

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL  
CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL – 7 MARCH 2019  
REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR (RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENT AND  
CULTURAL SERVICES)

INTRODUCTION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN VARIOUS ROADS, CUFFLEY

**1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 Residents and businesses in parts of Cuffley were consulted upon on street parking restrictions proposals in 2018. When concluding the works programme for Cuffley, all requests made before October 2018 were also looked at, including a request for double yellow lines on sections of roads where obstructive parking were causing traffic flow issues. This included requests from Colesdale and Brookside Crescent.
- 1.2 This report sets out the results of the informal consultation, the statutory consultation and the recommended course of action. A total of 232 residents and businesses have been consulted. One objection has been received. See **Appendix A**.

**2 Recommendation(s)**

- 2.1 That the Panel consider the objection received in 4.1, and in particular the issues raised in Section 15 around equalities and diversity and having considered all the detailed issues in this report including any proposed mitigating actions, recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for all the reasons set out in this report

**3 Explanation**

**3.1 Brookside Crescent**

Several residents from Brookside Crescent had contacted the Council independently to complain of parking congestion and damage to the grass verge on the bend leading into the crescent shaped area adjacent to numbers 46 and 48.

The initial response from Parking Services was to propose double yellow lines around the bend on the northeast side only to enable vehicles to have a bigger sweep left into the crescent area. This will also be of benefit to refuse collection vehicles which will reduce in driving up the edge of the opposite verge to navigate past parked vehicles on the bend.

One formal objection was received in relation to the Brookside Crescent proposals. See **Appendix A**.

### 3.2 **Colesdale**

A resident from Colesdale had contacted the Council to complain of parking congestion when entering and exiting the garage access area opposite number 8 Colesdale. In 2016, double yellow lines had been introduced on the side of road where the access road is.

The initial response from Parking Services was to propose double yellow lines directly opposite the garage access area to enable a better sweep for vehicles to enter and exit the area.

Following advertisement of the proposals, no formal objections were received.

### 3.3 **Station Road and Maynard Place**

As part of the conclusion of the Works Programme in Cuffley, residents and business in Station Road and Maynard Place were consulted on any requirements to change the parking conditions within the road. There was no majority from the responses wishing to change the times or lengths of restrictions already offered in the parking bays within the road. There was a strong desire to see a disabled bay made enforceable to give better provision for disabled badge holders in the shopping area. As part of the proposals, a disabled bay has been proposed to be restricted 24/7 and provided nearer to the centre of the shopping area and crossing point. See **Appendix C** for the plans.

It was also identified by Parking Services that the 'permit holder's only bay' which is located on Station Road by the junction of Lambs Close, was no longer being used by permit holders during the parking restriction days and times, due to sufficient parking provision in the permit bays in Lambs Close. As part of the parking restriction proposals, we proposed to change the bay from Permit Holders Only Monday to Friday, 11am to 1pm to match the other parking bays within the road to Monday to Saturday 8am – 6:30pm 30 minutes, no return within 1 hour. Obstructive parking is taking place on single yellow lines along both roads on Sundays and evenings when the restriction didn't apply – often vehicles parking within 10 metres of the junction. Double yellow lines are proposed to remove the option for parking in those parts of the road, reducing parking congestion.

Following advertisement of the proposals, no formal objections were received.

### 3.4 **Theobalds Road**

This section of Theobalds Road is narrow and unable to accommodate parked vehicles and delivery vehicles. A loading restriction was introduced in 2000 to prohibit vehicles, including blue badge holders, from parking or loading/unloading in the narrow section of road by the junction of Station Road. However, upon checking the Councils records during the consultation process it uncovered that Hertfordshire County Council had subsequently introduced a double yellow lines in the same part of the road which had caused the loading/unloading restriction to automatically revoke. Parking Services then re-advertised the loading/unloading prohibition to rectify the clerical error, and to enable the restriction to be enforceable.

Following advertisement of the proposals, no formal objections were received.

### **Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)**

- 3.5 On the 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019 the public notice proposing “**The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Cuffley) (Restriction of Waiting , Loading and Unloading) Order 2019** together with “**The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Station Road, Cuffley) (Parking Places) Order 2019** was advertised in the Welwyn Hatfield Times. Notices were also erected in the lengths of roads affected. The closing date for formal objections was Friday 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019. See **Appendix B**

#### **4 Objections**

- 4.1 There is one objection pertaining to Brookside Crescent, relating to the proposal for double yellow lines.

Below is a summary of the grounds for objection.

- a) There has never been an issue with parking within the area proposed for double yellow lines
- b) The section of road away from the proposed yellow lines is very narrow and two vehicles cannot park on either (both) sides.
- c) If the proposal takes effect then parking in the other section of Brookside Crescent will become more difficult

- 4.2 The reasons for moving forward with these proposals are as follows:

##### 4.2.1 Responses to 4.1

- a) The proposals were brought forward upon several requests from residents who live directly by the section of highway where lines have been proposed. The proposals relate to a short section of yellow lines on the bend of the road where the turning range is more limited for larger vehicles. The introduction would assist in larger vehicles like refuse vehicles from accessing the crescent area with a bigger sweep without needing to mount the verge on the opposite side of the carriageway. As highlighted by the objector further in the objection, vehicles for sale have been parked in the past, in the section of highway that is proposed for double yellow lines.
- b) There has been no other comments raised by residents in the road that the narrow section suffers with parking issues. On site visits by Parking Officers, there is often a limited amount of vehicles parked within that part of the road. Most drivers use a common sense approach in narrow sections of highway, to ensure not to park on both sides of the road and not cause obstruction for vehicles to be able to navigate past.
- c) There is a low likelihood of parking displacement towards the narrow section of highway between numbers 4 and 12, by the introduction of the section of line proposed which equates to 3 vehicle lengths, as there is spare capacity elsewhere within the road to handle the maximum additional 3 vehicles caused by the introduction of parking restriction. Parking Services monitor all restrictions for 6 months after introduction to see if any displacement has been caused and work can be planned to resolve any displacement.

## **5 Legal Implication(s)**

- 5.1 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.

## **6 Financial Implication(s)**

- 6.1 The cost of TRO works recommended in this report will be funded through existing Parking Services revenue and capital budgets.
- 6.2 It is standard procedure to monitor new parking restrictions for the first 6 months after they are implemented. During this period all reports of safety issues or parking displacement will be recorded. If any significant safety issues are discovered during the monitoring period, Parking Services will investigate and carry out the appropriate remedial action.

## **7 Risk Management Implications**

- 7.1 Changing the parking conditions in the above mentioned roads could generate negative publicity. Some parking may be displaced into nearby roads.
- 7.2 It is standard procedure to monitor new parking restrictions for the first 6 months after they 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 where possible will investigate and carryout the appropriate remedial action.

## **8 Security & Terrorism Implications**

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

## **9 Human Resources**

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

## **10 Communication and Engagement**

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 In addition, Notices are required to be erected within all roads affected and advertised in the local newspaper, in this case the Welwyn Hatfield Times.
- 10.3 This process has been carried out and there are no known implications in relation to the proposals in this report.

## **11 Health and Wellbeing**

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

## **12 Procurement Implications**

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

## **13 Climate Change Implication(s)**

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

## **14 Link to Corporate Priorities**

14.1 The subject of this report is linked to the Council's Corporate Priority Protect and Enhance the Environment, and specifically to the achievement to Deliver Effective Parking Services

- Protect and enhance the environment and deliver effective parking services;
- Engage with our communities and provide value for money

## **15 Equality and Diversity**

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

15.2 The EqIA found that there is potential for negative impacts on Age, Pregnancy and Disability. The double yellow lines will prevent parking at junctions which may force some motorists to park further away from their destination. Parking Services believe however that the benefits gained from junction protection far outweigh any dis-benefits.

15.3 Disabled drivers with a valid blue badge are allowed to park on yellow lines with no loading prohibitions for up to 3 hrs. The provision of the formal disabled bay in Station Road, Cuffley will enhance the disabled parking provision available close to the local amenities.

15.4 During the monitoring period (6.2) should any unintended impacts come to light, Parking Services will where possible investigate and carryout the appropriate remedial action.

Name of author	Matthew McCann 01707 357304
Title	Parking Services Officer
Date	18 <sup>th</sup> February 2019

Background papers to be listed (if applicable)