us as permanent residents.”</p> | <p>We have received reports from other residents that access to their properties are being obstructed by non-residents visiting the area during events. The proposal was designed to address these issues so that access to properties is improved whilst some parking capacity be still left opposite the properties.</p> |
| <p>“There are currently 43 properties and only 33 bays, 2 of which are marked as disabled bays. Added to that, many homes own multiple cars (34% of UK homes own 2 or more vehicles) so assuming more than 55 vehicles need to park when everyone is home, it explains why there are cars parked down the sides of every entrance road and on some verges. We would like to know what the council propose to do to rectify the problem, can additional parking bays be created?”</p> | <p>Parking improvements have been investigated in this area for approval from Hertfordshire County Council, but many areas did not qualify or comply with current design guidelines. Given that HCC under LTP4 (Local Transport Plan 4), there is an aim to reduce the number of vehicles upon the highway additional parking creation is harder to justify, bay creation also requires a minimum footway width of and ideally a verge width of 2.4m to consider such proposals. Some areas were also cost prohibitive to create extra parking bays due to underlying utility cables/pipes, lampposts, or the need to land transfer or re-route public footways.</p> |
| <p>“I agree with the double yellows as well as the VFPO but I ask myself where are the residence meant to park their cars? are you prepared to mark the parking bays? to stop those people parking who don't live here and stop those people who can't park properly?, I for one would be prepared to pay to park my car, although this won't raise</p> | <p>Grass verges and footways are not designed to withstand the weight of or provided for the parking of vehicles. Millwards residents were not in favour of a resident permit parking scheme therefore based on the consultation results; a permit parking scheme was not proposed in this road.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>any revenue for the council something needs to be done about it.”</p> | |
| <p>“... the proposed times of 8am-8pm will create an inconsistency with the permit times on surrounding roads, such as Hazelgrove. This could potentially lead to people parking there if they are away from home before 9am until after 5pm so that they don't need to pay for a permit within the new 8am-8pm permit zone.”</p> | <p>The advertised permit zone timings were based on the survey results and feedback including ward councillors that were gathered during the initial consultation, and the proposal reflected this. The initial suggestion was to propose Mon-Fri 9am-5pm to match the existing permit zones so that residents may have a choice of where to park within the same zone. However, upon consultation with ward members, Monday to Friday 8am to 8pm scheme was proposed for the reasons set out in Section 3.</p> |
| <p>“The proposed fees—£43 for the first permit, £73 for the second, and £95 for each additional—are unreasonably high and would impose a significant financial burden on residents. This is in addition to already substantial council taxes, which are likely to increase further to address persistent issues.”</p> | <p>The introduction of Residents Parking Permit scheme is intended to reduce non-residents parking issues, enabling residence and their visitors more parking space. 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 will not require a permit if they intend to park off road. Permit and voucher fees and charges are set within the budget and agreed by all parties. Permits are set to be cost effective, and we offer one of the lowest permit prices in Hertfordshire.</p> |
| <p>“Do you have a plan to create more parking. If you do not then residents will not be supported fairly, we will be set up to fail.”</p> | <p>Parking improvements have been investigated in this area for approval from Hertfordshire County Council, but many areas did not qualify or comply with current design guidelines. Given that HCC under LTP4 (Local Transport Plan 4), there is an aim to reduce the number of vehicles upon the highway additional parking creation is harder to justify, bay creation also requires a minimum footway width and ideally a verge width of 2.4m to consider such proposals. Some areas were also cost prohibitive to create extra parking bays due to underlying utility cables/pipes, lampposts, or the need to land transfer or re-route public footways.</p> |
| <p>“I think this is being proposed as a money-making scheme because there is no legitimate reason as to why the permit parking should be implemented - and there is no benefit to any of the residents... This will also limit the number of visitors that we can have at our homes, some of which are a necessity due to various people's needs.”</p> | <p>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 will not require to purchase a permit if they plan to park off road. As most respondents to the survey indicated they were in favour of a permit scheme, this was reflected in the proposal of introducing a permit scheme Monday to Friday; and for the reasons set out in section 3.</p> |
| <p>“The primary issue for residents in our area has not been non-resident parking; rather, it is the insufficient number of spaces available for residents. Introducing parking permits alone would not alleviate this issue.”</p> | <p>Some of this area has been identified to be used by motor traders. Permit zones are created to cover multiple roads as we recognise not all roads have suitable kerbside space for each household. Although parking might not be available in the road the resident lives in, they should be able to find parking in another road within the same</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>zone. The proposed restrictions are intended to reduce non-residents parking issues, enabling residents and their visitors more available parking space. The scheme would allow family and visitors to park during the daytime when displaying a valid visitor voucher. Only vehicles insured and registered at the permit address would qualify for a resident parking permit, which in turn will reduce motor vehicle traders taking up parking capacity.</p> |
| <p>“We are all for permit parking , but if we pay for it and then come home from work and unable to park what happens.? There are a lot of cars + vans that park on the grass so they will be parking in the laybys and we will not be able to park. There is just not a lot of laybys to park in.”</p> | <p>Whilst it cannot be guaranteed that residents will always get parking spaces of their choice on the highway, the proposed residents permit scheme is intended to address the issues relating to non-resident parking as raised by the residents and allow available parking spaces for residents and their visitors only. By removing the non-resident parking (aside from authorised visitors to a household), it would in turn free up parking space giving residents better options to park closer to their homes.</p> |
| <p>“We do not have the luxury of getting drop curbs and parking in our front garden like other houses in travellers lane so please do maths!!, parking permits are now in the surrounding area for which we cannot park, so please could you explain if it wasn't for the grass verge (where vehicles have been parking for the last 10 years) where would you expect us to park and what other proposals have you considered for the actual residents in the area”.</p> | <p>As this area is proposed as an extension to Zone B30, Travellers Lane would have an opportunity to use available parking spaces if available in other roads such as Lark Rise and Dove Court if eligible. Grass verges and footways are not designed to withstand the weight of or provided for the parking of vehicles. Permit zones are created to cover multiple roads as it is recognised that not all roads have suitable kerbside space for each household. Although parking might not be available within sight of their home or in the road the resident lives in, they should be able to find parking in another road within the same zone. The area will be subject to a monitoring review.</p> |
| <p>“I believe this will further alienate people who get visitors especially if they are not tech savvy. As they will be charged/fined for visiting. Having to pay for parking that has been free until now is another tax on motorists who couldn't afford a driveway or garage. How is this helping working families you were voted in on this basic fact. Also how is the extra funds going to be used.”</p> | <p>The Council is not proposing to introduce any residents permit parking scheme in the objector's road. The proposal to introduce a Resident Permit Parking scheme relates to adjacent roads and was based on what most respondents to the survey were in favour of. The proposal intends to reduce non-residents parking issues, enabling residents and their visitors more parking space. 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. The Council sets the parking permits fees and charges to balance the budget and is amongst the lowest on street permit costs in Hertfordshire and beyond.</p> |
| <p>“When I signed petition for no parking permits, I didn't think it would mean just our street Cloverland with no parking permits and other surrounding streets having permits... I would like to request if permits are going</p> | <p>The proposed restrictions were based upon what the majority were in favour of when the area was being surveyed. Sixteen Cloverland residents signed a petition not to be included in the permit scheme. If the proposals are approved, a six-month monitoring period will be in place to gather feedback from residents after the scheme is</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>ahead for surrounding streets, Cloverland must be included to have permit parking.”</p> | <p>implemented. If further restrictions are highlighted during the monitoring period, this will be investigated and may lead to further recommendation.</p> |
| <p>“Many neighbours and I object to this proposal because several homes have multiple cars and manage perfectly fine with the current situation. I think this is being proposed as a money-making scheme because there is no legitimate reason as to why the permit parking should be implemented.”</p> | <p>The Council considered parking concerns as raised and highlighted by residents who then participated in the consultation and voted for parking restrictions, and we acted upon majority of responses. Whilst it is acknowledged that some residents did not take part in the survey, proposals considered the feedback of those who participated in consultation process.</p> |
| <p>“I am an old age pensioner and enjoy the pleasure of visiting my son and his wife and our grand children at his house in Tollgate road... It is an irony that only a few metres from my sons house is a war memorial with names of individuals who bravely lost their lives at the expense of creating more freedom only for the council to take away our freedom of being able to park outside our sons property which is a very small price. please can you consider my wife and I would like to object to this proposal and suggest whoever thought of this idea reconsiders how this effects peoples lives on a daily basis.”</p> | <p>Reports that access to properties is being obstructed by non-residents visiting the area during events at the location has been reported and the proposals were therefore designed so that the access to these properties is improved whilst some parking capacity be still left opposite the properties.</p> |
| <p>“...because there is not enough parking, as you can imagine in Bradshaws we are alot of hours in a small space. there is the section of road where bishops rise meets bradshaws which is our 'overflow' section, we can't lose that or we'd be really in trouble.”</p> | <p>The same permit zone means residents would still be able to use available spaces in Bishops Rise which we understand they are referring to as their 'overflow', as well as the provision of parking availability for permit holders in the former bus turning area.</p> |
| <p>High Dells and Hilltop Review Objections</p> | <p>Response</p> |
| <p>“We pay a lot of money to park here and we cannot get a space late at night at all so how on this gods earth will it be if you put more yellow lines if. I am not walking 5 minutes down the road late at night to park around another street that may have a space.”</p> | <p>The proposals are based on issues that were raised during the review period whilst considering issues caused by parking in front of the garage forecourt in the area causing lack of access to garages.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>“Whilst I agree with the restriction, I am concerned that the unofficial parking bay outside No’s 22 - 24 High Dells has not been addressed in the consultation.”</p> | <p>Some residents are parking facing the kerb to allow extra vehicles to park. It is not anticipated that there will be major access issues due to off street parking capacity in the area. Residents who have no access to off road parking were also considered when proposals were drafted.</p> |
| <p>“I have had incredible difficulty since the original restrictions were introduced in July 2023... since the restrictions have been imposed my parents have been unable to visit or help me regularly because every time, they do we have to use a parking permit, even for an hour or two. Now there are proposed additional double yellow lines on Chantry Lane my family will not be able to park even with a parking permit.”</p> | <p>A road safety concern was raised by residents and the proposals were drafted to enable enough room for emergency vehicles to pass. Residents who have off street parking e.g. a driveway will not require to purchase a permit if they plan to park off road. Parking is also available in Vigors Croft and other parts of Chantry Lane and High Dells, also the objectors would not need to use visitor vouchers at weekends</p> |

8 Legal Implication(s)

- 8.1 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. 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.
- 8.2 Through the Agency Agreement with Hertfordshire County Council, Welwyn Hatfield can implement restrictions on any road within the Special Enforcement Area and links in with Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 powers to make certain Orders.
- 8.3 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 places an obligation on the Council to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between those groups who share protected characteristics and those who do not, when coming to a decision on the exercise of any of its functions.

9 Financial Implication(s)

- 9.1 The cost of the Traffic Regulation Order and associated works recommended in this report will be funded through existing Parking Services revenue and capital budgets.

10 Risk Management Implications

- 10.1 Changing the parking restrictions could generate negative publicity. Some parking may be displaced into nearby roads where no restrictions exist.
- 10.2 It is standard procedure to monitor new parking restrictions for the first six months after any are implemented; in this case Parking Services will place a feedback form on our website after three months to gather any views once restrictions have settled in. 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.

11 Security & Terrorism Implications

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

12 Human Resources

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

13 Communication and Engagement

- 13.1 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.
- 13.2 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 from them relating to the proposals recommended in this report.
- 13.3 In addition, Public Notices are required to be erected within all affected roads and advertised in the Welwyn Hatfield Times.

13.4 This process has been conducted and there are no known implications in relation to the proposals in this report.

14 Health and Wellbeing

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

15 Procurement Implications

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

16 Climate Change Implication(s)

16.1 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 non-resident vehicles driving through the zone from other locations to park. A verge and footway prohibition will also reduce parking on verges leading to a small increase in ecological landscape and biodiversity. Therefore, there is a potential for a positive climate change implication.

17 Link to Corporate Priorities

17.1 This report is linked to the following Council's corporate priorities:

Run an effective Council – to deliver efficient and quality services.

18 Equality and Diversity

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

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 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. Verge and footway prohibitions would have a positive affect for such pedestrians for easier navigation of the public footways.

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 three hours. 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.

18.2 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.

18.3 In addition, during the monitoring period, should any unintended negative impacts arise Parking Services will, where possible, investigate and conduct the appropriate remedial action.

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Name of author | Patrick Bepura |
| Title | Parking Services Officer |
| Date | December 2024 |

Background papers:

| | |
|---|------------|
| Objections Received | Appendix A |
| Hatfield South and East survey data | Appendix B |
| High Dells and Hilltop Review data | Appendix C |
| Advertised Public Notice | Appendix D |
| Hatfield South and East advertised drawings | Appendix E |
| High Dells and Hilltop advertised/ drawings | Appendix F |
| Initial ideas letter sent to residents, | Appendix G |