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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 Dacorum Borough Council (DBC), with assistance from Project Centre (PCL), conducted an informal consultation, offering parking proposals for residents in the Boxmoor area of Hemel Hempstead.

1.2 The results of the informal consultation in Boxmoor indicated approximately 72% of respondents would support some form of parking controls within the proposed area.

1.3 Residents and businesses were asked to provide their views on the parking proposals through an on-line questionnaire, written correspondence or via the dedicated consultation email address. 249 items of correspondence were received during the consultation process from addresses both within the proposed consultation area and throughout Hemel Hempstead.

1.4 Of the 249 items of correspondence received, these included 161 questionnaire responses, of which 132, (82%) of responses have been analysed and 18% of responses have been discarded as no address details were provided. Of the 132 analysed responses, the following opinions were provided: 80 (61%) respondents supported some form of parking controls, 45 (34%) respondents did not support any form of parking controls and 7 (5%) respondents did not have an opinion. 80 emails were received and 3 letters received.

1.5 3 areas were consulted, namely the proposed Zone G which would see parking controls introduced on a number of residential streets to deter all day commuter parking. The second area consulted consisted of properties located on Northridge Way with proposals to extend the existing Zone X to allow residents to obtain permits to park within the zone. The final consultation area was St John’s Road. Views and opinions were gathered from local residents and businesses as to the best solution for the village.

1.6 Residents towards the southern end of Cowper Road have expressed concerns about the proposed parking arrangements as off-street parking is limited and the current proposals would reduce the amount of available space, making it even more difficult to park. A further review of the proposed restrictions on Cowper Road is recommended to determine if alternative hours of operation are supported by the residents.

1.7 Residents of Puller Road have indicated much of the parking problem is due to residents rather than commuters, but have also suggested many customers of the pub often leave their vehicles over the weekend adding to the parking problems, which the current proposals did not address.

1.8 Although agreeing there is a parking problem, the residents of St John’s Road rejected the preliminary design. Further consultation is required to determine the needs of local residents and businesses.
1.9 We would recommend further consultation should be carried out to find a solution that would best suit the majority of the residents within the study area.

1.10 Although not originally included within the proposals, Gravel Hill Terrace and Green End Gardens should be considered for further consultation and inclusion in any scheme that may be implemented as residents from these roads expressed a desire to be included should the proposals move forward.

1.11 The table below indicates the total number of responses (questionnaires, letters and emails) received indicating whether there is support for some form of parking controls from each road in or around the consultation area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>% for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alston Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargrove Avenue</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulborne Close</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Hill Terrace</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Gardens</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor Terrace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwick Close</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Green</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchford Place</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puller Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebright Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poplars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 On-line questionnaire

- To determine whether the introduction of some form of parking controls were supported by residents, businesses and stakeholders within the study area.
- Provide an indication of the level of support for the proposed restrictions for each street within the study area.
- Allow further comments related to the consultation and overall proposals.

2.2 Email Responses

To provide a dedicated consultation email address for residents and businesses to make enquiries and leave their thoughts and concerns regarding the scheme proposals.

To obtain views from the community relating to proposed parking restrictions within each road of the study area.

2.3 Telephone Line

A dedicated telephone line was provided by PCL during the consultation process, again for the purpose of answering any questions consultees may have had regarding the scheme proposals. As we were unable to record any objections to the proposals, consultees were asked to record their objections or comments in writing.

2.4 Written Correspondence

To obtain views from the community relating to proposed parking restrictions within each road of the study area.

For PCL to analyse all correspondence and compile a report in order to summarise and present the findings of the pre-consultation to the client (DBC).

2.5 Public Drop-in Sessions

To hold two public drop-in sessions in order to further understand the proposed parking restrictions and to give residents the opportunity to meet DBC and PCL staff to understand the rationale behind the proposals whilst being able to express their views and opinions. Feedback forms were to be collected in order to record these comments.
3. **INTRODUCTION**

3.1 Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) undertook a further informal consultation, with assistance from PCL to gain the views of local residents within the Boxmoor area of Hemel Hempstead.

3.2 The consultations took place between 26th October 2015 and 22nd November 2015.

3.3 Letters containing the scheme proposals were hand delivered to all properties within the two study areas, during the week commencing 19th October 2015, inviting responses to the on-line questionnaire and any further comments to the proposals. The consultation material can be found in Appendix A of this report.

3.4 A notice was also placed in the Hemel Hempstead Gazette informing the local area of the planned consultation.

3.5 Supporting information was available to view at the council offices during the consultation.

3.6 Consultation questionnaires were available to complete on-line in order to seek the views of residents and businesses in relation to the proposed parking restrictions. A paper version of the questionnaire was available for residents who did not have access to the internet.

3.7 PCL managed the on-line questionnaire and have analysed the responses. This report details the number of responses for each question, the level of support for the proposal offered and the number of comments received relating to the proposals through the various means of correspondence.

3.8 Two public drop in sessions were held at St John’s Church, which gave residents the opportunity to meet DBC and PCL staff and gain an understand of the rationale behind the proposals.

3.9 This also gave DBC and PCL staff an opportunity to hear firsthand the views and concerns of residents and businesses. In order to document these views and concerns, residents were invited to complete feedback forms which, like the online questionnaires, have been analysed with the findings detailed in this report.

3.10 Views and concerns were also collated via a dedicated email address and written correspondence.

3.11 All correspondence and feedback has been analysed and summaries of the findings have been detailed in this report.
4. BACKGROUND

4.1 DBC introduced Zone X, a residents parking scheme in the Moorland Road/Kingsland Road areas of Boxmoor in Hemel Hempstead, in 2014 to deter commuter parking. This informal consultation is seeking to identify if the residents in surrounding roads now suffer from any displacement of vehicles following the introduction of Zone X.

4.2 A number of comments have been received from residents indicating parking problems following the recent introduction of a CPZ in the Moorland Road/Kingsland Road areas of Boxmoor and some residents have also indicated parking issues at school drop off and pick up times.

4.3 Subsequently, a scheme providing parking restrictions that would operate between 9am and 10am and 2pm and 3pm Monday to Friday has been proposed, with the exception of Green End Road where restrictions would operate from 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday.

4.4 The proposed parking scheme has been designed to indicate what the introduction of parking restrictions could offer the residents within the study area. At this time, no decision has been made to implement any of the proposals and as such this consultation was designed to indicate if there is wide spread support for parking controls.

4.5 As a result of the Zone X introduction, concerns have also been raised regarding the increased number of ‘commuter’ vehicles parking along Northridge Way. In order to address this, DBC is proposing an extension to Zone X along Northridge Way.

4.6 Residents were also invited to comment on a preliminary design to reduce any negative effects the new zone may have on St John’s Road. Whilst in its early stages, this was a good opportunity to gain an insight to the parking needs of residents and businesses on St John’s Road.

4.7 The Council is now seeking to gain the local residents and businesses opinions on the most suitable approach to reducing parking congestion in roads within the Boxmoor area of Hemel Hempstead.
5. INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS

5.1 A total of 289 items of correspondence to the consultations were received from residents and businesses in and around the study area. The responses were submitted in various formats.

5.2 161 online questionnaires were received in total (31 responses were not completed correctly and therefore cannot be considered). It should be noted only 1 on-line questionnaire response was permitted from each household within the study area to prevent multiple responses being received.

5.3 A total of 5 letters were received from residents and businesses both within the consultation area.

5.4 86 emails were received via the dedicated pre-consultation email address. Comments received addressed concerns across all 3 proposals.

5.5 35 feedback forms were collected during the public drop-in session where residents could further express their level of support for the proposals.

5.6 2 petitions were received. One from the residents of St John’s Road rejecting the current parking proposals and one from the residents of Moorland Road, Cangels Close and Grove Road objecting to the extension of Zone X.
6. **ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Options proposed:

6.1 The on-line questionnaire and consultation material offered a proposed parking scheme designed to stop all day commuter parking whilst protecting resident parking within the proposed zone. Respondents were asked to indicate if they supported the proposals.

6.2 Tables 6.10 to 6.12 in this report highlight the breakdown of the responses received to questions 7 and 8 of the questionnaire.

6.3 Respondents were asked to provide further comments as they felt necessary. Analysis of all the comments submitted via the on-line questionnaire, letters and dedicated email address are detailed in Appendix C of this report. For analysis purposes, the comments have been categorised into groups to indicate the types of comments provided. Please refer to paragraph 7.7 for comments codes. A summary of the key issues are reported in Section 7 Further Analysis

6.4 It was mandatory for the respondent to provide their address details to ensure the detailed analysis of the responses provided the intended views and opinions of each resident/business within the study area.

6.5 132 online questionnaires were completed up to and including questions 1 to 5 which sought to identify if the respondent was a resident, business or both, their address, the number of vehicles in the household and where the vehicles were normally parked.

6.6 88% of questionnaire respondents indicated they were residents, 1.5% indicated they were a business within the study area, 1.5% indicated they were both a resident and a business while 9% said they were neither a business nor resident.

6.7 The responses to vehicle ownership indicated 99% of questionnaire respondents owned at least one vehicle while only 1% of respondents do not own a vehicle.

6.8 68% of the questionnaire respondents parked at least 1 vehicle on their driveway with 56% of respondents indicating they park at least 1 vehicle on the road.

6.9 75% of the respondents indicated they experienced parking problems at some point during the day. 40% indicated there was a parking problem all day, 14% indicated the parking problem was during the day time (9am – 5pm), 13% experience parking problems in the evening, 7% indicated a parking problem in the morning and 25% indicated they never experienced a parking problem.
Completed Questionnaire Responses:

6.10 The following section provides the analysis of the 132 completed questionnaires, where the respondent indicated if they supported the proposals put forward. A breakdown of responses can be found in Appendix B of this report.

Question 7:

Table 1
Support for parking controls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>DO NOT SUPPORT</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11 80 (61%) questionnaire respondents indicated they would support some form of parking controls.
Question 8:

Do you agree with the proposed restrictions in your street?

Table 2
Do you agree with the proposed restrictions in your street?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>DO NOT SUPPORT</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.12 Only 117 respondents answered question 8, with the results indicating slightly less support (44%) for the proposed parking arrangements than those who did not support the proposed parking arrangements (50%).
7. **FURTHER ANALYSIS – ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS**

7.1 As previously indicated in paragraph 6.3 of this report, an option to provide further commentary was available at the end of the questionnaire. Analysis of the comments left by respondents is detailed below.

7.2 A complete list and breakdown of the comments received can be found in Appendix C of this report.

7.3 All comments have been analysed, collated and a code has been applied to each comment.

7.4 The comments fall into 9 categories of which:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Money Making Exercise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Commuter / Inadequate station parking causes the problem</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No perceived parking problems</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No Provision for School Runs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Will have a negative effect on local businesses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No provision for visitor parking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Most notably from the comments received, respondents suggested current restrictions are not adequate enough to resolve the parking difficulties, with 44 respondents requesting changes to the current proposed restrictions or that their street be included within the proposals.

7.6 Please note that not all completed questionnaires included further comments. 93 individual comments were taken from the 132 completed questionnaires.
Summary of Comments

Comment Code A: Support for parking restrictions: Residents who have indicated their support for parking controls have identified congestion, road safety, lack of enforcement and commuter parking as their reasons for supporting the parking proposals.

Comment Code B: Do not support parking restrictions: Residents have indicated they do not support the introduction of parking controls and would prefer to leave the current situation as it is.

Comment Code C: Money Making Exercise: Comments were received suggesting the proposals are simply a money making schemes for the council. Some residents felt neither they nor their visitors should be charged to park near their properties.

Comment Code D: Requests for amendments to the proposal: Comments received primarily from adjacent roads have requested their street be included within the proposals as residents indicate any scheme would displace vehicles into surrounding roads. Further comments from properties in Boxmoor have requested the proposed restrictions be extended to cover the entire street. Several comments were made requesting minor changes to the proposal or the inclusion of further restriction within the proposal.

Comment Code E: Commuters/ inadequate station parking cause the current problems: Comments suggest cheaper railway station parking would stop inconsiderate and all day parking within the study area.

Comment Code F: No perceived parking problems: Comments suggest that the current parking arrangements are sufficient and there is no requirement for further restrictions.

Comment Code G: Lack of provision for School run: Comments were received, mainly from people outside of the study area, concerned with the lack of provision for those dropping off and picking up from schools within the study area.

Comment Code H: Will have a negative effect on local businesses: Businesses on St John’s Road were concerned that the proposals would have a detrimental effect on business as the amount of available parking in the village would decrease.

Comment Code I: Visitor parking provision: Two comments were received stating the resident was concerned with where their visitors would be able to park.
8. DROP-IN SESSION FEEDBACK FORMS

8.1 Drop-in sessions were held over 2 days to give residents the opportunity to meet DBC and PCL staff in order to gain a better understanding of, and the reasoning for, the proposed parking scheme.

8.2 In order to record residents' views and opinions, feedback forms were offered to attendees.

8.3 35 forms were received, of which 26 related to the Zone G proposals and 7 were from residents or businesses on St John’s Road. No forms were received in relation to the Zone X extension.

8.4 As with the results of the online questionnaire, the comments collected via the feedback forms were analysed and a category code applied to each.

8.5 1 feedback form was received from a resident who lived outside of the proposed area. The resident felt the proposal did not cover a wide enough area and requested a more in-depth consultation take place.

Introduction of Zone G

8.6 The comments received via the drop-in session feedback forms fell into 7 categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Money Making exercise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Commuter / Inadequate station parking causes the problem</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No perceived parking problem</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7 Of the 26 feedback forms received from residents within the proposed Zone G, 69% of respondents were in support of the proposed parking zone. It should be noted however, 55% of those in support of the scheme made comments requesting minor amendments to the proposed restrictions.

8.8 Similarly, 57% of those who did not support the proposed restrictions made comments relating to the need for further or different restrictions.

8.9 2 comments were received from residents who believed there are no current parking problems in the Boxmoor area. 1 comment also mentioned the additional cost the scheme would impose on residents.
8.10 Summary of Comments

**Comment Code A: Support for parking restrictions:** Residents who have indicated their support for parking controls have identified congestion, road safety, lack of enforcement and commuter parking as their reasons for supporting the parking proposals.

**Comment Code B: Do not support parking restrictions:** Residents have indicated they do not support the introduction of parking controls and would prefer to leave the current situation as it is.

**Comment Code C: Money Making Exercise:** Comments were received suggesting the proposals were simply a money making scheme for the council. Some residents felt neither they nor their visitors should be charged to park near their properties.

**Comment Code D: Requests for amendments to the proposal:** Several comments were made requesting minor changes to the proposal or the inclusion of further restrictions within the proposal.

**Comment Code E: Commuters/ inadequate station parking cause the current problems:** Comments suggest cheaper railway station parking would stop inconsiderate and all day parking within the study area.

**Comment Code F: No perceived parking problems:** Comments imply that the current parking arrangements are sufficient and there is no requirement for further restrictions.

St John’s Road

8.11 The comments received via the drop-in session feedback forms fell into 4 categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Money Making Exercise</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Does not meet the needs of residents and Businesses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.12 Of the 6 feedback forms received from residents of St John’s Road, 100% of respondents were opposed to the proposed restrictions on St John’s Road. 83% of respondents stated the proposals did not meet the needs of residents and businesses on St John’s Road.

8.13 3 respondents requested amendments to the proposal including 2 comments requesting that St John’s Road be included in the proposed Zone G.
8.14 Summary of Comments

**Comment Code A: Support for parking restrictions:** Residents who have indicated their support for parking controls have identified congestion, road safety, lack of enforcement and commuter parking as their reasons for supporting the parking proposals.

**Comment Code B: Do not support parking restrictions:** Residents have indicated they do not support the introduction of parking controls and would prefer to leave the current situation as it is.

**Comment Code D: Requests for amendments to the proposal:** Comments were made suggesting the proposed restrictions were overzealous and requested changes to both the location and type of restriction.

**Comment Code R: Does not meet the needs of residents and businesses:** Comments were received suggesting the proposals have not been thoroughly consulted on as they do not meet the needs of local businesses or residents.
9. EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE

9.1 In addition to the online questionnaire, further correspondence was received via the dedicated consultation email address Dacorum-Consultation@projectcentre.co.uk.

9.2 Email correspondence was received relating to all 3 proposals. Whilst not explicitly stated, comments suggest correspondence came from both residents and businesses, especially along St John’s Road.

9.3 In much the same way as the comments which were received via the online questionnaire, and via the drop-in session feedback forms, the comments received via email were collated, analysed and a code applied to each.

9.4 A complete list and breakdown of the comments received can be found in Appendix C of this report.

Introduction of Zone G

9.5 A total of 39 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone G).

9.6 The comments fall into 9 categories;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Money Making Exercise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Commuters / Inadequate station parking causes the problem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No perceived parking problems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No Provision for School Runs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Will have a negative effect on local businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.7 38% of respondents were in support of the proposals, 49% were against and 13% did not explicitly state whether they were for or against the proposed parking scheme.

9.8 A lower proportion of comments received via email were in favour (38%) of the proposed parking than those comments received via the online questionnaire (51%).

9.9 26 comments requested amendments to the proposals, including 13 emails requesting that the zone be extended and comments raising concern over access to resident parking permits for those living in Rosehill Court and Latchford Court. Both of these lie within the proposed scheme.
In addition to comments made by residents, the Councillor for Boxmoor also has concerns about the effect the introduction of the proposed parking scheme may have on the un-adopted highway in The Poplars.

4 comments were received from residents of Gravel Hill Terrace who feared the introduction of Zone G would cause displacement parking in their roads and would like the proposed Zone G extended to include Gravel Hill Terrace.

A number of emails were received from residents outside the scheme whose children attended St Rose’s school. Objections to the 30 minutes limited waiting were among the most noted comments.

Summary of Comments

**Comment Code A: Support for parking restrictions:** Residents who have indicated their support for parking controls have identified congestion, road safety, lack of enforcement and commuter parking as their reasons for supporting the parking proposals.

**Comment Code B: Do not support parking restrictions:** Residents have indicated they do not support the introduction of parking controls and would prefer to leave the current situation as it is.

**Comment Code C: Money Making Exercise:** comments were received suggesting that the proposals are a money making scheme for the council. Residents felt neither they nor their visitors should be charged to park near their properties.

**Comment Code D: Requests for amendments to the proposal:** Several comments were made requesting minor changes to the proposal or the inclusion of further restrictions within the proposal. As well as comments received primarily from adjacent roads have requested their street be included within the proposals as residents indicate any scheme would displace vehicles into surrounding roads.

**Comment Code E: Commuters/ inadequate station parking cause the current problems:** Comments suggest cheaper railway station parking would stop inconsiderate and all day parking within the study area.

**Comment Code F: No perceived parking problems:** Comments suggest that the current parking arrangements are sufficient and there are no requirements for further restrictions.

**Comment Code G: Lack of provision for School run:** Comments were received, mainly from people outside of the study area, concerned with the lack of provision those dropping off and picking up from the schools within the study area.

**Comment Code H: Will have a negative effect on local businesses:** Comments were received from the businesses on St John’s Road displaying concern that the proposals would have a detrimental effect on businesses as the amount of available parking near the village would decrease.
Zone X Extension

9.14 31 emails were received with comments relating to the proposed Zone X extension. Only 6% respondents were in favour of the Zone X extension, with 94% (29) objecting to any extension of Zone X.

9.15 Comments fall into 7 categories;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Proposed Zone X Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Proposed Zone X Extension</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Inadequate station parking / Commuter parking causes the problem</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No perceived parking problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>Extension will cause inter-zone displacement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.16 Clear objection was received to the proposal to extend the existing Zone X, with 94% of email respondents objecting to the proposal.

9.17 7 comments were made suggesting that since the introduction of Zone X there has been an increase in the number of ‘commuter’ vehicles parked along Northridge Way.

9.18 A high number of comments (22) suggested the proposal needs be amended to provide more on-street parking or that the creation of a separate Northridge Way CPZ would better resolve the current parking difficulties.

9.19 Several comments were received stating that the current proposal does not provide sufficient parking for the number of extra properties which are to be included in the Zone X extension.

9.20 Concerns were also raised about inter-zone commuting by the residents within the new extension, as Northridge Way is considerably further away from the station than the western end of the existing Zone X.

9.21 Summary of Comments

**Comment Code A: Support the Proposed Zone X extension**: Residents who have indicated their support for the extension of Zone X have identified congestion, road safety, and the possibility of displaced commuter parking as their reasons for supporting the parking proposals

**Comment Code B: Do not support parking restrictions**: Residents have indicated they do not support the extension of Zone X and would prefer to leave the current situation as it is.
Comment Code C: Extension will cause inter-zone Commuter parking: Comments were received suggesting that by extending Zone X, there would be inter-zone commuting from those residents on Northridge way into the roads closer to the station.

Comment Code D: Requests for amendments to the proposal: Several comments were made suggesting the proposals did not provide sufficient parking and requested the proposal be amended. Comments were also received requesting a separate Northridge Way Zone.

Comment Code E: Commuters/ inadequate station parking cause the current problems: Comments suggest cheaper railway station parking would stop inconsiderate and all day parking within the study area.

Comment Code F: No perceived parking problems: Comments suggest that the current parking arrangements are sufficient and there is no requirement for further restrictions.

St John’s Road

9.22 A total of 16 emails were received from residents and businesses on St John’s Road. From this, 31% (5) were in support of parking restrictions and 69% (11) did not agree the design effectively resolved parking difficulties on St John’s Road.

9.23 The comments fall into 7 categories;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Proposed Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Inadequate station parking / Commuter parking causes the problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No perceived parking problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Will have a negative effect on local businesses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.24 Whilst there was some degree of support for parking restrictions on St John’s Road, there was clear opposition to the current design, with 69% disagreeing with the proposal.

9.25 The majority of comments (12) expressed concern that the introduction of 3 Hour Maximum Stay bays did not effectively meet the requirement of both businesses and residents in St John’s Road and changes to the operational times of the bays be amended.

9.26 3 comments requesting the proposal be amended to incorporate St John’s Road into the new Zone G or existing Zone X were also noted.
9.27 Other comments included concerns that the restrictions would have a detrimental effect on local business and community and 2 comments suggested there were currently no parking problems along St John’s Road.

9.28 Summary of Comments

**Comment Code A: Support for parking restrictions:** Residents who have indicated their support for parking controls have identified congestion, road safety, lack of enforcement and commuter parking as their reasons for supporting the parking proposals.

**Comment Code B: Do not support parking restrictions:** Residents have indicated they do not support the introduction of parking controls and would prefer to leave the current situation as it is.

**Comment Code D: Requests for amendments to the proposal:** Comments were made suggesting the proposed restrictions were overzealous and requested changes to both the location and type of restriction. As well as comments requesting the incorporation of St John’s Road into either Zone X or the proposed Zone G.

**Comment Code E: Commuters/ inadequate station parking cause the current problems:** Comments suggest cheaper railway station parking would stop inconsiderate and all day parking within the study area.

**Comment Code F: No perceived parking problems:** Comments suggest that the current parking arrangements are sufficient and there is no requirement for further restrictions.

**Comment Code H: Will have a negative effect on local businesses:** Comments were received from the businesses on St John’s Road who were concerned that the proposals would have a detrimental effect on businesses, as the amount of available parking near the village would decrease.
10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDANCE

10.1 A total number of 5 letters and 2 petitions were received relating to the proposed parking scheme in Boxmoor.

Introduction of Zone G

10.2 3 letters were received relating to the introduction of Zone G.

10.3 1 letter was written in clear support for the introduction of Zone G. The resident stated the increased parking difficulty was caused by inconsiderate commuter parking.

10.4 1 letter, whilst agreeing with the introduction of the proposed Zone G, requested extending Double Yellow Lines at junctions to improve safety and visibility.

10.5 1 letter was received from the residents of Green End Road requesting that PCL alter the proposed design. They suggest that by switching the parking bays from the left hand side to the right hand side of the road, visibility would be improved. Consequently, road safety for vehicles exiting the roundabout at St John’s Road would improve, whilst making it easier for those residents to access their off street parking.

10.6 The letter also raised concerns over access to permits for those properties which may be built within the grounds of the former St Mary’s Convent.

Proposed Zone X extension

10.7 2 letters were received from residents within the proposed Zone X extension.

10.8 Concerns raised in these letters included; the inadequate level of parking provision for the number of properties within the Zone X extension, the fear of inter-zone displacement parking from those residents at the north and eastern ends of the existing zone and the impact vehicles parked along Northridge Way would have on visibility and road safety.

10.9 Along with the letter, a petition was received from the residents of Moorland Road, Cangels Close and Grove Road objecting to the proposed extension of Zone X.

10.10 12 signatories objected on the grounds that the extension would simply push the commuter parking problem further up Northridge Way. Concerns were also made over inter-zone commuting if the existing Zone X was to continue to expand.

10.11 The petition suggests the creation of a new Northridge Way CPZ, including these roads, would be the solution to the current parking problems.
Proposed Restrictions on St John’s Road

10.12 1 letter was received from a resident on St John’s Road. The resident did not feel there was a parking problem along St John’s Road and questioned who had requested the implementation of parking controls.

10.13 The resident suggested by negotiating with Camelot Rugby Club to use their Car Park during the week, any parking issues in the Boxmoor area could be resolved.

10.14 A petition was also received from the residents and businesses on St John’s Road. Whilst accepting there is a growing parking problem caused by commuters, they rejected the proposed design in its current form.

10.15 134 signatories objected on the grounds that there will be a negative effect on local business. The petition argues that the proposal does not meet the needs of residents living on St John’s Road so the proposals would actually reduce the amount of available parking space.

10.16 The petition points to the insufficient and overpriced station parking as being the root cause of parking difficulties in the Boxmoor area.

10.17 The petition requests further consultation of St John’s Road in order to capture the views of those who it will affect.
11. CONCLUSIONS

11.1 The online questionnaire responses indicated significant support for the introduction of some form of parking controls, with 80% of respondents indicating they agree some form of controls are required.

11.2 When presented with the proposals, only 50% of respondents have indicated support for the proposed parking restrictions in their road. DBC may wish to review the proposed design as a number of residents feel the current proposals do not go far enough to alleviating the existing parking issues. This is demonstrated namely in Puller Road where customers of the local pub have been identified as adding to the current parking problems. The current proposals would not effectively deal with this issue.

11.3 Further analysis of the comments provided via the on-line questionnaire, letters and emails would suggest further consultation is required to find a suitable proposal for the current parking situation for proposed Zone G.

11.4 A number of respondents from the proposed extension area to Zone X have indicated their support to be included within the parking scheme, although some residents who live within Zone X have expressed their concern that parking may become an issue if more properties join the scheme.

11.5 The responses indicated a clear objection to the Zone X extension. Comments suggested this would simply push the problem further up the road and therefore it would not alleviate the problem.

11.6 A suggested solution would be to create a separate 'Northridge Way' zone, including those houses on Cangels Way and Moorland Road. The residents suggest this would allow for a smaller zone, which could be expanded independently at a later stage.

11.7 The preliminary designs for parking restrictions in St John's Road were not widely accepted by the residents or businesses, with 100% objecting to the proposals.

11.8 Support exists for some form of parking controls, but opinion would suggest the current proposals do not suit the community as a whole and further consultation is required.

11.9 Although not originally included within the consultation, residents from Gravel Hill Terrace and Green End Gardens have also expressed a desire to be included within the proposed resident permit scheme. 11 signed letters from residents living in Green End Gardens were submitted indicating their support for inclusion.
12. RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 The results of the pre-consultation have indicated that the majority of residents who responded were in support of some form of parking controls in their street. It is recommended that the DBC should consider:

- Carrying out further consultation with the view to implement a parking scheme that will deter all day commuter parking within proposed Zone G and extend Zone X to include those properties in Northridge Way.

12.2 Future consultation is required to determine an alternative to the proposed Monday to Friday 9am to 10am and 2pm to 3pm throughout the study area. Many respondents indicated the proposed restrictions did not meet their requirements and would not improve the current situation as there is limited on-street parking.

12.3 Consideration should be given to Cowper Road as many of the properties are terraced and do not benefit from off-street parking facilities. A review of the current proposals is recommended to determine if more parking provision could be provided.

12.4 Comments received from residents and businesses on St John’s Road were not comprehensive enough to determine a suitable solution to the current parking problems. Further consultation including the provision of a range of different options should be offered to gain a more thorough understanding of the needs of these residents and businesses.

12.5 Where possible, the proposals should be amended to take any requests from respondents into consideration.

12.6 Should the proposals move forward to implementation, it is recommended properties located on Gravel Hill Terrace and Green End Gardens be included within the scheme as correspondence received during the consultation indicated the majority of residents from both these roads indicated their desire to be part of any future scheme.
Quality

It is the policy of Project Centre to supply Services that meet or exceed our clients’ expectations of Quality and Service. To this end, the Company’s Quality Management System (QMS) has been structured to encompass all aspects of the Company’s activities including such areas as Sales, Design and Client Service.

By adopting our QMS on all aspects of the Company, Project Centre aims to achieve the following objectives:

- Ensure a clear understanding of customer requirements;
- Ensure projects are completed to programme and within budget;
- Improve productivity by having consistent procedures;
- Increase flexibility of staff and systems through the adoption of a common approach to staff appraisal and training;
- Continually improve the standard of service we provide internally and externally;
- Achieve continuous and appropriate improvement in all aspects of the company;

Our Quality Management Manual is supported by detailed operational documentation. These relate to codes of practice, technical specifications, work instructions, Key Performance Indicators, and other relevant documentation to form a working set of documents governing the required work practices throughout the Company.

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.
APPENDIX A – CONSULTATION MATERIAL
Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Amendments to current parking arrangements in Boxmoor.

Dear Residents/Business Proprietors

Following on from the recent informal consultation held in March this year, Dacorum Borough Council in partnership with their specialist consultants, Project Centre Ltd, have been working on proposals for possible changes to the existing parking arrangements within residential streets close to Hemel Hempstead railway station. These have been developed in order to address residents’ concerns over existing parking problems and your views are sought on the design.

Therefore we would like to take this opportunity to invite you to a public exhibition of the proposals at St. John’s Church Hall, Station Road, Boxmoor - on 27th October between 11am and 7:30pm and on 28th October between 9am and 4pm, where we will be consulting on the introduction of proposed Zone G. Plans showing proposed changes to the parking arrangements on St. Johns Road will also be on display.

To view the plans on line, please visit: www.dacorum.gov.uk/consultation

Council officers together with their consultants, the Project Centre Ltd, will be on hand to answer any questions and discuss these options in greater detail with you.

Your views will help to achieve the aim of meeting local resident concerns over parking issues and will assist in refining the design and minimise possible objections at a later stage. Any final proposals that result from these wider public events will need to go through a statutory legal process before any work can be implemented.

During the informal consultation period, which will run for 28 days, from 26th October 2015 to 22nd November 2015, if you have any concerns or comments please ensure you write to us, Parking Services Team Leader, Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

Please take the time to complete the short on line question which can be found at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/BOXMOOR2

Plans are also on display in the main reception area corridor at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH and detailed information and drawings are available at The Parking Centre at the same address.
If you have any queries regarding the above please contact us: at the address stated below, or telephone Richard Plant at Project Centre Ltd on 020 7430 6985 or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

Yours sincerely

Dacorum Borough Council working in association with the Project Centre Ltd

Data from this consultation will be collected and held by Dacorum Borough Council and Project Centre. The data will be used to produce a consultation report and to provide feedback to councillors. Individual residents will not be identified in the consultation report without permission. The report will be a public document.
LEGEND:
- Existing no waiting at any time
- Existing no waiting Mon - Sat 8.30am - 6.30pm
- Existing disabled bay
- Proposed no waiting at any time
- Proposed no waiting Mon - Fri 9am - 10am and 2pm - 3pm
- Proposed permit holder only bay Mon - Fri 9am - 10am and 2pm - 3pm
- Proposed permit holder only past this point Mon - Fri 9am - 10am and 2pm - 3pm
- Proposed shared use bay Mon - Fri 8am - 5pm
- Permit holders or limited waiting 30 mins no return within 30 mins
- Proposed no waiting Mon - Fri 8am - 5pm
- Permit parking zone boundary
- Private road

This drawing has been specifically prepared to meet the requirements of the named client and may contain design and innovative features which differ from conventional design standards.
October 2015

Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Formal Consultation: Extension of Zone X, to include properties on Northridge Way, Hemel Hempstead.

Following informal consultation on the proposed extension of Zone X to include property numbers 1a – 11 and 70 -122 Northridge Way, 2 Benchleys Road and 101 -111 Northridge Way earlier this year, Dacorum Borough Council has considered the responses received and decided to proceed towards implementing the changes.

This letter is to advise you that the formal proposals have been published in the Hemel Hempstead Gazette. The publication marks the beginning of a statutory consultation period that will last for 28 days from 26th October 2015.

During this period anybody may comment or submit representations to the proposals. Comments or representations must be made in writing, stating the grounds on which they are made and sent to the address at the top of this letter or via email to dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk to be received by e-mail by 23:59 on 22nd November 2015 or by last postal delivery to the above address on 24th November 2015. We want to know if you support the introduction of the proposals or whether you object to them so please respond to this consultation.

To view the plans on line, please visit: www.dacorum.gov.uk/consultation. The extension area will operate Monday to Friday 10 – 11am and 2 – 3pm and will allow the residents of the above listed properties to park within the existing roads of Zone X and on the paved adjacent to property No's 102 to 118 Northridge Way.

Summary information on how the scheme will work is set out in this letter. Plans are on display in the main reception area corridor at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH and detailed information and drawings are available at The Parking Centre at the same address.

Please note as this is a statutory consultation, all comments received will be reported to the Council who will make a decision on how to proceed after considering the feedback from the consultation. All representations should be made in writing and sent to Parking Services Team Leader, Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH

For further information please contact us: at the address stated above, or telephone Richard Plant at Project Centre Ltd on 020 7430 6985 or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

Yours sincerely,

Steve Barnes
Parking Services Team Leader
Dacorum Borough Council working in association with Project Centre Ltd
What are the proposals?

During the hours of operation (Monday to Friday 10 – 11am and 2 – 3pm) anybody wishing to park on-street in the Zone X must display a valid permit. The extended zone is shown overleaf.

What about deliveries, traders carrying out work and carers?

Deliveries may be carried out by vehicles provided this process is observed to be taking place within 5 minutes. Anything longer (including traders carrying out work and carers visits) will require the visitor to park in areas away from the limited waiting bay during operational times.

How will the proposals be enforced?

The Council's Civil Enforcement Officers will patrol the area during operational hours to ensure compliance. Any vehicle parked and not complying with restrictions will be issued with a Penalty Charge Notice.

What happens next?

When the responses from the consultation have been collated and a report produced, your councillors will decide whether to put the scheme into place or abandon it. If it is decided to put the scheme in place a date will be set for the scheme to go live and it will be advertised in the public notices section of the Hemel Hempstead Gazette. Residences within the scheme will be sent a letter detailing how to apply for permits and vouchers and lines and signs will be installed in readiness for the set date.

Data from this consultation will be collected and held by Project Centre and Dacorum Borough Council. The data will be used to produce a consultation report and to provide feedback to Councillors. Individual residents will not be identified in the consultation report without permission. The consultation report will be a public document.
LEGEND
- Existing no waiting at any time
- Existing no waiting Mon - Sat 8.30am - 6.30pm
- Proposed time limited parking bay Mon-Sat 9am - 5pm 3 hours no return with 3 hours
- Proposed no waiting at any time
- Proposed no waiting Mon - Sat 8.30am - 6.30pm
TO ENSURE YOU ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE CORRECTLY, PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING:

Please complete this online questionnaire before 22nd November 2015. Please include your address and postcode so that we can look at the responses from each street individually. Your information will not be passed on to any third party.

The round answer boxes allow only one answer, the square answer boxes allow multiple answers.

Please note: Only one response per household (IP address) will be accepted.

Please answer each question in turn.
1. Are you:
   - [ ] Resident
   - [ ] Business
   - [ ] Both
   - [ ] Neither

2. Does anyone in your household/business own/have a vehicle?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
* 3. Your details

Name (optional)

Flat No. (essential)

House No. (essential)

Road Name (essential)

Post Code (essential)
* 4. How many vehicles are in the household? (please indicate 0 in car column if you do not have a vehicle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5. Where do you normally park your vehicle/s?

- [ ] On the drive way/garage
- [ ] Elsewhere
- [ ] On the road outside my property
- [ ] Not applicable
6. Do you experience a parking problem in your street, if so, when?
- Morning
- Day time
- Evening
- All day
- Never

7. Do you support the introduction of parking controls in your street?
- Support
- Do not support
- No opinion
The proposals are a combination of permit parking and various types of waiting restrictions. The proposals are summarised on the consultation plans provided with the consultation letter.

* 8. Referring to the plan enclosed with the consultation pack, do you agree with the proposed restrictions for your street?

☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No Opinion
9. Do you have any other comments on the Council’s proposals? (All comments relevant to this consultation will be taken into consideration).
APPENDIX B – RESPONSE BREAKDOWN
## ONLINE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>No. Of Responses</th>
<th>Within Consultation Zone</th>
<th>Consultation Area</th>
<th>Support Some Form of Parking Controls</th>
<th>Against Some Form of Parking Controls</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alston Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtree Way</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargrove Avenue</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumayes Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechfield Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennetts End Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbourne Close</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullace Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardy Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Mead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catlin Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilham Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Beech Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Hill Terrace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor Terrace</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwick Close</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Orchard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Arrots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micklem Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhill Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puller Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensdell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reson Way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Lea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebright Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sempill Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel Chase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poplars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theedway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile Kiln Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varney Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrensfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoilt*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80  47  5
Summary of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can be analysed</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoilt*</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Address details not provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Responses</th>
<th>85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Comments</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to Zone G</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to Zone X</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to St John’s Road</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C - CONSULTATION COMMENTS
Dacorum Borough Council – Boxmoor Informal Consultation

Online questionnaire

Do you have any other comments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENT CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Parking Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Parking Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Money Making Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Requests for amendments to the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Commuter / Inadequate station parking causes the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No perceived parking problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No Provision for School Runs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Will have a negative effect on local businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No provision for visitor parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>Extension will cause inter-zone displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Does not meet the needs of residents and Businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zone G online comments

#### Ashtree Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My comment relates to the T-junction at the top of Green End Road (which turns right into Gravel Hill Terrace and left into Ashtree Way). Please could you ensure that double yellow lines go all the way round each of these bends? This is to make sure that cars do not park on the corners. My second comment relates to the roundabout junction at the bottom of Green End Road. Please could you extend the double yellow lines well past the corner into Green End Road and beyond the bollards in the middle of the road. Cars frequently park right up to the corner and alongside the bollards making passing in the car very difficult. Thank you.</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposals submitted by the council do not address the problem of inadequate parking space at Boxmoor station. The existing proposals will effectively move the problem from one area of Boxmoor to another namely Ashtree Way and Gravel Hill Terrace.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We live on Ashtree Way, just outside the proposed parking restrictions. We have not been notified of this proposal directly even though it would clearly affect us. Fortunately social media has alerted us to this. I previously lived on horsecroft road (until Feb 2013) therefore well aware of the impact that parking restrictions on these roads has had on neighbouring areas. Green end road completely blocked (almost impassible at school pick up times) and since the restrictions, our road Ashtree way also has seen a considerable increase in parked cars linked to commuters. If this new proposal goes ahead Ashtree way will be completely blocked, evidence has already shown that people are prepared to walk to the station from Ashtree way. By not including Ashtree Way, a much busier road than most of the roads covered in you proposal due to heavy use as a cut through - you will be creating a serious road safety issue for residents and road users alike. I am quite frankly disgusted that Ashtree Way residents have not been made aware of this proposal and given the opportunity to engage in this consultation as we are so close to the edge of the proposed restriction zone. Please remedy this immediately and give people the opportunity to have their say. Please reconsider impact on surrounding roads in walking distance particularly busy roads such as ours. More appropriate affordable parking options are needed for commuters, instead of pushing the problem elsewhere. This proposal needs serious rethinking. Please contact me at <a href="mailto:rster75@gmail.com">rster75@gmail.com</a> if further evidence of impact is required.</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Bargrove Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The congestion on Bargrove ave is due to parents of St Roses. They double park across the whole of the road including the corners, block driveways and stay on for longer. Some of them come as early as 2.30pm and wait in their cars with blaring music. A few have already indicated that they intend to wait in the car till the time the restrictions come off. Therefore suggest you 1) change parking restrictions on Bargrove Ave to 8.30am-9.30 am 2) likewise change afternoon slot to 2.30-3.30pm Parents of the school have the option to park for free at Grapes pub car park and the Cowper road car park, both of which remain underused. With the train commuters not able to use Green End road, they should have more spaces there.</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>How will the residents' only parking work in practice? We are definitely in favour of it for our road, but we will need to park a car on the road at all times as we have three cars and space for only two on our driveway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>I think we need to make sure that we have the ability for visitors to park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>My house is Bargrove Avenue. Getting out of my drive is hard enough during the 2 school runs for St Roses but now commuters are regularly parking in the road which just adds to the chaos. The commuters arrive when it's quiet and park at the kerbside in a spot that would take 2 cars - then the school run arrives and because there is no space, park all over the place sometimes blocking my drive completely. Because I share my drive with 1a, it is hard to manoeuvre out of my space and turn right because of cars parked opposite me and at the kerbside to the right. Emergency vehicles would also have no chance whatsoever getting through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Parking on Green End Road and Bargrove Avenue is unsafe and puts our children in danger when walking to and from school. It's also very dangerous when driving due to reduced visibility. These proposed conditions will help significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>People park right on the roundabout of Fishery Road &amp; St Johns Rd very dangerous. Parents at St Roses park appallingly - up on pavements double parking sometimes causing jams on Green end rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E / I</td>
<td>PLEASE DO IT ASAP I HAVE SENT A LETTER IN SUPPORT QUITE DESPERATE CHILD OR CHILDREN WILL GET HURT IF THIS PROPOSAL IS NOT IMPLEMENTED SOON IT IS A VERY FAIR PROPOSAL AND CATHERS FOR ALL BUT MOST IMPORTANTLY PROTECTS THE SCHOOL CHILDREN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Residents of St John's Rd will not be able to park outside their homes due to the restrictions imposed. Residents should be allowed a permit to override the current restrictions on 'casual' parkers. Local business will not suffer because of the car park at the bottom of Cowper Rd, currently, first hour of parking: free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Residents parking is not essential for Bargrove Avenue. All that is needed is restrictions during the day so that commuters do not park there all day. I don't mind parents at St. Mary Rose school parking in our road at drop off and pick up times provided that they park responsibly. The real problem is the junction of Bargrove Avenue and Green End Lane. This is now very dangerous because cars can park on either side of the exit from Bargrove Avenue meaning that drivers emerging from Bargrove Avenue cannot see whether traffic is coming either up or down Green End Lane and have to gamble that any such traffic will be able to stop when they emerge from Bargrove Avenue. The double yellow lines need to be extended on either side of the junction on Green End Lane, particularly on the northern (uphill) side so that traffic merging from Bargrove Avenue can see at least a few yards up and down Green End Lane. There have been several near misses to date and there is bound to be an accident soon (which is likely to involve children) if the problem is not properly addressed. Ironically the current parking proposals could exacerbate the problem because parking would still be allowed on either side of the exit of Bargrove Avenue but the speed of traffic on Green End Lane is likely to increase, thereby increasing the likelihood of collision with cars emerging from Bargrove Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new zones will need to have traffic wardens actually enforcing the restrictions and also stopping cars blocking the pavements. It would also help if the council “assisted” the local school (St Roses) to provide a drive-thru for parents to drop off their children safely.

The railway car park needs additional space by adding an extra level (like Berko) and making it cheaper to park at the station.

We have experienced increasing all day parking from station users over the past 12-18 months and this has led to problems with street parking, difficulty accessing driveways, visibility problems pulling out of side streets and buses/large vehicles not getting through. The proposed parking scheme would appear to alleviate these issues but would require proper policing by traffic wardens during peak drop off and pick up times at the local school when parking restrictions are often ignored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beechfield Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live just outside the impacted area. I live at the bottom end of beechfield road just off the St. John's road junction. I believe the proposal is a good idea but it does not extend far enough. Already beechfield road is impacted by commuters and particularly people parking on the junction of St. John's road. My family has one car, parked on the driveway. Regularly commuters park so close to the exit of my driveway it makes it almost impossible to get into and out of my driveway without making it dangerous, having to turn in or out into the wrong side of the road. Whilst I believe the new restrictions are a positive thing for the people who live in those streets I believe the people who live just outside the impacted areas will suffer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bennetts End Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not sustainable for infant school life, no time for parents to go to school assemblies and class visits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulbourne Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you do not include our street in this proposal all the cars that park in Greenend will park in our road, and it will be even worse than it is at the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living at Bulbourne Close</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living at Bulbourne Close we experience really bad parking from the school run for St Rose's both morning and afternoon. They park across our drive and opposite making getting on or off very difficult, they park on both corners too. We would like to see double yellow lines up to the lamppost outside no. 3 from the corner. We have just had a new lamppost and it has already been knocked and is now leaning badly. We very rarely get commuters block our close but perhaps if school mums could park in Green End Road and Alston Road for drop offs and pick ups then they wouldn't have to park so atrociously in Bulbourne Close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current parking situation makes it increasingly dangerous to walk my children to school. I fully support the parking restrictions &amp; would like to ensure it is no longer acceptable to park on the pavements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cardy Road</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whilst I am broadly in support of the proposals as something clearly needs to be done, I am concerned that as a result, cars will end up parking on Gravel Hill Terrace. This is a very fast road (despite the 30mph limit that so few stick to) that many of us with children have to cross several times a day for the school run. It is very difficult to cross as it is, but with reduced visibility from increased numbers of parked cars it could be lethal. Is there any opportunity for a zebra crossing or two (one for Wrensfield, and another for Cardy Road/people from Glenview) to help us out? If Cardy Road (and other roads such as Green End Gardens) start experiencing greater parking problems, will the zone be extended? As a mother who uses a pushchair I am already inconvenienced by pavement parkers on Cardy Road (and I also did when I lived in Green End Gardens) and I am concerned this is only going to get worse.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chilham Close

There is an infant school which relies on using the parking in the street to get their children to school safely including myself. If there is nowhere to park there is no way parents or carers can get the children safely to school. If there is a time based restriction this may be the solution to prevent those travelling by train from parking all day long and causing the issue.

### Cowper Road

As a charity run Preschool this will really affect us as we will have to pay for all nine members of staff to have permits.

I have already submitted a supporting letter with this survey. Although I have put neutral answers to the questions about agreeing with or supporting the restrictions, (even though I DO have an opinion) I did this because I feel that the restrictions will not improve our situation, though somehow I also feel that there has to be some control over parking but don't know what. I would hope that this survey reveals that there is in fact a too high a ratio of cars to parking places for the residents alone, and if there is a commuter parking problem- that this is confirmed, or a myth from the findings of this survey.

I live at the top of Cowper Road and the number of cars parked on the street at present is very few. With the proposed introduction of this scheme parking at the bottom of Cowper Road will be restricted to a single side of the street and the displacement vehicles will be forced to park further up the road. This will increase the cars parked at the top of Cowper Road which will have an undesirable effect.

I think its a great idea as some households have 3 cars and park outside their house but there is only really space outside each house for 1 small car. Also - we get a lot of people from Boxmoor village businesses parking in Cowper Road and some leave their cars in Cowper Road for the weekend while they go away via. the train station.

I think the Council and the Councillors should explore how they address the root cause of the perceived issue, the station parking with Network Rail, rather than imposing more cost on the residents. Has the Council considered approaching Network Rail and adopting the railway carpark and lowering the daily charges? I am sure this will gain more support than making Boxmoor a “no go car area” for the residents. No consideration appears to have been given to the impact on the Popalrs which will be excluded from the proposed parking scheme as it is a private road. It is bad enough in the mornings with parents double parking across driveways to drop their children off at school and also double parking in the Popalrs. If this scheme is implemented it will make the area of Cowper Road to the north and south of Boxmoor Primary school a nightmare. On another note I take exception, as a resident and rates payer, to have to pay additionally for a parking permit to park my car outside my house. This is even more ludicrous as someone from your parking services in their infinite wisdom decided to paint double yellow lines across the front of my driveway so I am unable to park there without risk of incurring a parking ticket. I note Wrensfield, where one of the councillors
lives, has been excluded from this scheme..........

I think these proposals will substantially reduce the amount of available parking for local residents and cause serious inconvenience for people who live in the zone. I also fundamentally disagree with having to pay for a scheme that makes my life more difficult, this is an additional tax on top of council tax and road tax which are both high enough as it is. I strongly disagree with these proposals.

If your new proposals are implemented we will lose 2 parking spaces which we presently use, putting further pressure on other roads outside of your proposed area for parking controls. Your proposals will cause us and many of our neighbours a major inconvenience when we are unable to park outside of our houses. We are confused as to how a reduction in the number of available parking spaces is going to benefit the residents of Cowper Road. I would also like to add that talking to our friends living in Horsecroft Road, they find that the new parking restrictions have not wholly benefitted the residents there.

My objection to the scheme is that there is no issue during the day with commuter parking on Cowper Road. The only time I have had any difficulty parking (and this is only on rare occasions) is in the evening when the commuters are long gone and the residents have returned from work. As I occasionally work from home and do not work standard Mon to Fri 9-5 I often need to be parked on Cowper Road when the two proposed restriction times are in force. I know I'm not alone with this and there will be a mad rush at 8:55am when everyone that didn't manage to get a permit space has to move their car elsewhere. If the permit bays are all full then we will have to park outside the zone, a long way from where we live. It will be an enormous inconvenience and create a problem on Cowper Road that doesn't currently exist.

Parking on Cowper Road can be tricky on occasions, but not insurmountable. Of course this is not ideal but it reflects the type of properties on the road and is a minor inconvenience. The proposed no waiting times will not solve the issue and will be significantly more inconvenient and particularly in the morning cause vehicles to be moved unnecessarily, at times when parents and young children are walking to Boxmoor primary and pre-school. Ignoring the potential congestion, more significantly this presents issues over children's safety as they negotiate vehicles moving from the proposed no wait zones. We, like many others on the road have young children at Boxmoor primary, working around school hours so that we can drop off and pick up our children. Depending where we leave our cars overnight, we and others will be in the ridiculous position of needing to move cars before school, adding aggravation to an already busy time of day. Finally, one of us works from home at least once a week and are mystified at the so-called commuter parking problem. This simply does not exist and parking during the day on Cowper Road is no different now as to what it was before the changes to parking on the Kingsland Road area. This proposal is attempting to solve a problem that does not exist, and will inconvenience residents rather than making life easier.
See separate email sent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Cowper Road MUST have all day residents parking both sides as house density and residents cars demand it. Currently in Cowper Road, north of the school, custom is that no-one parks on the east side of the road (residents or visitors). Residents park on own drives and visitors park on the west (school) side for pick up and drop off at school. This works well. Most visitors to Cowper Road and the school (including vans) enter the road from the north end because of the parking conventions, and encouraging parking on both sides of the road at the north would very much clog up the whole road. Consequently, Cowper Road, north of school should have no waiting Mon-Fri 9:15-10:15 and 1:45-2:45 on the EAST side. The West side of the road is used for school drop off &amp; pick up and should be residents parking Mon-Fri 9:15-10:15 and 1:45-2:45. Restricted times of 2-3pm and 9-10am are not good for Boxmoor Private nursery, which starts at 9am and finishes at 3pm I believe. So in summary - residents restricted parking both sides of road at bottom of Cowper Road, residents and restricted parking on the opposite sides of the road to the current proposal at the north of Cowper Road.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The disabled bay outside 32 Cowper road is no longer required as the owner it was granted to has sold. What type of parking will this be. If a controlled parking allows the residents to park on the road and not crouch field or even the car park at the bottom over night this is a result. There employees of castles and Doyle park on the road in the day and cause issues and in the evening after 5 the only option is to park round the corner and walk. The keep clear sign between 32 and 30 needs to be measured correctly to drop down kerbs when the restrictions are put in. Highways recommended this many years ago when the disabled pay was incorrectly draw up.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This will just create tension amongst neighbours, and move cars into other streets without parking restrictions. Why should residents be forced to pay to park outside they're own property? Why not make more parking spaces at the station and make it cheaper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why not give every household within this area a free parking permit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your proposals DO NOT enable residents to park in their street at any given time of the day and are therefore creating a parking issue elsewhere just for Cowper Road residents to park their cars. The problem is the parking at the station and this should be addressed by way of increased parking such as a two story car park, like Kings Langley or address the pricing. Residents should not be targeted or inconvenienced due to the parking issues at the station. I believe a residents parking zone should be considered so that residents can park outside their homes or in their nearby streets and for those wishing to park due to the station are forced to use the car park, take public transport or appropriately part elsewhere.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not a resident but my children go to school to St. Rose's. If your plan is successful there will not be anywhere near the INFANT School to park. I believe that all resident must have know of a school with short distance to their home and should therefore be accepting that for little children it is not always an option to park far away from the school! Further more, this plan is obviously too much tailored towards parents as I believe have a restriction from 9.30am would be much better for parents! In my opinion, people leaving their car in those street to take the train are the problem not parents of small children!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gravel Lane</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work at St Roses School. By implementing the parking controls, parents will be the ones who suffer. Unless parents at the school are granted permits to park on the roads around the school, it will seriously hinder the children getting to school safely and on time. I suggest permits are given to the school and parents are to ask the school office for them, should you implement the restrictions.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Green End Gardens</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The issue i have is that we have been left out of the scheme and are now on the closest street to the station for unrestricted parking. As a small cul de sac this is concerning. As the council does not have a long term parking strategy for the station they can only shunt the problem around. As we are also exposed to the planning departments lack of good taste the parking situation will not improve for years to come. Why not develop a strategy even if its based on a new car park somewhere in hemel with a regular reliable park and ride service. Yes this will cost but we have after all wasted a fortune on the town centre so there must be cash for a project this important.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Green End Road</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the plans stand they will make the situation worse and not benefit us at all. Please find below details of the issues we raised and the suggestions that we made regarding a small section in the South part of Green End Road where we all live: 1. Make the convent/school side of the road no waiting at any time (daily) from the roundabout up to the zig lines. The reasons for this are as follows: Geometry. Cars parked opposite our driveways will make it extremely difficult for us to enter onto and off of our driveways. We have measured the geometry of the space available for turning and with cars on the opposite side of the road this will not allow safe turning circles. If the waiting limit is only Mon- Fri 8am – 5 pm on our house side then we potentially have cars parked both outside our homes and opposite our homes which will make entering onto and off our drives virtually impossible and was one of the main things we pushed to avoid when pressing for parking improvements!! When parents collecting from school park on the opposite side now we are virtually imprisoned in our homes. With the proposed purple no waiting line on our side this would be the case from 5pm – 8am every day and at weekends!! Safety. There have been 4 accidents in recent years and cars parked on the opposite side of the road will only exacerbate the likelihood of more. 3 involved speeding cars coming off the</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
roundabout whereby 1 crashed into the wall on the corner outside Rosehill Court, 1 crashed into the traffic sign outside No.10 and the other over turned outside No.12 having skidded up the hill. The 4th involved a coach (taking pupils from St. Rose's on a school trip) damaging the side of a car parked on the convent/school side. The adverse camber on the roundabout and the blind corner as cars approach from Northridge Way will make it very hard to see any cars that may be parked on the convent/school side of the road, particularly if they are speeding as is often the case. Additionally if you have cars parked by having the bays we suggest (in point 2 below) outside No. 6 and No.10 then you create a further chicane which will add safety to the road and hopefully prevent cars from speeding.  

2. Create a SINGLE defined parking space outside No. 6 that is a shared use bay Daily 8am – 5pm permit holders or limited waiting 30mins no return within 30 mins. This bay should be situated centrally between the lower edge of the driveway of No. 6 and the corner leading into Rosehill Court. No waiting from the lower edge of this space around the corner into Rosehill Court as cars parked here obstruct the entrance to Rosehill Court and infuriate the residents.  

3. Between No.6 and No. 8 Green End Rd - no waiting at all or no waiting Daily 8am – 5 pm  

4. Create a SINGLE defined parking space outside No. 10 that is a shared use bay Daily 8am – 5pm permit holders or limited waiting 30mins no return within 30 mins.  

5. No waiting at all outside No.12 to allow the coaches and buses that drop off and collect at the school to have somewhere safe to stop on the convent/school side of the road. In addition we would strongly suggest a 20mph zone to be created in our road to help prevent speeding and make it safer for the children attending the school. Finally we request that permits are only granted to those residents who actually live in Green End Road (or at most- to those resident in this new proposed parking zone and definitely not to those in any planned development in the Convent. We have already addressed concerns to the developer that the proposed parking in the development will not be adequate).  

I do not see the need for Green End Road to be singled out for more draconian measures than any other road, because aside from the short term chaos at school drop-off and pick-up times, we have the same problem as elsewhere in Boxmoor - commuters parking in our road to save paying station parking fees. This problem can be solved in the same way as you propose to tackle it in other nearby streets i.e. permit only from 9-10 and 2-3. The hours could be adjusted if they are too tight for school the run, but there is no need to bring in restrictions from 8am to 5pm. This prevents residents from having visitors at lunchtime unless we can fit them on our driveway (or they can eat their lunch and leave within 30 minutes!), it will also affect trade for the pub and will make it hard for any tradesmen needing to park their vehicles while working in a house. It is the commuters that are creating the problem by parking all day all up the road. Tackle them and the other road users will be able to get along fine.  

The main problem with parking in my road are the all day parking of cars for people travelling by train combined with frequent short visits by people delivering or collecting children to and from St Rose’s school. I am concerned what provision will be made for people parking for the station. I have long been of the opinion that HH Station car park should have a second storey as at Berkhamsted station together with more flexible charging.  

There have been occasions where cars have parked, legally, on either side of my driveway and directly opposite making it impossible for me to get my car out of my driveway. I believe that these are mainly commuters but school traffic often fills in any “gaps” first thing in the morning and at least once a week I am pulling out into Green End Road with no visibility of traffic coming down from the Grapes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is a problem with parents bringing and collecting their children from the school next door. Also a minibus often parks across my drive entrance and the driver has to be persuaded to move so I can use my drive.</strong></th>
<th><strong>F</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear as to the meaning of shared use bay? As the problem is mainly caused by commuters, the use of single yellow lines with no parking, or limited parking Monday to Friday between the hours of 9 and 3 would allow parents at Saint Roses to drop their children off but stop the commuters parking all day in Green End Road. We do not agree with having to pay for visitors to park outside our house and believe that permit parking is just another way of revenue making for the Council.</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We are pleased to see that proposals are being brought forward to tackle some of the traffic problems on Green End Road. The growth of long-term parking along both sides of this road over the past few years has been problematic and created difficulties for residents, parents of children at St Rose's Infant School and other road users. We are very supportive of the plans and urge their rapid introduction (it was disappointing to hear at the recent public exhibition that it may take a year to implement this proposal). We believe that: 1. The proposed weekday no waiting restriction along about half of the length of Green End Road would be very helpful. 2. The proposed shared-use bay along the opposite side of Green End Road provides a sensible compromise between the needs of residents and parents of St Rose's School. 3. Given that children can be dropped at St Rose's until 9am, it may be helpful to start the restrictions on Bargrove Avenue at 9.15am and not 9.00am. 4. Given that children are collected from St Rose's at 3.10pm, it may be helpful to stop the restrictions on Bargrove Avenue by 2.45pm and not 3.00pm. Additionally, we believe that consideration should be given to imposing a 20mph limit on Green End Road to improve safety. With St Rose's Infant School located on this road, hundreds of very young children are on the road every day throughout the week. We have witnessed a number of concerning incidents and near misses. We urge Dacorum BC to work with Hertfordshire CC and the Hertfordshire Constabulary as appropriate to secure the introduction of a 20mph zone on Green End Road.</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We do understand that the residents might each have slightly differing views about the proposals but the need is now so acute during weekdays that I believe a decision has to be taken speedily to implement the scheme to avoid the prospect of a serious accident or ongoing disruption and administrative costs to local government.</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whatever the decisions made with respect to other roads in the proposed Zone G action needs to be taken in Green End Road for safety reasons. It is the only main road and bus route in the proposed Zone and the closest to the railway station and St Roses school and hence more affected. At present cars are often parked both sides of the road, including across driveways. Buses and by implication fire engines and ambulances often can't get down the road and pedestrians sometimes have to use the road and not the pavement. Our driveway has been completely blocked a number of occasions and is at certain times of day partially blocked so making getting out of it difficult (especially if cars are parked opposite) and dangerous due to limited vision because of parked cars to both sides.</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes. The implementation of the proposals cannot come soon enough. In particular, Green End Road has, in effect, become a single track highway as a consequence of commuter parking and the school run.</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have not stated the objective of this scheme. If it is to stop station parking it will simply move the station parkers to other non restricted areas. The real problem in green end road is school parking not station parking. The school parkers obstruct driveways park on double yellow corners. Leave gaps too small for a fire engine. They are often rude when challenged. Station parking HELPS the situation as they park sensibly (mostly) and deter the school parkers. In these times of austerity this seems like a huge waste of taxpayers money to NOT fix the problem. PLEASE STOP WASTING OUR MONEY and use it to repair potholes instead.

Grosvenor Terrace

• Directly opposite our house is indicated as ‘No Waiting At Any Time’. Presumably since it is a T-junction. Does this mean that yellow lines will be added (none there at present)? • We have two cars, but only room for one in front of the house on our driveway. However, we also have a dropped kerb, which we use for the second car, i.e. there is never a problem to park two cars outside the house. The legend shows that this area will become ‘No Waiting Monday to Friday 9-10am and 2-3pm’. Does this mean that we must move one of the cars, should we both be at home during the week? If so, where are we supposed to park? • Is there an option to continue using our driveway and dropped kerb at all times? • If this means that we must use a ‘Parking Permit’ for those individual one hour slots, it seems ridiculous! • It also means that we will be using another parking space, instead of the one outside our house, i.e. we will be adding to the parking problems. • What does ‘No Waiting’ mean? • You have allowed for vehicles to park on both sides of a narrow road. Currently there can be problems when larger trucks and lorries try to get through, and several cars have been damaged as a result. To ease the problems, most cars park partly on the pavement. The result is that pedestrians often cannot get through and must walk on the road! • Parking problems in the evenings are often due to customers from The Post Office Arms pub in Puller Road. Have you addressed or considered this issue?

My house is a double-fronted, detached cottage, so there is room for 2 cars outside my house. I own 2 classic cars and a runabout. I keep 2 of my cars on the road outside my house, including one across the entrance to my drive, so that my neighbour at 74 Puller Road can also partly park in front of my house. I would not benefit from parking restrictions because I am able to reserve my spaces by rearranging my cars depending on which one I am going to drive. People who are not Grosvenor Terrace residents only extremely rarely park in this street in any case. If these restrictions were imposed, where would I park 9-10am and 2-3pm? Would I be charged to park outside my own house, in addition to the considerable Council Tax bill I already pay? May I also mention that the house directly opposite mine used to have a double-drive, and they were given planning permission to build an extension on half of it, despite the fact that they are a 2-car household. They now park half on the pavement, which causes a nuisance to both me and the neighbour at 74 Puller Road when we need to get in and out of our adjacent driveways, as well as people walking on the pavement.

There are not enough parking places planned for the number of residents cars and vans in the street. Grosvenor Terrace is not affected by station parking. The road is virtually empty when everyone has gone to work and the school runs are over. I pay car tax on all of the vehicles present at my address. Why should I have to pay another ‘local tax’ to allow me to park in the road. All you need to do is mark the roads with double yellow lines near the corners, common sense Highway Code. If the scheme does come in against our wishes make it free for pensioners.
### Halwick Close

The no parking times on Cowper road in particular, being 9-10am and 2-3pm will cause issues for parents taking/collecting their children to/from Boxmoor pre school which runs from 9am to 3pm and drop off at Boxmoor nursery (it will not affect the school itself as the day runs from 8.45 to 3.15). Whilst I understand that the aim is to stop people parking their vehicles in the road all day, it seems a bad choice of times, which will cause unnecessary inconvenience. I am also concerned that, as my road (Halwick Close) is outside the controlled area, it will mean that we experience increased parking issues. We already have issues with cars parking both sides of the road on the corner of Veysey Close and Halwick Close, which often makes it difficult for residents to get into and out of the road. I would therefore like to request that Halwick Close be included in the proposals.

### Knights Orchard

I am a parent with two young children at the St Roses Infant School on Green End Road and need to be able to park within a reasonable walking distance to the school, one that my four year old would be able to manage. We live too far away to walk the whole way to school so normally drive and park in the local area. If further restrictions are imposed then then we will be forced to park further away from the area which will only move the parking issue somewhere else. Myself and most parents park with respect and courtesy to the residents within the area, however unfortunately there are a few parents that are parking carelessly and without consideration to the residents. I am aware that the problem has been made worse because parking restrictions near the station have moved commuters to park around this area to avoid paying for parking that is available at the train station. Parents with children attending the local school only need to park for a maximum of half an hour, twice a day and if a minimum parking time were introduced then commuters would not park there and this would make more space available for parents to park, which would hopefully in turn reduce problems for residents. Unfortunately there is no parking at the school and no local car parks within the area with enough space to accommodate all the parents driving to the school. I would urge you to consider what this will mean for parents like myself and many others who do not live within walking distance to the school, having to walk further to school but still having to park somewhere and in turn creating a parking issue elsewhere for school parents and commuters using the station.

### London Road

After the initial parking restrictions were put in place, commuters using the train station just park elsewhere to avoid paying the huge parking fees. They now park along London Road at the junction with Station Road and the roundabout. Double parking up on kerbs, on both sides of the road. I have seen several near misses on this very busy road with lorries & busses trying to negotiate their way round these cars. restrictions should be in place here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Arrots</strong></td>
<td>Hi, I live in Gadebridge but my son attends St Roses Catholic infant school. I feel that imposing parking restrictions that would affect school pick up and drop would be detrimental to parents and the school. If there is only a small window for this it will mean parents will be fighting for spaces, children will be late and it will infringe upon school life. In particular school events such as parent assemblies, Christmas plays, sports days, parents evenings and other fundraising events. The school is voluntary aided and relies upon fundraising events to raise money for the school. All introducing parking restrictions will do is force parents to park in streets further away, thereby causing congestion there and meaning the children have even further to walk to school. This may be a struggle for parents who like myself have a baby. It will mean school pick ups/drops off take even longer. Children will be walking further in the pouring rain, ice and snow which is not ideal. The key issue is commuters parking there for the station as the parking costs are too high for them to afford. I myself currently on maternity leave normally park in the roads in question to commute to work and am also worried about what I will do when I return to work. I am a midwife in a London hospital who already pays £20 a day travel and cannot afford to pay to park at the station. I work long shifts 8am-8pm and the thought of getting off the train at 9.30 in the evening and walking to my car (which will have to be parked further away) in the dark on poorly lit streets scares me. Having said that I would do it if it meant the school drop offs and picks ups were unaffected. I think the best solution if anything would be to impose a parking restriction of say no parking between 12-2pm if you wanted to reduce the congestion caused by commuters. Please don’t target the parents as it will impact upon the children. The residents in the area were aware that they were buying houses near a school and their houses and value of their houses benefits from having the station and the school so close by. They cannot have it all their way. Not to mention the fact that most of them have the luxury of having a drive way which is a privilege that not all of us have. If I didn’t live in Gadebridge I would happily walk when the weather allowed but it is simply too far. Please please consider our views. Kind regards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micklem Drive</strong></td>
<td>I am a parent of St Roses infant school located on Green End Lane. Us parents are blamed constantly for bad parking and blocking drives and bus routes when in actual fact it is commuters parking then walking down to the train station. To have an hour restriction would put a stop to this and allow us parents to actually park near the school and safely with our children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puller Road</strong></td>
<td>I agree that our road requires Resident Permit parking however I disagree with the time restrictions because our main parking issues on Puller Road &amp; Cowper Road are the following: 1. Residents from St Johns Road (who have double yellow or single yellow outside their properties) parking their vehicles all day and all night (particularly our issue is night time). 2. The Estate Agents and other businesses on St John’s Road employees parking on Puller Road, they will move their cars for the restricted time and then depart on Puller Road. 3. The main problem for Puller Road is the visitors the to Post Office Arms Pub - these visitors are evening only which means that once the commuters have returned home and moved their cars the pub visitors them park until nearly midnight. Not only does this mean in the evening you cannot park but unfortunately a large number of people drinking and driving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and attempting to leave the street late at night regularly hitting and scratching residents cars as they are driving and the influence.

<p>| I am happy with the restrictions in general and those proposed for Puller Road where my house is situated. However I believe the bays proposed for Grosvenor Terrace, where my driveway is, appear to be not the best use of the space. The proposed bays at the Cowper Road end are on the opposite side of the road to where cars usually park and are covering over access to existing driveways. I would suggest that the location of these bays are reconsidered. | E |
| On the corner of Puller Road and Hanover Green there should be no parking for safety reasons, it is hard to cross this road and turn vehicles around because of dangerous parking on the corners. Large vehicles also struggle to get around there after visiting Hanover Green or delivering to residents on Puller Road. I assume residents permits will only be given to those in Puller Road as the bottom of the road suffers from ST Johns Road knock on problems, especially as the houses on ST Johns and the bottom of Puller Road have very limited off road parking. The estate agents park a lot of their vehicles on this road taking up residential spaces. The parking problem is everyday of the week, not just Monday to Friday. | E |
| The current parking problem in Puller Road is caused by the pub, The Postman's Arms, during the hours of approximately 5 to 7:30 pm. I do support the proposals for restricted parking at the times proposed, because if there are none in Puller Road but others elsewhere, the parking problems caused by commuters will transfer to Puller Road, however the restricted times need to be extended for Puller Road to accommodate the pub issue. | E |
| The parking in the road is so bad it would be beneficial for the permit parking to be a permanent 24x7 restriction with residents able to buy day permits for visitors | E |
| The parking restrictions will affect my business, the charge for local small business is excessive to gain a permit, if granted, for parking outside my office. Central Boxmoor is a mixed residential, business area with local shops providing a essential service, if the shopkeepers can't park near there shops this would be an issue. local business will suffer as a result of the restrictions as the staff of the businesses will have no right to park at their places of work, the local car park has no where near enough spaces for all the staff employed in Boxmoor businesses. | I |
| The restrictions proposed will not make a difference to the difficulty in parking on our road. Parking issues occur from 5pm and from 9am the next morning there are plenty of spaces. | G |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravensdell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are 2 aspects here, firstly Hemel Hempstead station parking is not only prohibitively expensive (adding to the ridiculous cost of travel). There is also inadequate spaces for parking at the station, these restrictions are only going to push commuters out to the areas bordering the proposal and you will have this all over again. You could also experience the same as can be found at Stanmore station, the residents daily stand outside renting their driveways for £10 a time. Also St Roses school has children with a maximum age of 7, these are not children that can not be left to get themselves home or even leave the school unaccompanied they must be picked up. in an ideal world we could all walk to school to pick up our children, however that is not a realistic view of the world, a lot of parents including myself are rushing from work to pick up our children or dropping them off on our way to work. Therefore banning us from parking within access to the school means having to try to negotiate with employers for more time to allow for drop off or pick up. It will mean that people will end up sitting in our cars until the restriction is finished and picking up our children late. With some parents only having a small window of time to get to another school for pick up. Children are going to end up at risk somewhere in this scenario.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridge Lea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking is a problem in the area highlighted since restrictions were introduced South of St. John's Road forcing commenters to park further away from the station impacting on the two schools within this area. One of the schools is a faith school so it's catchment is not necessarily the surrounding area. The proposed times of the restrictions will directly impact those needing to get to the schools not only for drop off and pick up but also able to celebrate mass and other events. As the parking problem in this area increased due to restrictions introduced close to the station I am concerned about the impact it will have on the surrounding streets. I don't feel that the restrictions proposed provide a solution to the problem as people still need to park in this area, all that will happen is that the problem will be moved to another area. It doesn't address the capacity and cost of parking at the station which is the route cause of the problem parking in the area. Different restriction times would impact on commuters rather than those attending the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River park should be a different zone to kingsland road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rosehill Court

As a resident of Rosehill Court (junction of St Johns Road and Green End Road) I am not sure of our position in relation to parking permits and the council officers at the consultation evening were also unable to provide further clarification. The residents of Rosehill Court have only limited parking available in the private car park (one space per household). Any second cars, or vehicles belonging to our visitors, often have to park in the surrounding roads (e.g. Green End, Sebright, Alston etc) which would be included in the planned CPZ. I would like to ensure that the residents of Rosehill Court are also able to purchase permits for both ourselves and our visitors, should the CPZ be introduced.

Sebright Road

1. Sebright Road is physically too narrow to park all the resident's vehicles if the CPZ is only on one side of the road. I am supporting the CPZ on the understanding a resident within the current CPZ (blue dash bounded on the map) can park anywhere within it. 2. Parking restrictions on the non-parking bay side of Sebright should be appropriate to allow some flexibility outside of the CPZ times. ie NOT double yellow lines. 3. Rosehill Court (jcn St Johns and Green End) needs to be included and consulted as they can only park one vehicle and any second (or subsequent) vehicles, or more than one visitor will need to park in the CPZ. 4. There is a short section of St John's Road on the north side between No.s 288 and 282, opposite the Boxmoor Doctor’s surgery, that does not have any form of parking restriction. Given there is currently no restriction on the south side the one or two cars on the north side cause a severe restriction to the flow of traffic into and out of St John's and the adjacent roundabout. It would be much better for traffic flow if the short section on the north side was subject to the same parking restrictions like the rest of this section of St John's Road.

I disagree with the parking proposals for my street as they do not go far enough and will not solve the full problem. The proposals do not resolve the following. 1 Commuters parking late Friday to go away for the weekend. (Note:- Today is Sunday there is a car parked adjacent to my house which has been there since Friday pm the driver was seen going off with a suitcase) 2 Parking late in the day by people going on late shifts or flexi working. 3 Saturday parking by commuters going into London on a Saturday for work or pleasure. 4 There is no control from 3 pm onwards or on a Saturday. Living in the road the above proves to be a problem and is not picked up in snapshot surveys. Sebright Road needs to be a permit holder only zone the same as Puller Road and Bargrove Avenue. The control period needs to be extended to 8 am to 8 pm the same as many other areas in Hemel Hempstead

The new proposals will certainly ease the position as far as commuters goes as they will have to find alternative parking. The proposed no waiting areas will actually force some residents to move their own cars from outside their own homes twice a day. This ridiculous scenario would be alleviated if the proposed permit holders bay ran the FULL LENGTH of the right hand side(apart from driveway access). The recent regulations for parking in Horsecroft and Kingsland roads allow for permit holders only on both sides of road both the roads are wide enough for through traffic. Sebright Road is much narrower hence people on the left hand side have to take up the majority of the pavement so vehicles can drive up and down the road, even then space is tight. This is of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course not ideal for pedestrians</th>
<th>The residents of Sebright Road probably own enough cars between them to almost fill the road safely. Permits would be welcome on the left hand side as well although cars would have to park on the pavement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The parking restrictions should also apply on St. Johns Road turning right at the bottom of Sebright Road, because there is a blind spot making the turn out of Sebright Road dangerous.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Squirrel Chase**

There is a primary school on Green End Road. Parents need to be able to park on the street outside the school to collect children between 8.30 -9.10am, 12-12.45p and 2.45-3.30p to drop off and collect children. The children who attend St. Rose's Catholic School do not necessarily live near the school as the school serves the 4 Catholic parishes in Hemel Hempstead, and will need to access to street parking. | H |

**St Johns Road**

As a resident for 8 years one of the reasons I decided to move to the area was due to the unrestricted parked. This means that we can have guest over and as my family live in London it is important to me that they are able to come and park. The white line across our drive means that we are able to park both our vehicles without issue and that these can also be used by visitors so they don't cause an issue for others. As a community we work together to make parking as easy as possible and I see no reason for any chance. This smacks of a money making scheme which is being dressed up as community based improvement. What it will do is make the situation much worse and make having friends and family over much harder. There is already a car park down the road and what is really needed is a multi level car park by the station to cope with the parking needed there. | F / G |

At the moment I already have trouble parking - I have a child and have often had to walk 300 meters + to my flat, with shopping etc. This really will make a difference to me, as if I'm at home on a Saturday I might not be able park anywhere near my house without having to move it every few hours. Imagine if there was a wedding at St Johns? Has anyone considered using permits for local residents? This way, people local to St John's Road would be able to park close to their houses, but people visiting would be subject to waiting restrictions. I would wholly support a shorter time restriction for non-residents, if a permit system was put in place for people who do live on the street. | E |

Hi Thank you for your invitation to view the plans for the proposed Boxmoor parking arrangements which I have viewed today. I am a resident of St Johns Road. I see plans have recently added for this road, as these were not included in the original consultation I would assume that a longer period for consultation required to include this road in the scheme? That said my views are this, I feel it would not be a workable plan for St Johns Road as this would prohibit parking for residents of St Johns Road who... | G / I |
would not be able to park in the proposed restricted roads, there are substantial amount of dwellings without off road parking, therefore these residents would have no local parking available. Staff of local businesses would be unable to park either in St John's Road or the restricted roads, some of these shops provide essential services ie the chemist. The proposed parking arrangements for St John's Road seem to be a hastily conceived add on to the original scheme, for which I am most definitely opposed. With regard to the original Boxmoor parking scheme as my dwelling is on the corner of St John's Road and Puller Road and as I very rarely have difficulty parking in Puller Road or St John's Road I am also opposed to this scheme. During the days the local business staff and shoppers park in both roads without too much problem these vehicles are replaced in the evenings by residents returning from work so there is a natural change over, I see very few vehicles where the occupants are heading for the rail station. I really don't think in Puller Road we have a problem. some photos attached of Puller Road Regards Ian Kimmance

I do not think it is sensible to have a zone which does not also take into account St John's Road. The issues of parking around all the streets in Boxmoor are interlinked. Residents in St John's Road often need to park in the side streets, so they should be part of the consultation on the side streets. Yes, there is some anti-social parking and yes, the commuters are a problem. However, in deterring these, I fear that you will cause new problems, such as not providing enough on-street parking for the number of cars and causing problems for people working at and using the shops. The real problem is the station. The Borough Council should be concentrating on making sure there is enough affordable parking for commuters at Hemel station rather than bringing in schemes which pass on cost and inconvenience to Boxmoor residents.

I normally park in Puller road which is to the side of my house and where my back gate is due to the fact there are only a couple of spaces to the front of my house on St John's Road and are normally taken by people visiting the businesses near by. The problem in Puller Road is the electrical business on the opposite corner to me, the couple who live there have 3 vehicles and always want them parked outside of their property. They have a garage which is not used for vehicles but is used for storage, there is not a dropped curb in front of it, therefore, I used to park there, but they put a notice on my car telling me not to park there and then put a notice on the garage door saying keep clear. They also take up a lot of parking spaces with their vans making it very difficult to park and if I had to pay a parking fee each year and still could not park I would be most unhappy considering I am on a pension and need every penny I get.

Making St. John's road a 3 hour only zone leaves residents with no where to park during the day. If this scheme goes ahead we will need permits that allow us to park outside our properties. Many residents work in the street or have flexible hours so are not necessarily out all day. Many homes on St. John's road do not have drives and rely on parking on the street, or in the nearby side streets of puller and Cowper road. It is putting the needs of the few shops[which we do support] ahead of the many residents who all pay council tax. Also the plan shows double yellow lines across people's existing drives which will reduce the available parking even more! We can at the moment park on and across our driveway which gives us two spaces.... (We have coped quite well for 15 years with a single white line across the driveway) Most commuters[who we are trying to deter] park before 9.30 so restrictions are not needed after that. If we have visitors where are they supposed to park? All the surrounding streets are permit only which we will not be included in! I am also disappointed that the exhibition was held in half term when a lot of families were away and that the plan for St John's road was not included in the letter so many residents of this road assumed that we were not affected and did
not attend the exhibition. Residents of ST John's road SHOULD RECEIVE A LETTER AND COPY OF THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE STREET as did the other areas to be consulted so their views can be heard. Why was it not included on the plan we received? What is the aim of this proposal? If it is to deter commuters it is not needed, a one hour restriction during the day would work just as well. 1) residents need somewhere to park all day not have to move cars every three hours 2) if the scheme has to proceed we need to be included when permits are sold to residents 3) the whole scheme is going to cause worse problems as parking is being REDUCED on St. John's road by putting in yellow lines and parking bays on one side only in surrounding streets. 4) I feel businesses will also suffer as there will be nowhere for staff to park and they will find it easier to relocate 5) we do not want double yellow lines across our driveways

Proposed restrictions on St Johns Road make no provision for residents parking. Currently unrestricted parking causes many residents to use streets in the proposed Zone G to park due to congestion and a lack of available space to park. If current proposals go ahead without amendment, residents on St Johns Road will be unable to park in Zone G as they are not eligible for residents permits and will also be unable to park in St Johns Road itself due to waiting restrictions in place along the full length of the road.  As an NHS night shift worker I regularly park my vehicle all day in the vicinity of my residence and so I will be disproportionately affected by the proposed restrictions. I will have nowhere local in which I can park my vehicle during the day whilst I sleep between 12 hour work shifts. I would suggest the council meets with residents of St Johns Road to discuss provision of parking for residents and also display the statistical analysis of parking and enforcement currently taking place upon which this proposal was founded. I believe parking is currently under-resourced and under-enforced for residents in this street and the proposed plans will have a negative effect on local stakeholders both from a residential and business standpoint.

Reading what you are thinking of doing is not helping my situation at all.

The introduction of CPZ's to the south of St John's Road has inevitably shifted those who desire free parking onto other roads, in particular on St John's Road and those roads to the north of St John's Road. Restrictions in St John's road may create a problem for bona fide visitors to residents of St Jon's road.

There is absolutely no provision for residents parking permits in this proposal. How can this possibly be? It's absolutely right that non residents not be able to park for free on streets near the station. It is not right that residents are penalised, especially when they choose to LIVE near the station as a purposeful decision. Free residents parking permits have to be introduced. This proposal should not be agreed by the council without free parking permits for Residents in St John's Road and surrounding streets.

Totally disagree to the proposals on the following grounds: 1. If there is a problem it is due to the lack of sufficient parking at Hemel station. 2. Hemel has grown considerably in the past few years and the additional accommodation being built in the town has not had the additional services provided i.e. sufficient parking for commuters at the station as well as the other amenities. 2. Additional parking should be found either at the station or elsewhere i.e. the Rugby Club which is empty most of the time in the day. Also local schools should provide parking when parents dropping off/picking up their children. 3. Do not believe there have been complaints from residents as most of the residents I have spoken to totally disagree with the proposed plans. These plans will
not help the businesses that are flourishing in Boxmoor. Just another way of penalising residents. 4. I believe plans are another way of getting the residents to pay out more money. Why should we have to pay to park in our own street when we pay council tax already? 5. Why should I not be able to park over my own drive? 6. Do not think these plans will stop or reduce the amount of traffic using St.Johns Road, which makes it very difficult to come out of my drive (up a slope) when reversing onto St Johns Road. 7. The Gazette article of Nov 11 2015 states that among the proposals are parking bans at road junctions. I did not think cars could park at road junctions anyway due to yellow lines being already in place. What is this proposal about? 8. I do not agree with Permit Holder parking.

Fortunately the plans for St. John's Road weren't included in the letter sent out and it was only by calling in at the church hall that discovered the problem. The proposed 3 hour wait time on our road takes no account of the fact that it is mostly residential. Which means that people living on St. John's road would be unable to park there during the day! Further more as the residents of St. John's road, many of whom park up Cowper / Puller / Sebright roads as they have no parking of their own on St. John's. Won't have permits under these proposals and therefore should have NOWHERE to park at all. If the parking controls went ahead, simply including the residents of St. John's road would solve this issue - allowing them to park on their road as well as. With outing streets to the north. Another issue is the proposal to put double yellow lines across our driveway (and that of our neighbours). Thereby providing even less parking! We've lived here for more than 15 years and a single yellow line over the drive has been fine for discouraging would be parkers whilst leaving us or our friends and family some where to pen when visiting. Putting double yellows over our drive is ludicrous and something we would strongly challenge. So in short, if the Parking restrictions go ahead residents of St. John's road should have permits to park there and on the roads to the north at anytime and driveways should be left as single white lines to maximise the spaces available. The residents should not be worse off as a result of the council trying to manage a commuter parking problem.

We live further along St Johns Road than your proposals cover. It is always difficult to park outside our home and would welcome the extension of the zone as your current proposals will just exacerbate the problem on our road and make it even worse and more cars will be parking in our end of St Johns Road.

With these proposed parking restrictions and the proposed time restricted parking on St. John's Road I will not be able to park near my property. I regularly work from home so I need somewhere to park my car during the day. St John's Road should also become a permit holders parking between 9am - 10am and 2pm - 3pm or Permits should be issued to those residents of St. John's Road to enable them park on Sebright Road, Puller Road or Cowper Road.
The Poplars

If the CPZ is implemented the Poplars will become prey to commuter and Cowper Rd residents parking we are therefore asking that Dacorum implements measures to protect the Poplars residents from this.

We are writing as residents of The Poplars estate which is off Cowper Road and therefore within the proposed CPZ “G”. As our service roads are not public highways we have been told that they cannot be subject to any form of controlled parking scheme. During both day and night time, Cowper Road and nearby Grosvenor Terrace are constantly full with cars owned by people who reside in those roads. It is proposed that for 1 hour each weekday morning and afternoon parking will be restricted to bays on only one side of those roads. We understand this is intended to improve the safety of both pedestrians and car users for two hours each weekday. In particular, on the stretch of Cowper Road between Crouchfield and The Poplars most home owners have two cars and the people living in Cowper Road ignore the “residents only” signs and frequently park in our service roads. It is inevitable that car owners living near to The Poplars will choose to park permanently on our service roads rather than move their cars each morning and afternoon and fight for a space in the limited number of parking bays available. If the CPZ is implemented, with or without including Cowper Road, The Poplars will become prey to commuter parking (it takes only 11 minutes to walk to the station) and to residents of the nearby roads whose owners wish to avoid buying a permit or who cannot find space to park. Our preference is that no CPZ be implemented for the roads north of St John’s Road. If, however, most people within the proposed zone are in favour, then it is vital that Dacorum Council, who are the owners of our service roads, implement an arrangement to protect us from unauthorised parking. It seems reasonable that such an arrangement be funded from the income generated by the CPZ.

Ian & Sue Burton  16 The Poplars  Boxmoor

We live in the poplars which is a private road off Cowper road. While I am not totally against parking restrictions I am very concerned on the significant reduction in parking that the proposed plan will have on Cowper road, which the result will be a even higher number of non-Polars residents parking in our private road. Cowper road each day/night and weekend is full of cars which indicates that it is residents of Cowper that are parking on the road. While stopping commuters is fine doing so can be achieved by allowing all existing parking spaces to be under the residents permit area, as is with puller road. Why the yellow sections stopping residents parking for an hour, meaning they can’t leave there car while at work! I would also add that this concern was raised and noted in the first consultation but does not seem to be taken into account. As a resident of the poplars and given we live on Cowper I would also like to be eligible to obtain a permit should the proposal go ahead. Should the proposal go ahead I believe it is also needed that assistance/assurance be given to the poplars to prevent those forced of Cowper and surrounding roads from parking on our private road, given this scheme will be the direct cause. Again I bring it back to local residence that do not drive to work being forced off Cowper due the reduction in spaces and thereby parking in the poplars, which already occurs is a limited degree but will be far worse.
### Theedway

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My children go to school here, we have to get to 3 schools in a matter or 15 minutes of St Roses (green rd) finishing, the parking problem is from people traveling into town and leaving cars all day, school mums then get abused by the residents as we have few spaces left to park. I agree to putting restrictions in place to stop commuters parking here, I don't agree for it to stop at 3pm, I think 2:30 would be fair.</td>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Drop In Session Feedback Comments

### Introduction of Zone G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alston Road</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am totally in favour of G zone proposals because with commuter parking</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now becoming double parking (all day) it is often impossible for my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband + myself to access our house especially during school drop off +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pick up times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only observation is that on Alston Rd plans do not show dropped kerb to</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Alston + Neighbouring Garage. If vehicles park on the other side of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the road at the moment they are parking half on the path as road narrows?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a car is parked completely on the road, we have problems getting on to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our drive. Would ask for these to be considered as you plans are not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bargrove Avenue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I FULLY SUPPORT ALL PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN BARGROVE AVENUE AND</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN END ROAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to “proposed no waiting” on the corner of No. 12 Bargrove -</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with resident parking only we park with consideration &amp; no obstruction -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I don't feel it is required as it will limit parking [redacted] on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the corner i.e No 12 [redacted] &amp; No7, No 9 + No 11. Perhaps extend the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no waiting to “8.30am - 10. am” in the morning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cowper Road

It will make the situation FAR WORSE by:

1. Current Plane REDUCES number of spaces by - reducing number of spaces available - Stopping people from parking on both sides of the road.

2. Concerned about the Hassle/ remembering to move car from one side to the other if I’ve parked in an area restricted by certain hours, or if I have gone out (I frequently walk to get somewhere)

3. Current 3 Hour limit proposals to St Johns Rd residents will mean they park on Cowper Rd, making the situation worse. I have seen Fire engines + Lorries go up and down the road - No problems

4. If car park at bottom of Cowper Road was free - as it used to be - other than 1 hour limit at some point in the day to stop commuters - It would free up spaces for David Doyle + Castles Estate Agents - who are the main 'offenders' for parking in Cowper Rd.

5. NB Disabled Bay outside No.34(ish) Cowper Rd in No Longer Needed - He’s recently moved out. 6. It would cost us £65 per year (A lot of money over the years we may live here + it'll only go up!!) At the moment, we rarely have a parking problem. If we do, it's due to estate agents or St Johns Rd residents, generally.

| G Zone plan will actually reduce the number of available spaces by preventing parking on both sides as now (which emergency vehicles regularly test access) Restricting hours will mean having to move cars regularly. This is impractical if your car is in a residents bay, but you then go out without the car, when you return it could be illegally parked! A better solution would be to make the car park at the bottom of Cowper Road free except for one hour a day to dissuade all day parking by commuters who will be forced to risk parking in Cowper Road. | E |
| At the moment, we rarely have a parking problem. If we do, it's due to estate agents or St Johns Rd residents, generally. | C |
### Green End Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL IN FAVOUR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes find my drive partially obstructed by cars parked all day presumably by commuters. There is also a problem with cars parked too close to the roundabout on St Johns Road. The proposed plan would solve those problems.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive change being proposed. The new restrictions will help reduce commuting congestion and help with lessening danger to pedestrians walking to school. Hoping the changes will be accepted + introduced next year.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I very much support the introduction of the G Zone. At present cars are parked both sides of Green End Road, other partly on the pavement. This is dangerous for pedestrians and for drivers with much anger as drivers refuse to give way to drivers coming the other way as the road is often reduced to single track. Quite often buses cant get up and down the road as there is not enough room between the parked cars on both sides. By implication fire engines and ambulances would also not be able to get up and down the road. With all the parked cars it is very difficult to get out of my driveway in the morning and dangerous as I cant see vehicles coming up and down the road. Cars on a number of occasions have parked across the driveway so I have not been able to get out of the driveway in the morning. I hope that for safety reasons highways restrict parking in the road whether this scheme is approved or not. I hope the introduction of the scheme is accepted.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grosvenor Terrace

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numerous households from Grosvenor Terrace down Cowper Road have no garages or driveways to park their cars so have to use the road. Has a count been done to see how many cars each household has in each road? What happens when people holiday, who will move their cars twice a day?</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for residents in Cowper road will be totally inadequate. Few houses have garages or drives and your plans means permanent parking with a permit or otherwise will be inadequate for residents. There is a large hard surface car park at Camelot rugby club which is 95% empty during weekdays. Could this area be used for commuter parking?</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not agree with permit parking as we have no problems or accidents in the road. If permit parking goes ahead, we suggest the bays are marked on the south side as more bays would be available as there is more driveways on the north side. The amount of proposed bays in Cowper Road, Grosvenor Terrace and Puller Road would not be enough for the residents. Will there be disabled bays for blue badge holders. If so, will their bay be outside their house or on the opposite side of the road.</td>
<td>C / E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in favour of the proposed introduction of the G-zone subject to the below feedback. The green proposed permit holders only bay should be moved to the same side of the road as 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 Grosvenor Terrace as I do not want to have to cross the road to get to my car with 2 children when we could park outside our house from a safety perspective. Also this would enable you to get more permits bays as your ordnance survey map is out of date as there are new drives at the back of 68, which are not identified as the individual looking at this</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed double yellow lines on the corner of Hanover Green because of parking difficult to get ambulance and dust carts or fire engines to get in.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-zone did not walk that far up. This could enable 6 bays rather than 4! The kerb side on our side of the road is much higher and will do damage to vehicles. I suggest you switch the yellow proposed no waiting restrictions to the other side of the road and people who are not residents will park half on half off the pavement to allow for pushchairs and refuse vehicles to get along this narrow road. Even better would be if you cut bays into the pavement to avoid people blocking footpaths as they will need to park correctly. Your current proposals should be reviewed for Grosvenor Terrace in order to support the residents and owners of 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and adapt a sensible approach by putting the green bays outside the houses and yellow proposed no waiting on the other side to maximise the benefits for the residents and safeguard our children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchford Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No waiting at any time is required across the entrance to Latchford Place. The extent of the No Waiting to be either, 1. Match the existing NO WAITING in Cowper Road and Sheridan Close 2. From the drive of No. 72, to the boundary of No. 76 Cowper Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We require no parking outside Latchford Place from the driveway of No 72 to the boundary of No 76 Cowper Rd due to the lack of vision when leaving and entering Latchford Place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For safety reasons when exiting Latchford Place in our case we would like to see a ban on parking outside the road boundary of our properties i.e not only the driveway but also the area up to the boundary of No. 68 Cowper Road. Exiting on one driveway to that road can be hazardous and dangerous when turning left and when one or two cars are blocking the view of oncoming traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding the entrance to Latchford Place - I wish the proposed restrictions across the entrance to Latchford place to match the existing &quot;no waiting at any time restriction&quot; which is at the junction of Cowper Rd and Sheridan Close i.e to be effective for 24 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sebright Road

| Traffic Calming Essential in Sebright as children live at both ends of road so cars need to be parked on both sides at start of road. (even if only 2 cars spaces). Disabled parking sign not needed as people moved out last year.  
3. Lines needed at rear of drive for safety reasons as inconsiderate drivers block vision when parking too close.  
4. 7 Day restriction is more feasible. 5. What zone St Johns Road. 6. St Roses School need to be more community minded and enable access to thier school land for parking. 7. With parking only on one side of road - this will result in only one side of the road (eg drains and gutters) being cleaned - we ALL pay our Council Tax! so this is not fair. | C |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If St Johns Road CPZ goes ahead, what zone will they be? - Disabled parking markings need to be removed in Sebright Road - the &quot;disabled&quot; tennent moved out 18 months ago!! - Traffic calming is essential in Sebright Road - it is dangerous when exiting a drive onto the road as large parked vans / 4 x 4 vehicles block vision when turning out, and speed down the road. -lines need to be painted on the drive access as it is dangerous when exiting own drive due to cars blocking vision (as in Green End Lane and bottom on Sebright Rd) Implementation of this would be a deciding factor. 7 Day restriction would be more practical. -What will decide the outcome of this consultation?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree in principle to the introduction of the G zone CPZ. However as for Sebright Rd is concerned and possibly other roads in the area the measures proposed do not go far enough 9am-10am 2pm -3pm Monday to Friday is not sufficient to deal with the problem. Further problems are 1. Commuters parking thier cars on Friday to go away for the weekend. 2. Parking late afternoon bu commutes working late shifts. 3. Saturday parking by commutes going into London for work or pleasure. 4. No control from 3pm onwards. Living in the road the above can be seen as a problem and is not picked up in the snapshot survey carried out. Sebright Rd needs to be a permit holder only zone as for Pullee Rd and Bargrove Ave. The control period needs to be escalated to 8am to 8pm Monday to Saturday as other areas of Hemel Hempstead.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently you have placed a parking place adjacent to our house, which means our 2 childern having to cross the road every time we want to use the car. Also the house opposite number 5, 7, 9 Sebright has got planning permission to build houses at a later date, that will efffect the proposed parking places.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### St John's Road Proposal

#### St John's Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We've just seen that ALL driveway parking around our area of St Jons Road will be DOUBLE YELLOW LINES. This will simply make the parking WORSE! I will not be able to park over my own driveway meaning that my car or my friends will be unable to park anywhere in the area (No permit!) A single white line has been fine for 20yrs we've lived here. We DONT WANT a double yellow line across our drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes to St John's Rd will affect our means to earn a living and cause untold stress to already stressed life of my sole bread winner wife. One hour a day permit would be sufficient to control the parking if it were not changed in would be a nightmear with other proposed schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a resident and a business owner I see both sides and do not agree with a three hour limit as a house owner this would be unnessecary hassle. And would prefer the same as surrounding roads. As a business to have the same as the others would be great for my clients as they would more likely be able to park due to no commuters parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We live on St John's rd and we are one of the rare properties to have a driveway. At the moment we are able to park (friends park on the line outside our drive (white line) We would not be able to do this if we had double yellow lines outside and would have to park somewhere else (where??) We NEED a permit to park on st johns rd for more than 3 hours and/or permits to park in Puller/cowper/Sebright. We are ONE property our drive does NOT lead to area for deliveriey etc We do NOT want double yellow line outside our drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a resident of St. Jons Rd. I am seriously concerned about the lack of provision/ consideration for residents of St Johns Rd who are left with nowhere to park. This particularly affects shift workers such as myself who have days off in the week, potentially having to repark my vehicle upto 3 times per day. I think these/ our properties should be included to be able to obtain a permit to the proposed zone G, although to be frank there is seemily no issue with alleged &quot;commuter parking&quot; in thier area at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about parking for businesses and owners + staff, can not keep moving cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Zone G &amp; changes to St Johns Rd are fundamentally flawed Whilst 3hr parking is helpful to the few shops that are there, the majority are residential properties that need parking on or around St Johns Rd (Many don't have drives) If restrictions are to go ahead, then residents of the top part of St Johns Rd should have parking permits that allow them to park on St Johns Rd and the roads to the north (Puller/Cowper/Sebright) It is not right that we should not be able to park outside our own houses or opposite on adjacent roads. The obvious thing is to give everyone permits on St Johns Rd so they aren't bound by the changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechfield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals don't go far enough - it is already a problem to park in Beechfield Road. Let's look at the whole area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Email Comments

Introduction of Zone G

Bargrove Avenue

*I have just returned home from work - unable to park on my driveway because it is once more blocked by a commuter's car,... and found your paperwork.

I am absolutely delighted - nearly excited.

Please carry out this proposal forward and complete the work without delay.

The situation is now very difficult and not pleasant to deal with.

I have tried leaving polite notices and speaking to commuters about their parking habits and I just get verbal abuse and aggressive behaviour (male and female). They also park on the double yellow lines.

The situation is increasingly dangerous for the children walking to the local schools.

Unless this proposal is carried and action taken soon a serious accident is very likely to happen.

The proposal as outlined is very fair and will still give the parents and carers ample time to deliver and collect their charges but it will be so much safer if they are not having to negotiate the difficult parking of commuters not prepared to use the railway car park - or at least park considerately.

Personally it is vital because I care for an elderly relative with some physical issues because he has suffered two strokes. When he visits I cannot get him out of my car safely unless I can access my own driveway, which forms part of my property but is afforded no respect - and neither am I or a frail elderly gentleman.

I am very happy to pay for a parking permit too - very fair system for all.*

*Dear Sir

We have received your notice of the amended parking arrangements for Boxmoor and would like to make the following comments.

1. We feel that double yellow lines on the bend relating to Nos 7, 9, 9a, 11a and No 12 in Bargrove Avenue are completely unnecessary as this takes away resident parking spaces outside these properties.
2 On the Green line permit holder only bay should be changed from Monday to Friday 9.00am to 19.00am to 8.30 to 9.30am and the period 2.00pm to 3.00pm should be altered to 2.30pm to 3.30pm.

3 We realise that this will prevent the School parking in Bargrove Avenue which at the moment is completely chaotic with illegal parking on pavements and double yellow lines. We are strongly of the opinion that St Roses School should make provision on their own land for mothers to drive into the grounds and drop their children off there. Alternatively a Minibus shuttle service could be used at a drop off point possibly in Chaulden Lane car park to take the children to school and a similar system employed for their return journey.

We shall be attending your exhibition of the proposals at St John’s Church Hall when we can discuss this further.

"Having review the proposed changes, there are a couple of points that we feel need to be reconsidered

1) South end of Green End Road

Currently with the traffic parking on the right hand side, going up the hill, gives cars coming off the roundabout the right of way up Green End Road. This works well as the cars coming down have space to pull out and see the cars coming up the hill, as the road widens.

The proposed changes mean cars will park on the left hand side which means that they have to pull out into the oncoming traffic to see what may be coming down the hill and as they no longer have the right of way will potentially create a bottleneck and block the St John’s road roundabout.

We would suggest that keeping the parking on the right whilst not ideal, from a parking space perspective, would be a safer option and would lessen the opportunity to block the roundabout

2) North end of Green End Road

The proposal has parking on the left hand side. This means that cars turning into Green End Road will have right of way, and if they behave as they do today this will lead to accidents as cars coming up the road will be in their path.

Again whilst not optimizing parking spaces, parking the cars on the right will force those turning in to slow down as they will have to pull onto the wrong side of the road."

*I write to express my concern about the dangerous situation at the junction of Bargrove Avenue and Green End Lane, which I don’t think the current proposals seem to address.

At present vehicles are allowed to park on either side of the exit of Bargrove Avenue, which means that drivers have almost zero visibility of traffic driving up or down Green End Lane. When cars are parked on either side of the junction, drivers emerging from Bargrove Avenue have no option but to guess whether another vehicle is travelling up or down Green Lane.
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There have been a number of near misses over recent months and it is only a matter of time until there is an accident at this junction, probably during the morning rush hour.

I think the only solution is to prohibit vehicles from parking on either side of the exit (particularly the northern, uphill, side) at any time.

Therefore the double yellow lines on either side of the exit from Bargrove Avenue need to be extended so that drivers emerging from Bargrove Avenue will have at least some view of any traffic which is driving up or down Green End Lane.

I am concerned that the current proposals may make the problem worse because they will still allow vehicles to park on either side of the exit from Bargrove Avenue but will probably have the effect of increasing the average speed of traffic on Green End Lane, thereby increasing the likelihood of a collision between a vehicle emerging from Bargrove Avenue and a vehicle travelling down Green End Lane.

Bennetts End Close

“[Name] have concerns regarding the proposed parking in boxmoor as a parent of a child that attends St Roses infant school on Green End Rd.

Firstly the times restrictions of no parking between 9 and 11 are a problem as not all children are settled in class by 9.00 a.m, being an infant school some are as young as 4 yrs old and mum needs to settle them in, talk over concern with a teacher, PTA members need to stay in school long than 9.00 a.m, mass and school plays and assembly that parents are invited to stay to are impossible with these time restrictions.

I myself park in the public car park and walk over to my child’s school, but if all parents did that, there wouldn’t be any place to park.

Commuters do not take up that many parking places as in that case there would be no where for parents to park, and everyone finds a place. Most residents have a drive so why residence have an issue with Joe Blogs parking on a public highway is beyond me. Maybe just some double yellows on corners would be apt.”

Bulborne Close

“Unfortunately we were away on holiday during the open days and this is the first opportunity I have had to make my views heard. I live in Bulborne Close. The current plans do not take into account how small our road is—only just wide enough for one car and as we are a close (no exit) to proceed with parking bays would be just plain stupid. I believe my neighbour at [Name] has submitted an alternative that both ourselves, [Name] and [Name] would be happy with. We need the extension of the double yellows / Red lines to run as you are coming into...”
our close all the way to the hedge on the right (boundary of No 2) and all the way up to the border of number 5 on the left. Under your current plans people would be able to park opposite our driveways which would block our access and it would also allow someone to park directly in front of our house which would partially block No 5’s driveway – in fact people constantly try to park there until they realise there is not enough space due to the lamp post – which all though was replace earlier this year has again been hit by a commuter / school mum to the extent that it is at an alarming angle!

Whilst we do embrace the opportunity for permit parking the hours proposed again need to be tweaked from 8.30 to 9.30 and 2.30 to 3.30 which would stop the commuters completely and the school parkers hopefully parking dangerously. I also hope that once the permit parking is in place there will be a traffic warden patrolling to ensure the hours of permit parking are being complied with.

Once again just to confirm I would like to see the extension of the Red / Double yellow line further into our road to the boundaries of number 2 by the hedge and number 5.

Cowper Road

"I am emailing you to communicate my disbelief at what appears to be a knee jerk reaction and a hair brain scheme to a problem that doesn't exist. I, my family and every neighbour I speak to, whole heartedly object and refuse to accept your proposed parking amendments.

Firstly, whilst you might perceive there to be a parking problem on Cowper Road, I don't accept that there is one and therefore, I do not require any new or amended parking regulations to be brought in.

Secondly, how do you foresee your proposed parking arrangements making parking any easier when you are effectively reducing the parking capacity by 50% by only allowing parking on one side of the road?? This is ridiculous! IF (and it's a big" IF") there is currently a parking problem, how does reducing the capacity help the problem?

Thirdly, instead of moving the problem on, why don't you solve the parking issue at it's heart and improve the parking capacity at Hemel Train station and also look at the cost of parking? Instead of investing thousands of pounds in introducing these proposed parking restrictions, you should invest the money in a second story car park level as they have done at Tring and Berkhamsted and many other stations.

I am absolutely dumfounded by the plans and struggle to understand how a group of officials have come up with this idea and actually think it is going to improve anything. I would welcome you to answer all of the above points, however feel confident that you won't be able to offer proper justification, as it simply doesn't stack up.

Please don't pretend this is anything other than an opportunity for the council to raise money. There is no way this proposal addresses any of issues you claim exist. I do not accept this proposal."
"I wish to put in my response to the planned amendments to the parking restrictions in Boxmoor, in particular the lower half of Cowper Road. From conversations with others the push from the residents themselves to have this in force from what I understand is to reduce the number of commuters parking, will advantage some but not all residents, like myself. I feel the residents living on the easterly section of Cowper running from 81 to 29 of Cowper are the most disadvantaged residents in the whole of the project. After speaking at some length to Richard Plant and a very helpful gentleman by the name of Peter Farrier from the Housing Department I am writing to voice my concerns, but wholly you may understand from a purely selfish point of view.

I own and reside at the property Cowboy Road. My property whole side is adjoining the private service Road which borders the southerly aspect of the Poplars private estate. In regards to the impact of these restrictions, there are many variables and I am not wholly objecting to everyone of them as I will agree that this is a necessary thing, but to which residents will it be favouring will be my concern. I will as perfunctory as possible with my comments.

As highlighted on the plan as I understand it here are my comments

Immediately outside the front of Cowboy

1. Proposed no waiting at any time markers - no objection to that for obvious reasons

2. Proposed no waiting Mon-Fri 9-10, 2-3pm this will have an impact on residents who reside and try to park outside their properties running all the length of Cowper on the easterly side. If they are parked outside their own home most of the day (if they are lucky to get a spot) they have to move it twice a day if they are not given a permit.

Currently even the residents of the properties have trouble parking their cars not due to commuters using up their space, I suspect, it is purely the residents themselves, as there simply isn't enough space for each car now. The section of Cowper Road East going down to Crouchfield is just resident's own cars, not commuters, I am sure, as I have identified most of the cars as belonging to residents. For the section of Cowper on the east side, south of Crouchfield as far as no. 29, I cannot absolutely verify, but still suspect the majority of the cars parked there are residents cars anyway.

On the western side of Cowper going as far as 32/32a

1. Proposed permit holder section - will these areas be only allocated to the residents who have their properties immediately opposite them or at least in that whole section, or is it for anyone in Cowper? If it is the former then the residents opposite will have a tough time of it again. As I suspect even that section will only just be enough for the immediate residents themselves. You just have to count up the number of houses per square mm and assuming most have cars, that this will be taken up already.

Knock on affect to the Private Road surrounding Poplars Estate

Due to there not being enough parking for each resident in Cowper in the first place, when my fellow neighbours have knocked me out of a
I do understand that this is an unadopted Road according to the residents of the properties to the Poplars private Estate, that is they pay the maintenance to upkeep the road in some capacity or another. To whom do they pay service charges to and may I contact them? Moreover I have spoken to the project manager Richard Plant and Peter Farrier, from the Council who has been speaking to his colleagues in Estates and Estate Assets etc, and there is still some confusion (more likely on my part) as to who actually owns the road as Mr Farrier believes it wasn’t sold over in the 70’s or 80’s by the council to any management company, just the properties themselves. Is this the case? If so why, are the residents paying for its upkeep and who owns it? I would like to request permission for access and parking if it is a management company or ALMO (as it was called once?) because if the restrictions go through it will have a worsening affect and possible encourage more people to illicitly park, ignoring the signs down the Private Road who aren’t resident.

The timing of the restrictions

If the restrictions were to deter station users why are the times set for 9-10pm and 2-3pm? Most commuters would be coming before and after those times to park their cars if they are at all. I suspect its more to deter people parking for the school run due to there being a school on Cowper Road.

I do understand that theoretically speaking it is a step in the right direction if this controlled zone impedes the actions of a few commuter cars trying to avoid car parking fees. However I believe it is only a few and the restrictions might have the ironic effect of making things more difficult for some residents.

General knock on effect on roads that are not in the proposals for restrictions, surrounding Cowper – Crouchfield

I believe that this may be a place where the commuters park as most of the properties have off street parking but I have observed that a great many residents of Cowper park their car there too. It is already very crowded at the Cowper Road end. This will be worse once the restrictions come into force.

I thank you in advance for your time and hopefully your response to some of my comments or queries.

Whilst (in principle) I am in favour of controlled parking in Cowper Road, it must be to the benefit of the local residents and as this proposal stands, this is clearly not the case.

Before I outline the reasons why, I would also like to point out that not only do we suffer from commuter parking in Cowper Road, but we also have the additional influx of business parking (estate agents in particular) and residents from St Johns Road.

The area of deep concern is the stretches of yellow lines under the ‘no waiting’ banner Monday to Friday between 9am – 10am and 2pm – 3pm.
At present, there is not enough parking space in the road to meet the needs of the residents – even during weekdays – and with this proposal there would be even less at specific times, which may lead to unnecessary tension between residents. Parking would simply be pushed into adjoining roads outside the controlled zones, such as Crouchfield, as residents seek to park their cars during the restricted periods.

On speaking to the council officials and Mr Daniel McCrory at the public exhibition at St Johns Hall on the 27th October, there was a clear assumption that houses with off road parking would take up the slack. If we take the batch of houses on the even side of Cowper Road up to number 30, yes there is a limited amount off road parking, with limited being the operative word. I live at [redacted] and am one of three houses sharing the driveway between [redacted]. In theory great, but the drive is too narrow for a family sized car to pass through. Hence we all park at least one car on the road and no, we can’t park across the drive way (which was suggested) as its shared access.

When I suggested that these proposed single yellow lines be replaced by ‘permit holders only’ replicating Puller Road, I was told:

‘Cowper Road is too narrow to put bays both sides and it would be dangerous to do so. In addition, Cowper Road is a through road, unlike Puller Road’.

Breaking this down into two sections, my response at the time, which remains constant was:

1. Cowper Road is too narrow to put bays both sides and it would be dangerous to do so:
   
   This is floored, as eventually acknowledged by Mr McCrory, because it would appear (according to the proposal) that the road is only dangerous between the hours of 9am – 10am and 2pm – 3pm Monday to Friday, because the rest of the week (158 hours out of 168) it’s deemed safe, as vehicles would be allowed to park either side of the road.

2. Cowper Road is a through road, unlike Puller Road’
   
Puller Road is exactly the same as Cowper Road in that both roads can be accessed from either end. Indeed Puller Road is far narrower than Cowper Road, a fact acknowledged by all local residents. But under your proposals, Puller Road becomes permit holders only both side of the road at key times. How can this be right?

Therefore the solutions to meet the needs of the residents, need to be either:

1) The ‘Permit Holder Only Bays Mon – Fri 9am-10pm & 2pm-3pm’ are extended the full length, both sides of Cowper Road

or

2) ‘Permit Holders Only’ on a permanent basis.
To conclude, I am not asking for more parking, just that the current capacity is maintained, so that the residents of Cowper Road can park more freely and continue to enjoy the friendly atmosphere that exists within this neighbourhood.

*I am writing to advise you of my concern regarding the proposed parking permit scheme within the Cowper Road and surrounding area.

The proposed scheme proposes single sided street parking at the bottom of Cowper Road and will therefore displace cars from the bottom of Cowper Road forcing residents to park further up the road, an area which currently does not suffer from extensive street parking. Additional cars parked at the top of Cowper Road will affect access to driveways within this area and parents dropping children off a school - a safety point that needs to be carefully considered.

This will be compounded by displacement of cars that currently park on both sides of Grosvenor Terrace which will also be forced to park in areas that currently do not suffer from excessive street parking.

As Crouchfield is not to be permitted, this street will also suffer from the effects of displaced cars.

Has a survey been undertaken so the effects of the displaced cars from a single sided street parking scheme will have on the area? If so can this be made publicly available.

Additional, has a scheme of permit parking that allows the current double sided street parking to Cowper Road and Grosvenor Terrace to remain, as is within your proposals to Puller Road, Sheridan Close and Bulbourne Close? This will prevent the issues outlined above and also deal with the commuter (and other unwanted) parking.

*I believe from the notices around the existing restricted parking zone in Boxmoor, that you are the Parking Services Team Leader. Further to the email I sent on the 4th November I just would like to update you with my new email address in case I receive a response.

I have since spoken to one or 2 people (unfortunately there was an informal residents meeting at a local pub but couldn’t get to that) and I have established from a neighbour that Cowper Road there is one commuter that affects the parking of their car. Obviously the further down the road and closer to the station the likely hood of commuters parking is greater. Hopefully you have some means as to finding out how many commuter cars there are, if this has been perceived as a genuine problem. They are also concerned about the restrictions opposite their side that will have an affect on that side’s residents parking, which will in turn having an affect on their side.

Regarding the restriction times suggested, I realise stupidly these may be the optimum times as the commuting traffic will still have their cars parked there having left them earlier in the morning, obviously not in a position to move them, and the 3pm cut off to catch those who may have returned from work earlier than normal.*

*As requested in your circular outlining the proposed revision to parking in Boxmoor, please see below my response.
I live on Cowper Road and consider the proposed arrangements to be unnecessary, ill-considered and disruptive. Parking on Cowper Road can occasionally be difficult, but this reflects the age and nature of the houses, life-stage of many residents and parking is usually available within 30 seconds walk. As a resident in a property without off-road parking I consider this to be perfectly acceptable.

My work can involve me driving from home or walking to the station coming and going at different times of the day, or working from home. As such I see parking on the road at a mixture of times and genuinely do not see the problem these plans are seeking to address.

At present there is limited parking on the road from commuters avoiding paying charges at the station. I appreciate this might differ on neighbouring roads, but anyone attempting to park on Cowper Road for the station faces a lottery of finding a space as many residents don’t move their vehicles until after the school run is complete. As a consequence the proposed no wait slot between 9-10am will inconvenience residents and serve no obvious benefit. Furthermore as the road serves Boxmoor primary and pre-school, the proposals will result in vehicles being moved out of time restricted areas just at the time young children are walking up the road to school. This will unnecessarily add to congestion, and poses an increased safety risk to pedestrians.

At a more detailed level, I'd query why the proposed no wait 9-10am and 2-3pm zones starts outside number 29, rather than the properties with drives higher up the road which by definition should not be parked over. Also, the disabled space outside number 32a is no longer necessary as the resident who arranged the space moved out earlier in the year.

To summarise, I oppose the proposed amendments and wish this to be reflected in the consultation. I would be grateful for acknowledgement of this message and look forward to receiving your response to the points I raise.

DBC Boxmoor Councillor

I wish to respond to the above consultation as a DBC Councillor for Boxmoor. My only comment at present is that, if a CPZ is introduced in Cowper Road, DBC has, as successor to the New Towns Commission, a responsibility to facilitate remedying any detrimental impact on the residents, and in particular the service roads, of The Poplars.

Gravel Hill Terrace

“Dear council

I live in the Boxmoor area. We live immediately on the fringe of the area that is the proposed area for a parking controlled zone. We live on Gravel hill Terrace and looking at the plans, I feel it will only push the problem of people parking to use the Station further up the road, most already spend 10 mins walking to the station to save a few pounds per day, an extra minutes walk will do nothing to deter them. Its not going to stop them and this will make Gravel hill Terrace a very unsafe road, considering some of the excess speeds seen, and obstructions caused by selfish commuters, and the fact it is a main route for School Children. Also with regards to putting a 30min waiting time outside St Roses. I can see why this has been proposed but what do those parents do when they need to visit the school for longer? Which is not
uncommon with assemblies etc. Is 30min waiting time long enough. They will simply move up the road. I am concerned that this will make Gravel Hill Terrace a dangerous road. I am also concerned that we will just get the problem with access to our drive and I think we wont be the only one with the problem on the road. Please can you get back to us on what consideration has been given to surrounding residents, and confirm that we can all be consulted on the prospect of being included in the proposals by widening the parking restrictions should they be likely to be implemented, to make the whole area unattractive to commuters.

I feel it is unfair that residents close to the proposals have had no letters to engage us so we can have our say.

Kind Regards

| Belinda Walton and Nigel Burnell |

| "Whilst I have not been informed or consulted regarding the above proposed controlled parking zone I have become aware of it's existence from a neighbour who has also provided me with a copy of the street plan (Drawing No. 1000002642-2-010-02).

I, together with my wife are householders/residents of Gravel Hill Terrace, Boxmoor, HP1 1RJ, have 2 cars that are parked in the drive and garage of the property.

As we often travel through Green End Road during the day, we are well aware of the problems that exist as a result of rail commuters parking their vehicles in the road and causing dangerous obstructions and congestion. I am therefore in agreement that action should be taken to control parking in the roads within walking distance of the station.

Gravel Hill Terrace is a busy through road used by many, including local buses and commercial vehicles, which not only makes it difficult to reverse or even drive forward onto the road due to the speed of the traffic it often becomes quite dangerous. It is noted from the plan that although the roads either end of my road (Green End Road and Cowper Road) which largely go to form the proposed controlled zone, the main part of Gravel Hill Terrace, is actually excluded from the zone. This will undoubtedly result in commuter parking in Gravel Hill Terrace and create an even worse problem in my road than currently exists in Green End Road given the volume and speed of traffic. Gravel Hill Terrace is in easy walking distance of the station and indeed my wife and I always walk rather than parking in the station car park, so there is no question that commuters will merely choose Gravel Hill Terrace as their new alternative.

It is difficult to understand why the residents of Gravel Hill Terrace have not been consulted over the Council's proposals when it is patently obvious that the critical affect of the proposal will have greater impact upon us than many of the roads inside the currently proposed zone.

In the circumstance I would be pleased to receive your assurance that the plans will be reviewed to include Gravel Hill Terrace before implementation with full and proper consultation with the residents of the road." |
"We learnt today of the proposal to extend the area of residents only parking, close to Hemel Hempstead railway station. We wholeheartedly support the plan to extend the zone as both Cowper Road and Green End Lane are hazardous Monday to Friday, due to commuter vehicles parked on the road. We do however have serious concerns that the zone does not encompass Gravel Hill Terrace or Ashtree Way. This road is far narrower than Green End lane and also a school route. Your plan will only push the parking problem into these areas making them extremely dangerous. The junction of Green End Lane and Gravel Hill Terrace is already unsighted, and this will create a serious accident waiting to happen. This road is already used as a ‘cut-through’ for many who avoid the slower traffic of roads which run parallel both above and below it. We believe that the zone needs to extend much further north, possibly up to Warners End, to discourage people from avoiding the station car park charge and walking an extra 10-15 minutes in the morning.

We would be more than happy to be contacted regarding the issue and welcome a survey of the level of traffic already passing Gravel Hill Terrace at peak times of day.

(The route cause of course is the price charged to park. Perhaps this might be a better issue to tackle, rather than move the problem from pillar to post!)"

"We are residents of Gravel Hill Terrace and are very concerned about the proposed boundary of the Controlled Parking Zone G. We recognise the current difficulties in Green End Road and Cowper Road and do not oppose a CPZ, but feel that it is essential for it to extend at least far enough to include Gravel Hill Terrace. Commuters currently park all the way up Green End Road as far as the junction with Gravel Hill Terrace. If they cannot park in Green End Road or Cowper Road they will certainly park in Gravel Hill Terrace, adding just a very short distance to their walk to the station. Thus the current congestion in those roads will simply be transferred to Gravel Hill Terrace. The disruption in Gravel Hill Terrace will be at least as much as currently experienced in Green End Road and Cowper Road. Buses will experience difficulties in getting through Gravel Hill Terrace, as they currently do in Green End Road.

A bend in the road already restricts visibility in Gravel Hill Terrace and, particularly, for vehicles turning into Gravel Hill Terrace from Green End Road. Increased parking in Gravel Hill terrace will exacerbate this problem. Only prohibiting parking at the junction will not, in itself, resolve this.

Gravel Hill Terrace is commonly used as a cut through by vehicles and many children take this route when walking to school. A high volume of parking, which is inevitable if it is not controlled, will further reduce visibility along the road and increase the risk of accidents.

We understand the logic of having a natural boundary to the CPZ. Including Gravel Hill Terrace from the junction with Green End Road to the junction with Cowper Road or Cardy Road will provide this.

We strongly request that the proposed CPZ be extended to include both sides of Gravel Hill Terrace and that parking be restricted to permit holders for at least two one hour periods, Monday to Friday."
| Green End Gardens |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| "I heard today by chance about the plan to revise parking in boxmoor. I note the proposed zone boundary takes a route which omits gravel hill terrace and green end gardens. As I live in green end gardens I am concerned of the impact that this will have on such a small cul de sac. Please can you clarify the logic of this and highlight what long term strategy there is to address the parking for the railway station. Clearly this is just moving the problem around." |

| Green End Road |
|----------------|-----------------|
| "I would like to understand the objective behind the boxmoor2 parking proposals. There are no clear objectives stated anywhere. The proposals will simply move station parkers to other unrestricted areas in my opinion. The real problem in my road Green end road. Station parking actually helps the situation as the station parkers do not obstruct driveways and tend to park sensibly. This discourages the school parkers from blocking driveways etc. The school parkers after the scheme will go back to free for all. They will all park as near the school as possible. They leave insufficient room in the road for a fire engine. Park on double yellow corners and verges. Across drives and refuse to move even if you are leaving while they park. The whole scheme is likely to reduce trade at local pubs and other businesses in my opinion. It has no clear objectives to be measured by. It will waste quite a lot of money. The signs and road marking will require maintenance and cause extra street clutter. The money would be better spend mending more potholes in our awful roads." |

| "I am totally in favour of the proposed controlled parking zone G as described on drawing number 1000002642-2-010-02 dated 12 October 2015 and frankly the sooner it is implemented the better. Green End Road, where I live, has, over a number of years, become very congested with commuter parking which has been exacerbated with the school run to St Roses Infants School opposite my home. During the week Green End Road has become a single lane road due to commuter parking on both sides of the road." |

| "Thank you for meeting with us on Tuesday 27th October and for taking the time to listen to our concerns and suggestions regarding the Controlled Parking in Boxmoor proposal. As the plans stand they will make the situation worse and not benefit us at all. Please find below" |
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details of the issues we raised and the suggestions that we made regarding a small section in the South part of Green End Road where we all live:

1. Make the convent/school side of the road no waiting at any time (daily) from the roundabout up to the zig lines. The reasons for this are as follows:

   • Geometry. Cars parked opposite our driveways will make it extremely difficult for us to enter onto and off of our driveways. We have measured the geometry of the space available for turning and with cars on the opposite side of the road this will not allow safe turning circles. If the waiting limit is only Mon-Fri 8am – 5 pm on our house side then we potentially have cars parked both outside our homes and opposite our homes which will make entering onto and off our drives virtually impossible and was one of the main things we pushed to avoid when pressing for parking improvements!! When parents collecting from school park on the opposite side now we are virtually imprisoned in our homes. With the proposed purple no waiting line on our side this would be the case from 5pm – 8am every day and at weekends!!

   • Safety. There have been 4 accidents in recent years and cars parked on the opposite side of the road will only exacerbate the likelihood of more. 3 involved speeding cars coming off the roundabout whereby 1 crashed into the wall on the corner outside Rosehill Court, 1 crashed into the traffic sign outside No.10 and the other overturned outside No.12 having skidded up the hill. The 4th involved a coach (taking pupils from St. Rose’s on a school trip) damaging the side of a car parked on the convent/school side. The adverse camber on the roundabout and the blind corner as cars approach from Northridge Way will make it very hard to see any cars that may be parked on the convent/school side of the road, particularly if they are speeding as is often the case. Additionally if you have cars parked by having the bays we suggest (in point 2 below) outside No. 6 and No.10 then you create a further chicane which will add safety to the road and hopefully prevent cars from speeding.

2. Create a SINGLE defined parking space outside No. 6 that is a shared use bay Daily 8am – 5pm permit holders or limited waiting 30mins no return within 30 mins. This bay should be situated centrally between the lower edge of the driveway of No. 6 and the corner leading into Rosehill Court. No waiting from the lower edge of this space around the corner into Rosehill Court as cars parked here obstruct the entrance to Rosehill Court and infuriate the residents.

3. Between No.6 and No. 8 Green End Rd - no waiting at all or no waiting Daily 8am – 5 pm

4. Create a SINGLE defined parking space outside No. 10 that is a shared use bay Daily 8am – 5pm permit holders or limited waiting 30mins no return within 30 mins.

5. No waiting at all outside No.12 to allow the coaches and buses that drop off and collect at the school to have somewhere safe to stop on the convent/school side of the road.

In addition we would strongly suggest a 20mph zone to be created in our road to help prevent speeding and make it safer for the children attending the school.

Finally we request that permits are only granted to those residents who actually live in Green End Road (or at most- to those resident in this...
new proposed parking zone and definitely not to those in any planned development in the Convent. We have already addressed concerns to the developer that the proposed parking in the development will not be adequate).

We provided you with a drawing to illustrate the points made above.

---

**Grosvenor Terrace**

Dear Sirs

We have viewed the new plans for parking in Boxmoor, and have the following concerns and /or questions.

We live at Grosvenor Terrace.

- Directly opposite our house is indicated as ‘No Waiting At Any Time’. Presumably since it is a T-junction. Does this mean that yellow lines will be added (none there at present)?

- We have two cars, but only room for one in front of the house on our driveway. However, we also have a dropped kerb, which we use for the second car, i.e. there is never a problem to park two cars outside the house. The legend shows that this area will become ‘No Waiting Monday to Friday 9-10am and 2-3pm’. Does this mean that we must move one of the cars, should we both be at home during the week? If so, where are we supposed to park?

- Is there an option to continue using our driveway and dropped kerb at all times?

- If this means that we must use a ‘Parking Permit’ for those individual one hour slots, it seems ridiculous!

- It also means that we will be using another parking space, instead of the one outside our house, i.e. we will be adding to the parking problems.

- What does ‘No Waiting’ mean?

- You have allowed for vehicles to park on both sides of a narrow road. Currently there can be problems when larger trucks and lorries try to get through, and several cars have been damaged as a result. To ease the problems, most cars park partly on the pavement. The result is that pedestrians often cannot get through and must walk on the road!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boxmoor Consultation Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halwick Close</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I am contacting you to express my concerns at the current consultation for Boxmoor. While completely in agreement at proposed changes to parking I am concerned about the impact on roads outside the zone. I live in Halwick Close and we already suffer from commuter cars parked during the week. We also have cars from St John's Road who are unable to park outside their own properties. Please could you advise me if there are any plans to extend the parking zones to other parts of Boxmoor.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Latchford Place**         |
| "On behalf of the Latchford Place residents I attach a number of completed Feedback Forms. The gist if the feedback is as follows: 1. It can be difficult exiting Latchford Place safely due to parked cars in Cowper Road. They can obstruct the sight lines both up and down Cowper Road. 2. It can be difficult coming into Latchford Place as parked cars obstruct the sight lines towards potential pedestrians who can be crossing the entrance. This is especially dangerous at school opening and closing times. To resolve the problem we request one of the following: 1. No Waiting at any time across the entrance to Latchford Place to match the similar markings at the junction of Cowper Road and Sheridan Close. 2. No Waiting at any time from the driveway of No 72 to the boundary of No 76 Cowper Road." |

| **Lockers Park Lane**       |
| "As a concerned local resident and parent of a child in St Roses Catholic Infants School I am writing to you with regard to the proposed waiting restriction schemes in Boxmoor which are currently under consultation. Myself and my family have resided at Lockers Park Lane since September 2010. I have one child currently at the school, and additionally have one child attending St Cuthbert Mayne Catholic Junior School. Because of the distance between the schools and the limited differential between the times when the schools start and finish, I am forced to drive my children to and from both schools every day. Consequently, my family will be adversely affected by these proposed changes and thus I am in a position to comment on these changes." |
The current proposed changes mean that although there will be time limited bays available for school guardians to utilise at school drop-off and pick-up on Green End road these will be insufficient for the number of cars requiring their use. This is despite the fact that the majority of cars allowed to park on the road to use the train station will be reduced or eliminated due to the 30 minutes maximum wait time proposed. Please consider the fact that guardians are not allowed to use the school car park without prior approval from the Head Teacher and the parking available in the Grapes Public House Car Park and Cowper Road car park is already limited and fully utilised most days. A lot of parents, including myself, are simply not able to walk to school or utilise public transport because we have a responsibility to get our other children to school on time and in my case I have work commitments and physical restrictions.

If this proposal was to go ahead, may I propose please that you amend the maximum waiting time to 2 hours. This will also enable us to attend events run at the school, which often take place straight after morning drop offs and before pick up, whilst still eliminating the issue of all day parking for station users etc... although you may note that the station car park is already at full capacity, so it will result in an issue for those who commute into London but can’t afford the shocking parking prices at the station and do valuable jobs in our community, for example nurses in UCLH hospital in Euston.

I hope you will take into account the above feedback from this local resident and very concerned parent.

Not Given

"I support the introduction of the proposals due to the problems caused by people parking for the station. It is a constant issue and becoming intolerable. I assume that the council will not take advantage of the parking permit prices however in the future."

Rosehill Court

I would like confirmation that the residents of Rosehill Court (St Johns/Green End Road) will be able to purchase permits for ourselves and our visitors. We currently have one designated space per household in the Rosehill car park. Any second cars, or those belonging to our visitors, often have to park in the nearby roads which are included in the planned CPZ.

I am in support of the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in Boxmoor, however I have a few comments. As a resident of Rosehill Court (junction of St Johns Road and Green End Road) I am not sure of our position in relation to parking permits and the council officers at the consultation evening were also unable to provide further clarification. The residents of Rosehill Court have only limited parking available in the private car park (one space per household). Any second cars, or vehicles belonging to our visitors, often have to park in the surrounding roads (e.g. Green End, Sebright, Alston etc) which would be included in the planned CPZ. I would like to ensure that the residents of Rosehill Court are also able to purchase permits for both ourselves and our visitors, should the CPZ be introduced.
Sebright Road

Thank you very much for taking time to listen to our concerns this morning about the proposed Residents’ Parking scheme for Sebright Road. Our main concerns relate to safety, and are as follows:

1. All of those who live in numbers 7, 9, 11 and 13 (and indeed 15) Sebright Road have young children. The proposed scheme would require the people from these houses to cross the road holding their children (and buggies, shopping, etc. etc.) every time that they parked. At the moment, with parking allowed directly outside these houses, children can be loaded safely, directly from the pavement outside our houses. Changing the plan to give residents’ parking outside their houses (i.e. down the full east side of the street) would therefore allow this much safer way of loading or unloading the children that we are responsible for.

2. We cannot agree that the proposed “chicane” would be safer than having the parking all down the east side of the street outside the houses. This is because, with the proposed scheme, when children from numbers 9 to 13 cross the road to get into their cars (as they would have to), the cars parked outside numbers 15 and above in the street would actually block their view of any cars coming down the road, requiring them to get out into the middle of the road before they could see whether any cars were coming down the street. This would seem to be really dangerous.

3. A further consideration is that Dacorum Council has given planning consent to the building of two houses in the garden of the house immediately opposite numbers 7 to 13. The planning permission includes off-road parking with dropped kerbs, which would therefore immediately remove the proposed zone of parking next to this garden. A change to parking on the east side of the street would then probably be the required solution.

It did appear this morning that you understood our concerns, and would be able to revise the proposal to meet our concerns - which as noted above are primarily about the safety of our families. We can confirm that all of the residents of these houses are in agreement, and all have the same safety concerns as ourselves, which I hope adds weight to our request for a revised plan.

I have attached a pdf copy of the letter that I originally sent in February this year, which includes the two drawings of the parking that I showed you this morning, which you said would be good to have copies of. The letter itself goes into much more detail that the above (other things like the Disabled Parking spot not being required, and the dropped kerb between 13 and 15 being unused as too narrow), but the points in this email show our primary concerns.

So I sincerely hope - as you indicated - that our concerns will be taken into account when drawing up a final version of the plan, and would really appreciate it if it were possible for you to confirm to us that this will be so. In any case, we trust that we can look forward positively to seeing the final version.

We would appreciate confirmation that you have received this email, as we sometimes find that emails do not get delivered.
Thank you for the opportunity for us to view the plans for the proposed parking scheme held this week at St Johns. It was helpful to be able to speak to someone with our concerns.

I live at [11 Sebright] and my neighbours at [7, 9 & 13] all are in agreement with the plans except for the plans for the parking permit bays to be opposite our homes. We do not want proposed no waiting outside our homes between the hours of 9 to 10 and 2 to 3pm. We all agree that the permit bays should be outside our houses, also there is planning permission to build two houses opposite which will take away the allocated spaces. We all feel the best solution is to have the permit parking outside our houses also making it safer for us with our children and grandchildren and to put yellow lines opposite, making it no parking Monday to Friday 8 to 6pm. This would then allow easier access for dustcarts, emergency services vehicles to pass safely along the road. It has no benefit to have the permit parking on that side of the road.

The bays opposite also have over hanging trees which when a vehicle is left for a period of time gets covered in tree drool, leaf and birds mess.

Our road is not a cut through road so there are no issues with speeding and all the houses on the other side all have off road parking so it would make sense for the whole of the other side being a single yellow line. Also all cars that park on the opposite side park up on the pavement, which does not allow you the space to walk along the pavement. This is a hazard for people with small children and for the elderly/disabled as they are forced to walk in the road. The cars that park on our side do not mount the curb as they are adjacent to our homes and would block access.

I welcome the proposal, my comments are:

1. The proposal to put a parking restriction in at the roundabout end of the north side of St Johns (yellow on plan) is welcomed as it would prevent the parking which causes severe restrictions to traffic flow.
2. Consideration should be given to providing the parking bays on the northern side of St Johns Rd between Sebright and Puller, rather than on the southern. This would have the advantages of providing a much longer bay capable of parking more vehicles in a more flexible way. It would “free up” the south side which has many more dropped kerbs which have to be taken into consideration. It would allow residents of vehicles on the south side better visibility of the oncoming traffic when exiting via their dropped kerb. It would largely address the issue of vehicles parking too close to dropped kerbs which cause residents difficulty on entry or when exiting. It would put a chicane like direction change in the path of through traffic and may help address the issue of cars racing through the village up to and away from the pedestrian crossing.
1. That our approval of this scheme would only remain if a white 'h' line be painted outside our driveway on 27a Sebright Road, or even
double yellow lines as in other roads.

2. That parking on the road going north in Alston Road (on the right hand side), outside the Social Centre for the Blind, keeps the existing
parking for two cars along the STRAIGHT part of this road. Whilst we agree that yellow lines are required on the bend, it is NOT on a bend
outside the two houses adjacent to the Blind Centre and therefore does not require double yellow lines there. Two cars are permanently
parked there which do not breach the Highway Regulations. Marking yellow lines along this STRAIGHT part of the road, would result in a loss
of two vital parking spaces.

3. That possible other spaces be made for car parking instead of extending the yellow lines beyond the necessary Highway Regulations - this
would help with the high number of cars in the area.
We omitted to add our final point to yesterday's email (see below).

We wish to stress that we require space either side of our driveway to swing our car out onto a busy Sebright Road, in order to maintain our
safety and that of other drivers.

We would ask you to give the same consideration to this, as you have informed me that you have given to other residents in this scheme.

**St Roses**

Can you please explain how the parking will work on Green End Road for school drop off at St. Rose's Catholic School?

From looking at the map it appears the street will be marked with bays you can park in for 30 minutes without a permit, but can not return to
for 30 minutes.

Can nonresidents purchase permits for longer stays as needed for meetings at the school or for those parents who volunteer at the school
during the day? I volunteer for approximately 2.5 hours one day a week, but am unsure now how I can continue this activity if I have no
place where I will be able to park my car.

Have you sent information regarding this to the head teacher so she can work with the parents?
I have become aware of proposed parking restrictions that are currently up for consultation in relation to Boxmoor. Of importance to me and this correspondence is Green End Road, this is the location of my daughters school, St Rose's Catholic Infant School and Nursery. I note from the proposals the following:

No waiting Mon-fri 8am - 5pm

Proposed shared use bay Mon-fri 8am - 5pm which will be permit holders or waiting for a max of 30 minutes.

I understand the issues that are faced in relation to commuters parking in the area, and that street in particular. For the residents of the street I can see how irritating this must be. As a parent it is challenging to safely drop the children off and collect due to the already busy nature of the road.

However, I do feel that the waiting times are insufficient. I feel that one hour would be more sufficient to allow parents to arrive in plenty of time, drop off their children (start times are staggered for nursery and the rest of the school) and return to their vehicle. The one hour slot would mean that commuters would stay away from the area and it would therefore be of no detriment to the overall goal that you are looking to achieve.

I am also Chair of the schools PTA. As I am sure you are aware, St Roses is a voluntarily aided school and we therefore have to raise much needed funds throughout the year to pay for new equipment, maintenance etc. This often means that we put on after school activities, such as bedtime stories, discos, and film nights, as well as weekend functions such as fairs. This run from 3:10 until around 5:30pm. The parking restrictions would be exceptionally detrimental to our events. Parents would not be able to volunteer their time to help as they would have no where to park, without volunteers we are unable to run events as it jeopardises the safety of the children. In essence we would then not make the money that is necessary to ensure that our children have all of the resources that they need to flourish in this lovely school. I often have to stay at the school for around an hour after dropping my daughter off to arrange PTA events, with a 30 minute time slot I will no longer be able to do this and I am sure that you can understand that parking within the small grounds of the school is not an option due to safety.

I understand that the residents concerns are a priority, however this needs to be taken into consideration also. I would appreciate your thoughts on the points that I have raised. Whilst I am sympathetic with the resident my main concern is the detriment that this will have to St Roses school.

I look forward to receiving a reply.

I am a parent of a child that currently attends St Roses school. I am extremely concerned of this recent proposal and the safety implications it will have on the very young children who attend the school. Parents rely on parking in the street to then be able to transfer the children safely from the car to the school. The roads are busy as it is and many of us parents do not live in walking distance.

It is already a struggle to find somewhere safe to park and drop the children off to school due to commuters leaving their vehicles parked all day to save money from parking in the train station car park. There is one small car park in th high street which is already full to capacity and cannot cope at present let alone if these restrictions come into play. There is no alternative for parents or carers and I can see no alternative other than to move my child to another school.

Please reconsider this proposal and look at an alternative solution such as time restriction based ie. No parking over 1 hour or similar. This way it will address the commuters issue and also enable parents to park/ drop off/ pick up safely.

As Chair Person of the Governing Board of St Roses Catholic Infants School I am writing to you with regard to the proposed waiting restriction schemes in Boxmoor which are currently under consultation.
St Roses Catholic Infants School is located on Green End Road, HP1 1QW and as a Catholic Faith voluntary aided school serves a wide catchment area covering the parishes of St Mark’s (Gadebridge), St Mary & St Joseph (Boxmoor), Our Lady Mother of the Saviour (Chipperfield), Church of the Resurrection (Grovehill) and Our Lady Queen of All Creation (Adeyfield). We have a nursery and dual forms in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2.

The Governing Board of the school is extremely concerned about the proposed waiting restriction schemes in Boxmoor and above all, about the safety and well-being of our children and parents. The majority of our parents/guardian drive their children to school for the following reasons:

- As a faith school the catchment is wider than most
- We are a feeder school for St Cuthbert Mayne School (located off Gadebridge Road, HP1 3EA) and our families often have children attending both schools
- There is no school transport available
- The age of our children.

We are acutely aware of the difficulties of the current situation especially since the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones in the roads near to the train station. Green End Road is regularly extremely difficult to negotiate due to commuter, resident and school traffic being parked along both sides of the road and frequently blocking drives and pavements. This is clearly putting children's safety at risk as parents try to negotiate obstacles and cross the road in safety frequently with smaller children and buggies.

We consider the proposed waiting time restrictions will have the following effects:

1. There will be insufficient 30 minute maximum wait bays along Green End Road available for parents to use at drop-off and pick-up times because of the number of our parents forced to drive, and the fact that residents with permits will also be legitimately permitted to utilise these bays if they have no or insufficient off-street parking.
2. Other car-parking options available to our parents (The Grapes public house car-park, and the car-park on Cowper Road) are very limited and already fully utilised by parents and commuters.
3. Parents/guardians will be unable to attend Masses, assemblies, sports days and open afternoons as well as other PTA organised fund-raising events held at our school due to the lack of parking and 30 minute wait times.
4. The proposed waiting restrictions along Cowper Road, Alston Road, Grosvenor Terrace and Sebright Road of permit holder only bays 9-10am and 2-3pm Mon-Fri will seriously deplete the parking options for the majority of guardians for Boxmoor Preschool and Boxmoor Primary School Children who currently use these roads who need to drop-off and pick-up at these times.
5. Parents will be forced to utilise other roads, further away from the school, for example Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Northridge Way, impeding the flow of traffic along these major thoroughways and bus routes, and putting children at risk.
6. Commuters who currently park in the roads under consultation will be forced, if the station car-park is not an option to them due to financial or capacity issues, to also park further away resulting in increased congestion in roads just outside the consultation area affecting traffic flow and directly impacting other local residents.
The factors above will, in our opinion, lead to the following:

• Admissions to our school will be negatively impacted due to the difficulties imposed in getting children to and from school safely and on-time.

• The culture of the school will be adversely affected as parental attendance and support of events will be reduced. I remind you that as a faith school family attendance at Mass and assemblies is encouraged and currently very well supported by our families. This in turn contributes to the faith life and family support of our children.

• Funding raised by the PTA will be reduced as support of these events will be reduced. Without the funding of the PTA the children will have insufficient computing equipment and resources

We believe that you should consider all of the factors above and make changes to the proposed plan. For example, consider changing the parking time restrictions along Green End Road to prevent parking for half an hour or an hour during the day which will enable parents to park for pick-up and drop-off and attend school events, whilst preventing all day parking by commuters. Extending this change to Cowper Road, Alston Road, Grosvenor Terrace and Sebright Road, and potentially Woodland Avenue, Gravel Hill Terrace, Ashtree Way and other nearby roads.
## The Poplars

Thank you for your help at the public exhibition of the proposals at St John's Church Hall earlier this week.

We are writing as residents of The Poplars estate which is off Cowper Road and therefore within the proposed CPZ “G”. As our service roads are not public highways we have been told that they cannot be subject to any form of controlled parking scheme.

During both day and night time, Cowper Road and nearby Grosvenor Terrace are constantly full with cars owned by people who reside in those roads. It is proposed that for 1 hour each weekday morning and afternoon parking will be restricted to bays on only one side of those roads. We understand this is intended to improve the safety of both pedestrians and car users for two hours each weekday. In particular, on the stretch of Cowper Road between Crouchfield and The Poplars most home owners have two cars and the people living in 77 & 81 Cowper Road ignore the “residents only” signs and frequently park in our service roads. It is inevitable that car owners living near to The Poplars will choose to park permanently on our service roads rather than move their cars each morning and afternoon and fight for a space in the limited number of parking bays available.

If the CPZ is implemented, with or without including Cowper Road, The Poplars will become prey to commuter parking (it takes only 11 minutes to walk to the station) and to parking by residents of the nearby roads whose owners wish to avoid buying a permit or who cannot find space to park.

Our preference is that no CPZ be implemented for the roads north of St John’s Road. If, however, most people within the proposed zone are in favour, then it is vital that Dacorum Council, who are the owners of our service roads, implement an arrangement to protect us from unauthorised parking. It seems reasonable that such an arrangement be funded from the income generated by the CPZ.

As the freehold landowner of the poplars, the Commercial Assets and Property Development Department at Dacorum Borough Council must also raise their concerns about this controlled parking scheme.

This is a un-adopted private road, owned and maintained by Dacorum Borough Council for the use of the owner/occupiers of the Poplars. If the surrounding area was part of the controlled parking scheme, then the Public and any one not holding a pass would use Poplars for free. This area cannot be patrolled by Dacorum Borough Council and would result in the Council having to pay a significant amount to install a barrier or such like to prevent misuse.
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Email Comments

Zone X

Cangels Close

I live at Cangels Close and fought for some years to have limited parking in my road. Now I find we are going to be swamped with cars once more, the only difference being that they will not be commuters’ cars, but residents of Northridge Way. I always complained that those residents have treated Cangels Close as their overflow car park. You are now making it official.

What was the point of it all?

I do not object to the creation of a CPZ for the properties within the proposed extended boundaries but I do strongly object to their inclusion within X zone. In my opinion they should have their own zone created which would prohibit parking by other property owners outside of their zone but it should not provide extended parking for property owners within Northridge Way to park in adjoining roads and make parking worse in those adjoining roads.

I live at Cangels Close which has parking spaces directly outside my property and the proposal would open up these spaces to residents who do not even live in Cangels Close. A CPZ should be used to protect spaces outside of peoples houses for those living in the relevant road and not open it up to additional parking from people who have no association with the road. I am sure the three spaces outside of my home would be permanently used by residents from Northridge Way if Zone X is extended in the way proposed. Cangels close is very close to the proposed extended area and also closer to the train station so I am sure Cangels Close will take the most impact for the proposed extension.

Accordingly, I strongly object to the proposal to extend Zone X but do not object to the creation of a separate zone for those properties within the extended area.

This e-mail is to object to the current proposals in respect of the extension of Zone X in Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead to include Northridge Way.

There is clearly a huge imbalance in the proposals given that numerous residents of Northridge Way will be given permission to park in current Zone X areas with only very immaterial reciprocal parking being made available to residents currently living in Zone X.

As a resident of Cangels Close, this will seriously impact our current parking arrangements, no doubt making space outside our residences regularly unavailable throughout the day as residents of Northridge Way opt to park in Cangels Close.

The appropriate solution appears to be creating a separate zone for the residents of Northridge Way, rather than an extension of Zone X.

I would like to strongly object to the proposed extension of parking zone X which proposes to include vehicles from Northridge Way. It is obvious that this will just reverse the whole idea of alleviating the parking problems in Cangels Close and Moorlands, the majority of the
problems in the first instance at the top end of Cangels Close was caused by residents from multiple occupancies of rented accommodation and businesses in Northridge way, constantly parking in Cangels close and Moorlands. It appears that your current proposal will only allow these non-residents to again create parking problems. Even with the layout that has been introduced we still have trouble in exiting and entering our drives, as the road is extremely narrow with pinch points. When cars park in the bays opposite our drives it is extremely difficult, even dangerous, manoeuvring our vehicles in and out of our drives.

**Grove Road**

I object to the proposed changes that will put unnecessary strain on the existing parking spaces in Zone X. You are giving parking to new people without creating enough new parking spaces.

By all means alleviate the parking problems in the area designated but create a new zone.

We wish to object to the extension of Zone X controlled parking zone.

You will receive letters signed by residents of Grove Road Cangels Close and Moorland road.

We are attaching the detailed objections in a word document.

**Extension of Zone X**

We wish to object to the proposed extension of Zone X to include properties to the west of Cangells Close.

We appreciate that the residents living in the area of the proposed extension have been adversely affected by the success of Zone X in displacing commuter cars, as have the residents of the now proposed Zone G to the north of St Johns Road, hence the current proposals.

We note that the proposed Zone G is to be a new zone, and not an extension of Zone X. Thus none of the residents of the existing Zone X are affected by the proposed Zone G, whilst the residents at the western extremity of the existing Zone X most certainly are affected by the proposed extension to Zone X, but the residents to the east of Fishery Road are not.

The proposed extension to Zone X would greatly disadvantage the residents of Grove Road, Cangells Close and Moreland Road because of the gross imbalance of road-side parking places, as fully detailed by other objectors. (This could of course be resolved if additional parking spaces were to be created in the existing grass verge on the south side of North ridge Way, starting at the junction with Cangells Close (as was done recently around Chaulden House Gardens).

It will be recalled that the residents of 1 to 11 Northridge Way were asked if they wished to be included when Zone X was created, but they decided they did not, nor did they take the opportunity taken by the two “end” residents who were initially included but joined for the final implementation.
History indicates that, if parking controls are introduced along Northridge Way, as shown on the plan, then the displaced parkers will simply park further up Northridge Way and also in the adjoining roads, with the result that there will then be a call from the residents of those roads to be in an RPZ. DBC will then be faced with the choice of:

- Further extending Zone X or
- Extending Zone X to the boundary of a totally new RPZ or
- Creating a totally new RPZ to incorporate the currently proposed extension to Zone X

If they choose either of the first two options then DBC will have to decide just how large Zone X will be – will it extend from Wharf Road to Chaulden Lane, a distance of over 1 kilometre? How big can an RPZ reasonably be?

Surely it is better for DBC to plan for the inevitable and rather than extend Zone X create a new small zone ready to extend when called for.

With respect to the creation of a separate new RPZ, it might be said that it is too small to be viable – this would only confirm the disproportionate effect that a mere extension would have on the roads noted above. It would also indicate that the sooner a proper new zone is created the better.

Parking on Northridge Way between Fishery Road and Cangells Close

Since the creation of Zone X there has been a steady growth in the number of cars being parked partially on the south side pavement (up to Grove Road), or on the south side verge. As a result, traffic is obstructed and the pavement is blocked, forcing push-chair users to walk in a busy road. Observation would indicate that the parkers are not railway commuters; in addition on a number of occasions, cars have been parked at week-ends or over-night.

We would therefore suggest that the proposed restrictions are inadequate and should be upgraded to “No waiting at any time” on both sides of Northridge Way, from the roundabout up to at least the full width of 1A and 1 Northridge Way on the south side and to the edge of the new RPZ on the north side.

We wish to object to the proposed extension to Parking Zone X, Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead. Residents’ Parking Zone X has been a real success. The area is no longer blighted every day by huge numbers of inconsiderately parked commuter vehicles. CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone) Zone X was introduced after considerable consultation and consensus. CPZs solve the parking problem for residents, but in this case the problem has been pushed further away from the railway station. Hence the need for the new Zone G, proposed. When the commuter parking problem is displaced again in the future there are likely to be further proposals, in a year or two to extend the CPZs.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF ZONE X

If the proposed extension of Zone X goes ahead the commuter parking problem is simply displaced further up Northridge Way. It is almost inevitable that a further extension will be proposed in a year or two. We will soon be in a position where commuters living at the northern boundaries of Zone X will park legitimately in Zone X closer to the railway station recreating the problem that is currently solved in Moorland Road, Horsecroft Road, Grove Road and Cangells Close.
The solution is to create a NEW CPZ for Northridge Way. The advantage of a CPZ, which residents pay for, is to have available parking close to ones house. This works on a ‘give and take’ basis. This can be put simply as ‘you can park in front of my house and I can park in front of yours’. The six houses in Northridge Way numbered 1a – 11, all have multiple parking on their properties (yet in the past have parked regularly on Grove Road), will be able to park in Cangels Close, Grove Road and Moorland Road. NO reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents. ie existing Zone X residents cannot park in front of the Northridge Way houses. The sixteen properties (flats) on Northridge Way numbered 70 – 100, with a private parking area, will all have parking rights to Zone X, but NO reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents. The twelve properties on the north side of Northridge Way, numbered 102 – 124, have proposed permit parking for approximately 10 vehicles. The six properties to the west of Northridge Way appear to have no parking available for Zone X residents. The single property, Windybeg, at the Easterly end of Northridge way, will have parking rights to Zone X, but no reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents.

In summary, it is proposed that 35 properties in Northridge Way are added to Zone X. Approximately 10 permit holder spaces will be added to Zone X. Furthermore, if additional parking is required by these 35 householders, then it will be in the area closest to them. ie Cangels Close, Grove Road and the part of Moorland Road west of Fishery Road.

CONCLUSION
If this extension to the CPZ goes ahead a precedent will be set for further extensions, all to the disadvantage of current Zone X residents. The proposed extension of Zone X will have a significant and disproportionate adverse effect on current Zone X residents in Cangels Close, Grove Road and Moorland Road west of Fishery road.

ALL PARTIES WOULD BENEFIT BY CREATING A NEW CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE FOR NORTHRIDGE WAY, WHICH WOULD ALSO HAVE SCOPE FOR EXTENSION IN THE FUTURE.

Yours faithfully,

Kingsland Road
I am a resident in Kingsland Road and I have recently become aware of the proposed extension to zone X. I strongly feel that there needs to be a new zone created to avoid a return to previous problems in our streets with parking. Being so close to the station it is very likely that those further out will use our roads to park for the station, we will not be parking near their houses. Our zone X needs to be protected, the system currently works and the current proposal will put this at risk.
Moorland Road

After years of parking hell and now getting some slight respite due to the creation of zone x restrictions which have partially eased the issue I wish to object to this proposal to destroy the purpose for which the zone x was created.
The root cause of the problem is the lack of free parking around the station and boxmoor shops/church/ Moorland Road.

Putting a larger restricted zone around this key essential to visit areas is a great profit idea for the council but an unfair tax on the local residents and a deterioration of the area not an improvement.
It's for sure the elected members don't pay when they visit the council offices and would not vote for that or create an area around the council offices where they exclusively can't park!

Thinking it through the obvious result from increasing the size of the area is the outer extremities of the x area parking to visit the central areas and turning those areas back into the problem the area x sought to alleviate. The requirement is for people to have economically viable parking at their residence and the same at the essential parking areas of Boxmoor shops, the moor, the catholic church and the station. Please stop tinkering with unbroken things until you break them as well. Solve the real problems with new inexpensive ideas that benefits the towns people eg large free car parks in the essential areas and cancel this ridiculous idea of extending area x.

Please think through the next steps and consequences of these plans before asking us to vote for example here are two better proposals:-
1. Please create a new car park in the area of the closed road next to the catholic church in boxmoor this is a cheap option that increases the benefit of the area to residents without any downside
2. Please create a better layout including substantially more parking in front of the station the existing arrangement with bus lanes is dangerous, hugely wasting of space and the creation of it removed a substantial number of parking places.

As a resident living in Zone X I object to the Zone X proposed extension as it stands.
The number of new spaces (approx 10) is not enough for the number of new households (35).

As a resident of Moorland Road I write to object against the proposal to extend 'Controlled Parking Zone X' as outlined in the recent document circularised to residents in Zone X.
The proposals are biased in favour of the residents now to be included in the scheme. The houses in Northridge Way are being given the opportunity to park in existing controlled roads, while there is little or no extra parking for those of us already in Parking Zone X.

As an example there are 6 Houses (1a-11 Northridge) who all have multiple parking spaces and who will be able to park in Cangels Close,
Grove Road and Moorland Road yet there is no reciprocal parking. Also the 16 flats on Northridge Way who already have private parking will be able to park in Parking Zone X without any reciprocal parking becoming available for the residents already in the Parking Zone.

35 properties in Northridge Way are being added to Parking Zone X, and yet only approximately 10 permit holder spaces will be added to the Zone.

The obvious solution to this issue is to introduce and create a NEW parking zone and not to extend Zone X.

As residents of Boxmoor since 1971 and living in Moorland Road since 1979, we now pay for the privilege of parking in our road which was previously dominated by commuter parking during the working week. The introduction of 'Zone X Parking Restrictions' has been extremely successful in that residents can now park without restriction during the daytime in the week. There are still problems in the early evening however, when the parking spaces 'designated for residents/permit holders' are barely adequate to accommodate residents returning home in their vehicles.

Weekend parking in this road and other Zone X designated areas' is still at a premium as people continue to park here to use the station therefore residents and their visitors alike often have difficulty parking.

The proposed extension of Zone X to include a further 35 properties in Northridge Way whilst only supplying a further 10 new parking spaces is not a viable proposition. The introduction of a different 'designated zone' to cover these new proposals is imperative as no doubt it will eventually have to be extended even further once commuters have nowhere else to go for 'free parking'. As the situation stands at the moment, under this new extension of zone proposal, there will be no adequate reciprocal parking for the residents of Moorland Road, Grove Road and Cangels Close whilst the newly proposed Northridge Way residents and their 'visitors' already have free use of our 'parking bays' during the unrestricted parking period.

There used to be a frequent and extremely reliable bus service running to and from Hemel Hempstead station from Warners End. This service no longer exists meaning that people from the Chaulden/Warners End/Gadebridge areas wishing to use the station have no efficient means of public transport thus necessitating the use of private vehicles trying to park as near to the station as possible.

The negotiation of a 'subsidised parking scheme' at Hemel Hempstead railway station should have been negotiated years ago and may well have benefited both local residents and Dacorum Council alike resulting in less unnecessary expenditure on both sides.

I am writing to you to object to the proposed extension of our local Zone X parking zone to include the additional 35 nearby households in Northridge Way. When Grove Road and Moorland Road recently received the new zoning it made an immense difference when it came to access to our property: we no longer found ourselves having to dodge around vehicles simply to be able to get in and out of our side gate in Grove Road.

There was also a noticeable drop in terms of incidental rubbish and litter that has to be cleaned up from outside our property each week and, I think, observably less wear and tear to the (unmade) surface of the 'un-adopted' Grove Road itself and to the immediate border adjacent to our property.

In the event that the extension to which we are objecting were executed I believe it would be to the detriment of our access to our properties and, truly, a step backward in terms of our local living conditions.
I cannot support the proposed extension to Zone X as it presents a strong possibility of the parking bays in Cangels Close, Moorland Road and Grove Road, in particular, being overloaded with cars from outside the immediate area.

As implementation of the proposed extension would only increase the existing issue of 'station parkers' further north up Northridge Way and associated side roads, with consequent demands for residents parking, surely the better option would be to implement a Northridge Way based zone immediately.

I object to the proposal to expand parking zone X. There are already problems parking when returning home in the evening. This expansion, allowing residents from Northridge Way, many of who, already have parking facilities, to park anywhere in zone X, will simply make parking even more of an issue for those residents of Cangels Close, Grove Road, and Moorland Road who continue to bear the brunt of commuter parking, the underlying issue that needs to be addressed. The car park serving the railway station is frequently only half full. The cost of parking in this car park has to be negotiated with the landowner because the problem is just getting pushed further 'up the road'. Subsidising the car park would be a more sensible solution than pouring more money into setting up parking schemes, more of which will be needed until the zone gets too far away for people to walk to the station. If there MUST be more parking in a controlled zone then this should be another zone, separate from zone X, and when another zone is needed in 2 years - when this lack of insight by DBC has pushed the parking problem 'up the road' - that too should be another zone - enabling all residents to park within the vicinity of their homes.

I would like to add my voice to the objections to the extension of Zone X parking - Moorland Road, Cangels Close and Grove Road.

My name is Mrs Mary O'Connor of 17 Moorland Road and I agree with the logic of having a new zone instead of extending the present successful Zone X. I attach the letter presented by Helen Jennings which explains fully the reasoning behind the objection to the extension of Zone X and the new proposal for a new zone.

I would like to object to the changes as proposed.

Further to the information sent to us in October 2015 setting out the proposed extension to Parking Zone X, I had to write and voice my objection.

The very people in Northridge Way who will now be covered by Zone X extension are some of the people who choosing to walk as little as possible, used our road to park for the station before the parking zone came in.

I understand why the residents of Northridge Way want permit parking, I just wonder why it needs to be an extension to zone X and not an entirely new zone. Please can you explain the reasons behind this thinking.

I would like to object to the changes as proposed.

Your proposal will upset the delicate balance of parking which now exists in Grove Road, Cangels Close and Moorland Road after the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>introduction of the Controlled Zone X.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst I have every sympathy for the people who live in Northridge Way, it would make far more sense for you to introduce a new complimentary zone to cover the next tranche of roads rather than expand the existing Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, some of the most persistent parking problems in our roads before Zone X was introduced came from people who were prepared to drive no more than 200 metres from their homes nearby to shorten their walk to the station. If you extend the Zone outwards you will be inviting the old problems to return as people within an extended Zone X will gravitate toward the Station.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My husband and I live at Moorland Road Boxmoor, which is part of parking zone X. We campaigned for a long time to have residents parking only on our street due to the nightmare of commuters parking on our road. |
| I was rather concerned to read the proposed changes and extension of the residents that will be able to park on Moorland Road Cangels Close and other roads within this zone. |
| I feel that if the proposal goes ahead we will have a similar number of cars to the number that we used to have when commuters parked on the roads. You are talking about allowing at least 30 more cars to park on our streets but are not extending the amount of parking places within the zone! |
| An example of the problems that will arise is the top of Cangels Close (next to Northridge Way) will have many more cars parking on the road due to the fact that you will now stop cars parking on Northridge way. This will make it dangerous to drive in and out of Cangels Close and also difficult for the residents of candles close to get in and out of their drives. |
| In addition to these concerns, I find it strange that there are marked bays outside some of the driveways. |
| Can the council not spend their money more wisely and provide better ‘park and ride’ services pork metres to the station? Alternatively you could build better parking facilities at the train station. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your proposals represent a dilution of the excellent parking restrictions imposed by the CPZ for Zone X and we strongly object to the inclusion of 35 additional properties in the zone. The Zone X restrictions were introduced after considerable consultation and in our view they should not now be reversed, even in part. The effect of what you are proposing will be for (at least some of) the residents of the 35 properties to use Grove Road, Cangels Close and Moorland Road for their regular, nearer the rail station parking as they did in the pre-Zone X past. Any future further extension along Northridge Way would undeniably make the situation much worse, returning us to the pre-Zone X days. This surely cannot be your intention.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In making this objection to the proposals as they now stand, we offer as a solution the creation of a new CPZ for Northridge Way. This would seem to benefit all parties and would provide a suitable framework for any future extensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry and Vivienne Trindall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The advantage of a CPZ, which residents pay for, is to have available parking close to ones house. This works on a ‘give and take’ basis. This can be put simply as ‘you can park in front of my house and I can park in front of yours’.

- The six houses in Northridge Way numbered 1a – 11, all have multiple parking on their properties (yet in the past have parked regularly on Grove Road), will be able to park in Cangels Close, Grove Road and Moorland Road. NO reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents. ie existing Zone X residents cannot park in front of the Northridge Way houses.

- The sixteen properties (flats) on Northridge Way numbered 70 – 100, with a private parking area, will all have parking rights to Zone X, but NO reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents.

- The twelve properties on the north side of Northridge Way, numbered 102 – 124, have proposed permit parking for approximately 10 vehicles.

- The six properties to the west of Northridge Way appear to have no parking available for Zone X residents.

- The single property, Windybeg, at the Easterly end of Northridge way, will have parking rights to Zone X, but no reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents.

In summary, it is proposed that 35 properties in Northridge Way are added to Zone X. Approximately 10 permit holder spaces will be added to Zone X.

Furthermore, if additional parking is required by these 35 householders, then it will be in the area closest to them. ie Cangels Close, Grove Road and the part of Moorland Road west of Fishery Road.

CONCLUSION

If this extension to the CPZ goes ahead a precedent will be set for further extensions, all to the disadvantage of current Zone X residents.

The proposed extension of Zone X will have a significant and disproportionate adverse effect on current Zone X residents in Cangels Close, Grove Road and Moorland Road west of Fishery road.

ALL PARTIES WOULD BENEFIT BY CREATING A NEW CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE FOR NORTHRIDGE WAY, WHICH WOULD ALSO HAVE SCOPE FOR EXTENSION IN THE FUTURE.

We wish to strongly object to the proposal for the extension of Zone X, which makes absolutely no sense.
implemented residents were unable to park anywhere near their own property and were often parking on Fishery Road or up into Northridge way whilst the residents of Northridge way and beyond were parking their cars here to avoid a further, in Northridge way cases, 5 minute walk to the station.

Of the 35 Northridge way households proposed, many already have parking!

It also needs to be considered that most houses now have 2 cars and with only 10 proposed extra spaces there is a real concern and possibility that the X zone could have up to another 50+ cars, ludicrous. Even if 1 car takes a space it still puts another 25 cars in our roads.

It makes absolutely no sense to have instilled permit parking to alleviate congestion in the road only to extend the zone, thereby bringing that congestion back. So we live in our roads and have to pay to park however, with the zone extension we are highly unlikely to be able to park, so what are we actually paying for? We will be right back to where we were prior to the controlled parking being implemented. Currently we can all, mostly, park in the road although at weekends/evenings when everyone is home there still isn't enough for all the residents, yet you want to put more there.

We strongly feel that this will be a huge issue and concern for the residents. Prior to parking zone implementation for zone X, there were arguments, fights, residents bins being thrown over the road by people parking, emptying their car rubbish in our roads. When people can park where they don't live they don't offer the respect they give to their own road and their own neighbours.

If this had been the proposal when the parking zone was initially created and we were asked to pay to park in our road but that residents from Northridge way could also park (although we cannot park there) we, along with most of the residents of these roads would have definitely objected as it would have solved nothing at all regarding the congestion in our roads.

All it would have achieved is DBC will have had some money in their coffers, that's it, nothing regarding the parking problems for residents will have been resolved, yet this appears to be the plan now! The residents will be paying to NOT be able to park in their own road.

Can you advise as to the reason that a new zone isn't being created?

This seems to be the most obvious solution for all residents.
Northridge Way

Thanks for the explanatory letter. We wholeheartedly approve of the parking scheme zone-X Bomoor extension

I would like to express my support for the Zone X extension. The pavement at the lower end of Northridge Way is frequently made impassable by cars parking on the pavement. No action is ever taken by the police to remove these cars. Hopefully the scheme can be implemented before someone dies while having to walk in the road.

If the proposed extension of Zone X goes ahead the commuter parking problem is simply displaced further up Northridge Way. It is almost inevitable that a further extension will be proposed in a year or two.

We will soon be in a position where commuters living at the northern boundaries of Zone X will park legitimately in Zone X closer to the railway station recreating the problem that is currently solved in Moorland Road, Horsecroft Road, Grove Road and Cangels Close.

The solution is to create a NEW CPZ for Northridge Way.

The advantage of a CPZ, which residents pay for, is to have available parking close to one’s house. This works on a ‘give and take’ basis. This can be put simply as ‘you can park in front of my house and I can park in front of yours’.

- The six houses in Northridge Way numbered 1a – 11, all have multiple parking on their properties (yet in the past have parked regularly on Grove Road), will be able to park in Cangels Close, Grove Road and Moorland Road. NO reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents. i.e existing Zone X residents cannot park in front of the Northridge Way houses.

- The sixteen properties (flats) on Northridge Way numbered 70 – 100, with a private parking area, will all have parking rights to Zone X, but NO reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents.

- The twelve properties on the north side of Northridge Way, numbered 102 – 124, have proposed permit parking for approximately 10 vehicles.

- The six properties to the west of Northridge Way appear to have no parking available for Zone X residents.

- The single property, Windybeg, at the Easterly end of Northridge way, will have parking rights to Zone X, but no reciprocal parking is available for existing Zone X residents.

ALL PARTIES WOULD BENEFIT BY CREATING A NEW CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE FOR NORTHRIDGE WAY, WHICH WOULD ALSO HAVE SCOPE FOR EXTENSION IN THE FUTURE.
I would like to register my discontent at this parking zone extension, I feel it is unwarranted.

Whilst I understand residents living within the proposed zone extension must become frustrated at commuters leaving their cars in these areas, it hardly warrants an extension to the parking zone as we all donate some of our earnings towards the upkeep of these parking areas. Quite frankly many of these properties already have off-road parking, yet have two or three cars that they are unable to park within metres of their house and this is the cause of their consternation.

As far as I am aware, as council tax payers, we all donate some of our earnings towards the general upkeep of those parking areas so therefore we should all have an equal opportunity to park in these areas and I heartily object to this parking extension.

I wish to register my objection to the proposed extension. The current plan has been working very well since its introduction. This proposal will create further unnecessary parking problems (going back to how it used to be).
St John's Road

I am contacting with regard to the letter recently posted to residents in Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead.

On viewing the map of parking proposals (Drawing Title: proposed Controlled Parking Zone, Zone G) it shows there is no proposed restriction on the north side of St Johns Rd outside property 284 and 282.

I live at number 286 and am aware of problems this lack of restriction causes. I have previously contacted the Highway Department about my concerns: please see email below which outlines the issues.

As people park their cars on the south side of St Johns Rd to make their way on foot to the railway station, now with other people parking outside 284 & 282, this means traffic is restricted to one lane. At peak periods there is tail back to the mini roundabout.

Outside 284 & 282 often people opt to park their cars half on the pavement and half on the road. (This can be all day from before 07:00 to after 19:00.) Sometimes this is quite dangerous as parents with young children walk along here on their way to St Roses Catholic Infant School. One day a young mother with twins in a pram and other young children in front of her, could not get the pram between the car parked and the wall. Consequently she had to had to take her pram out on to the road to get around the car parked, leaving the other two children waiting on the pavement.

Thank you for your invitation to view the plans for the proposed Boxmoor parking arrangements which I have viewed today. I am a resident of St Johns Road. I see plans have recently added for this road, as these were not included in the original consultation I would assume that a longer period for consultation required to include this road in the scheme?

That said my views are this,

I feel it would not be a workable plan for St Johns Road as this would prohibit parking for residents of St Johns Road who would not be able to park in the proposed restricted roads, there are substantial amount of dwellings without off road parking, therefore these residents would have no local parking available.

Staff of local businesses would be unable to park either in St Johns Road or the restricted roads, some of these shops provide essential services ie the chemist.

The proposed parking arrangements for St Johns Road seem to be a hastily conceived add on to the original scheme, for which I am most definitely opposed.

With regard to the original Boxmoor parking scheme as my dwelling is on the corner of St Johns Road and Puller Road and as I very rarely have difficulty parking in Puller Road or St Johns Road I am also opposed to this scheme. During the days the local business staff and shoppers park in both roads without too much problem these vehicles are replaced in the evenings by residents returning from work so there is a natural change over, I see very few vehicles where the occupants are heading for the rail station.

I really don't think in Puller Road we have a problem.

some photos attached of Puller Road
I recently attended the exhibition to view the proposals for extending permit parking in Boxmoor. I was shocked to see that there was a plan for three hour parking on St. John's road as this plan was not included in the letter I had received. Why were these plans not included in the original letter? Many residents of St John's road were unaware that the plans affected them as they were not on the information sent out and therefore did not attend the meeting. It is also disappointing that the meeting was held in half term when many residents were away.

As a resident of St John's road I am left wondering where we are supposed to park our cars during the day? Many properties on this street do not have off street parking. Many people work flexible hours and are not necessarily out 9-5. Where can they park? Do they have to move their vehicles every three hours?

If the aim of this scheme is to deter commuter parking it seems excessive. Most commuters park between 730-930 so restrictions are not needed all day.

If this scheme goes ahead residents will need permits to park for longer than three hours at a time on the street where they live. Also many residents rely on parking in nearby roads as it is so will find parking even more difficult if they are not included in the permit scheme.

The plan also seems to suggest that when the parking bays are put in residents driveways will be covered with double yellow lines. This will reduce parking further as those of us lucky enough to have drives rely on being able to park across them too if needed. The introduction of yellow lines will make things worse as we have managed with a single white line despite commuters for 15 years.

The plans used also seem to be outdated. My house which is a single dwelling (has been for 15 years) was shown as two properties. When I asked about the double yellow lines across my driveway I was told it was to allow access to both properties and potentially a delivery yard at the back! I wish to make clear 77 St John's road is one domestic property only and there is only a driveway and it does not need double yellow lines.

I would be grateful if you could keep me informed of any further developments.

I have received the details of the proposed plans to change the parking arrangements in Boxmoor and I would like to express my concerns. I live in 87a st johns road, the only road in the area that will be restriction free if the proposals go ahead. I am concerned that parking on St Johns road will become impossible for residents and shoppers if the proposed plans go ahead. It is already a nightmare to park on my own street because of commuters using the train station and the proposed plans will make this even worse. Is it possible to extend the restrictions to St Johns road as well? I realise this hasn't been possible before because of the shops but if parking is left unrestricted just on St johns road shoppers wont stand a chance of parking on this street during the day.

I would really appreciate it if someone could reply to me and explain whether these proposals could be adapted in the way ive suggested.
I'm writing about the proposed parking restrictions to the area of Boxmoor to the north of (and including) St. John's Road. Firstly I'd like to say how disappointed I am about the way you have gone about informing the residents of Boxmoor, and especially St.John's Road.

No map of The proposals for St. John's Road was included with the letter you sent out, only a short line that many of us overlooked referencing St. John's Road.

The consultation was held at the church hall furthest from the affected area with no visible signs outside to draw attention to you being in there. (St. Mary and St. Joseph Hall next to the Blackbirds would have been more appropriate).

And it was held during half term when a lot of people are away and only during the day, so that anyone who works in London for example, wouldn't be able to attend (I get home at 7.30).

I don't believe you have properly shown the full extent and impact of your parking proposal to the residents of St. John's Road and I think you should mail out the map you didn't include last time and extend the consultation period as it so adversely affects the residents there.

It was only by taking the morning off work and calling in at the church hall that discovered the problem with your plans.

Unfortunately the proposed 3 hour wait time, whilst good for people visiting the shops on our road, takes no account of the fact that it is predominantly residential.

Even the few shops that are beyond the immediate centre - Handsome Hounds, the fish & chip shop and Pour Elle - have people living above them.

The gentleman I spoke to said he'd been told by the council to make the whole of the west end of St. John's Road 'commercial' which it quite clearly is not.

This of course means that people living on St. John's road would be unable to park there during the day - having to move their car every 3 hours. A ridiculous situation given the alleged 'commuter' problem you are trying to solve.

Furthermore, many of the residents of St. John's Road park up Cowper / Puller / Sebright roads (as they have no parking of their own) but won't have permits under these proposals and therefore will have NOWHERE to park at all.

If the parking controls were to go ahead, simply allowing the residents of St. John's Road to park on their road as well as the streets to the north at any time would solve this issue. (It was suggested during my visit that residents on the south side of St John's Road might be permitted to park on the the streets behind them - Horsecroft / Kingsland - but this would make no sense as it is much further away than Puller / Cowper and Sebright).

Another issue is the proposal to put double yellow lines across our driveway (and that of several of our neighbours). Thereby reducing the parking even more! We've lived here for more than 15 years and a single white line over the drive has been fine for discouraging 'would be' parkers whilst leaving us or our friends and family somewhere to park when visiting.

Putting double yellows over our drive is ludicrous and something we would strongly challenge.

At the meeting the man talking through the proposals said this was done to every access because he didn't know if it was an entrance for traffic or not. Clearly these proposals have been put forward without anyone walking around the affected area and looking for themselves which accesses are simply driveways, which are for shops or garages at the rear, or of course how many shops vs homes there are along that part of St John's Road. Our house is labelled [redacted] and the man assumed it was a shop and a flat. It is in fact one detached house and has been for a very long time. The two numbers are a hangover from when the plots were sold in the 1800s. Again, walking around the area for yourselves would have shown you things like this and your proposals could have been better thought though. I also think it's worth pointing out that although the 3 hour wait time is there to stop commuters parking and allow people to visit the shops, it doesn't take into account the people who work in the shops. Where do they park all day when they are at work?
If the aim of the residents parking proposal truly is to stop the few commuters who park around St John's/ Sebright and Green End Road, why reduce parking on Cowper Road by 50%?

Residents currently park on both sides, where do you imagine all these vehicles are going to go?

Having looked at the work that has been done to Horsecroft and Kingsland Roads when you implemented restrictions there, I was stunned at the massive over use of signage and road markings.

Residents had huge poles concreted into the ground every few yards in front of their houses without thought to how it would look - I know residents were upset by this and have since had posts lowered etc.

And painting bays seems both excessive and redundant.

I think your proposed plans could have been better thought through before being presented to the public and far from making parking better for residents of Boxmoor, they will make it worse.

I would strongly suggest you reconsider the current proposals.

St Johns Road (HP1 1QG)
As landlords of a property with off road parking on St Johns Road, we have concerns over the proposal to make no waiting areas on parts of the road where currently white lines enable householders to park across their own driveways, please make sure this can continue as it would be a mistake to remove it and create even more parking issues.

Puller Road (HP1 1QL)

There is a second dropped curb outside number 12 Puller Road that appears not to be indicated on your plans. We plan on reinstating this as off-road parking - please ensure this second dropped kerb is indicated on the plans.

Are dropped curbs providing access to driveways to be indicated by white lines?

I'm very concerned that the introduction of limited waiting bays to St John's Rd will make it impossible for residents on St John's road to park. This would actually discourage people from owning businesses on the road.

I write on behalf of Parkwood Surgery.

As you know, we have a branch surgery that is for the local residents of Boxmoor as well as the rest of our practice population. We cover the vast majority of the population that is covered by the new parking scheme.

Whilst we totally understand the need for the parking restrictions to avoid rail travellers using the local roads for their convenience, we have already had major problems under the present scheme which is likely to be made worse by any extension of it. We do suspect that the local residents would like the branch surgery to remain in operation in Boxmoor.

Firstly our patients already struggle to find anywhere to park, particularly any patients with any form of physical disability as the closest parking is Cowper Road. This has had an impact on the type of patients we can now see in Boxmoor and a very large number of late arrivals disrupting what is already a very tight appointment system. A potential solution would be 2 disabled slots on the road outside the surgery.

Secondly, and more importantly our receptionists are struggling to find anywhere to park for the morning. They rotate on a weekly basis down to the branch surgery and have to carry a significant amount of items with them each day. We have requested a surgery pass (that is not linked to any one particular car) to try and get around this problem, but this was not forthcoming. We do believe this would be a very simple solution to the problem and would be very grateful if this could be looked into again. I believe it did have the support of Mike Penning whom we involved in the discussion.
This comes at a time when we are already struggling with practice space due to the expanding population and ever growing demands on GP practices. Whilst we are doing everything in our power to improve access, the parking scheme, and proposed extension of it, makes accessing us even harder.

I live at St. John's Road and trying to park is very difficult. What you are suggesting is making it even worse. People that live in St. John's Road you should be given permits. The restrictions that you are suggesting does not make sense. I know a lot of elderly people that are my neighbours would agree with me.

It is with great concern that I have found out about the proposed parking restrictions to St. John's Road, particularly outside my house. At present there is a "polite Parking" solid white line outside the block of houses in which I live. This has worked well for the many years it has been in place. The current proposal of having this area turned into a "no waiting" zone will be more than inconvenient for my wife and I. I am a disabled blind Old Age Pensioner who does have need of various visitors at any time of the week. Such restrictions would make parking for any visitor, for any reason, to my house too difficult. Examples of such visits are the person who comes to do my gardening for me, people who come to do my household decorating, and any medical needs etc. as well as family visits with very young children who need to park near the house... Where will any of these people be able to park? Some will have considerable amounts of equipment to use at my house and it may well impinge on my ability to get the help I require as a necessity to my living an independent life. I therefore urge you to reconsider these changes to parking restrictions and leave those that are current in place for the future.

We note the proposals to introduce CPZ's to the North of St John's Road, and some restrictions on St John's Road., and have some sympathy with those residents affected by those taking advantage of free parking in residential streets. St John's Road itself is already becoming a free car park during the day, and occasionally overnight since the introduction of CPZ's in Horsecroft Road & Kingsland Road. Motorists who presumably then make their way to the Railway station, are not breaking any law but do create issues: Difficulties in access to driveways at residential properties, especially adjacent to the Beechfield Rd bus stop. Reduced visibility is an issue. Reversing onto our short drive (152 St John's Road) has become dangerous because of legally parked cars adjacent to the marked bus stop. Difficulties with highway cleansing & maintenance. Street sweeping is ineffective when the road has parked cars - some residents, but a significant proportion of non-residents. A related & relevant topic is the Station car park - increasing charges do not encourage commuters to park there. We have some sympathy with those who already faced with prohibitive season rail tickets, then must bear the costs of parking for 5 or 6 days. What can be done to make the Station car park commuter friendly.
I have just read the article in The Gazette dated 11/11/15 page 9 with the heading “proposed parking restrictions target commuters”. The article says that Dacorum Borough Council in partnership with their specialist consultants Project Centre Ltd have been working on proposals to alter the existing parking arrangements within the residential streets close to Hemel Hempstead railway station. Who asked them to do this and why? I have not found one person that asked the Council to impose parking restrictions outside their home or business?

For various reasons many of today’s motorists want to drive to the railway station to catch a train that will take them to their work. They want to park as close to the station as possible in unrestricted roads. Each day these motorists arrive in the vicinity and take the first available space they can find. Most of the roads in the area already have some form of restriction either in the form of Council parking restrictions or residents simply parking their cars outside their homes.

The current system works within the parameters in which it finds itself. Everybody knows the score. If you want to park close to the station on a nonrestricted road, you arrive at the intended road that much earlier because the later you leave it the further away from the station you will be, unless you find a closer vacant space by chance. The residents in these roads are parking outside their homes without problem or expense. The shopkeepers and local businesses are managing OK. Everyone you speak with in these roads say that there is no problem with the way things are at present. Boxmoor is a village for heaven’s sake and St Johns Road is not some super highway. The consensus is that the village has seen enough parking restrictions recently and doesn’t want any more, thank you. If you really want to improve things for local inhabitants extend the car parking at the station for the commuters and encourage them to use the facilities. Negotiate with the Camelot Rugby Club to use their parking areas during the weekdays when the place is empty. Encourage the schools to use their playgrounds for picking up and dropping off children on the school runs. These are the schemes Dacorum Borough Council and Project Centre Ltd should be spending our money on if they are really concerned for Boxmoor and its inhabitants?

The latest proposed parking restrictions really do no good for the village or its inhabitants. The restrictions will produce revenue for the authorities but the village will die. That is not progress! Please, just go away and leave us alone.

I live on St John’s Road and wasn’t made aware of this proposed change. Can you let me know how it was communicated?

I note that proposals 1 and 3 include a letter which was (presumably) sent out to residents. Glad that I’ve been made aware though, this will really cause me trouble.

I work from home a lot of the time, so am around during the day, and so is my car. At the moment, I currently have to park wherever I can find a space, sometimes up to 400+ meters from my house.

This wouldn’t be such a problem if I didn’t have a young toddler-aged son. Imagine having to walk that distance, carrying your shopping, and with a toddler?

Add to the fact that the road can be jam packed all the way down to town sometimes - if there’s a wedding at the church, for example. I think I would support a permit based system on St Johns Road, so that residents can park there, but keeping non-permit holders subject to the waiting restrictions. I would even support shorter time limits for non-permit holders.

Thanks for reading my email. Can you please let me know what the next steps are? I presume that all feedback will be reviewed and addressed by the council?

Would also be interested to know how much these changes would cost, and how much the council would expect to collect from ticketing cars that have passed the waiting time - how would that money be used?
I fear your suggestions for St Johns Road are very ill-considered.

To a large degree St Johns Road is not broken. A few commuters may sneak in, but they are not a major problem. What will make St John's Road broken is the introduction of a parking scheme for the side streets to the north. It is illogical to introduce a parking scheme up those side streets without inclusion of St Johns Road.

My greatest concerns are that the suggested scheme for the sideroads and St Johns Road may well deter the commuters, but it will also impact on residents and shopkeepers:

1) Will shopkeepers have access to resident parking? If so, will this be at an affordable rate? If not, this will be another burden on the shops and will affect the viability of running commercial enterprises on St Johns Road
2) Many of the suggested elements of the schemes limit the parking:
   - yellow lines on Cowper Road and Grosvenor Terrace instead of residents bays. Many people commute by train and need parking for cars during the day as well as the evenings.
   - absence of resident parking on St Johns Road. Those that live in St Johns Road already spill into the side streets. To not provide parking for St Johns residents will just make things impossible.
   - removal of white lines across drives limiting parking for visitors/guests/carers/deliveries. Whilst white lines are not enforcable, my experience of the past 16 years is that the majority of people respect them. Sometimes they are used by people popping into the shops, but that rarely causes inconvenience and I am happy to support the shops in this way.
   - yellow lines being replaced by double yellow lines

This will mean there are too many cars for the spaces available and will cause more inconcenience.

Commuters park in Boxmoor because the station car park is often full. In principle, therefore, these schemes would not be necessary if the Borough Council had worked with residents and the railway to solve the parking at the railway station. This should be a priority and actually should have been addressed many years ago. If the second tier of parking goes ahead at Berkhamsted station, Hemel Hempstead, the largest town in the Borough, will be the only town in Dacorum with single parking! This is simply bad planning by DBC.

I live at [39] St Johns Road, Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1QQ and purposefully chose to reside in this location to be within walking distance of the train station. I received a letter at the end of October providing me with a copy of the parking proposals for Cowper Road and surrounding areas. I was not provided with any copy of proposals to restrict parking on St Johns Road. I discovered your proposals to restrict parking on my street when a neighbour advised me of them. The current consultation regarding parking restrictions on St Johns Road is not a valid consultation as you failed to tell the affected population of the proposals.

Turning to the proposals themselves, I fundamentally reject the proposal that there is no provision for residents parking on St Johns Road. It is right and appropriate to restrict parking for non residents who park their car in St Johns Road and neighbouring roads to avoid paying parking fees at Hemel Hempstead station. Dacorum council however, need to ensure that residents are able to park their cars because they are residents. There should be no maximum 3 hour bays for residents.

I look forward to you starting the consultation again with regards to St Johns Road and hopefully seeing a proposal that provides for free resident parking permits.

I have provided my views via the Survey Monkey and also signed the petition that local residents have organised.
Your letter to residents of St. John's Rd was received at St. John's Rd which is the postal address for St Mary and St Joseph RC church which is located on the corner of Wharf Rd and St. John's Rd with its front entrance located on St. John's Rd.

We have previously expressed our concerns regarding the complete lack of parking restrictions along the road in front of our main entrance/garden wall which extends from the entrance to Wharf Rd cul de sac up to the Boxmoor convenience store. These concerns focused on the impact from the earlier restrictions in nearby streets which dealt successfully with the commuter parking problem but have resulted in all day parking along the church frontage which is unrestricted.

The impact of this is twofold. Parked cars mean that official wedding and funeral vehicles cannot draw into the slightly recessed kerb. They have to double park with the resultant difficulties of unloading people and coffins. There is no alternative safe access to the church.

Additionally, this creates a significant restriction in the ability of other road users - especially DBC buses, refuse collectors etc - to pass through the traffic calming restriction already in place resulting in a high risk of collision and personal injury to motorists and pedestrians. This was clearly in evidence during the reconstruction of the church wall this year when the contractor's safety barriers caused mayhem for several weeks and any benefit from the traffic calming layout was completely negated by a big increase in road rage and pedestrian unwillingness to use alternative signposted routes.

The new waiting restrictions now proposed do go some way towards resolving matters ie stopping all day parking. However, we feel that you should seriously consider introducing double yellow lines along the section of St. John's Rd which fronts the church up to the point where it ends at the Boxmoor convenience store where it should change to a 2 hr restriction to allow short term parking to support local traders concerns.

Disabled badge holders will still be able to park.

We have been in Boxmoor for over 100 years and have always cooperated with pavement/traffic reconstruction and already provide substantial off-road parking (25 incl disabled) for church and local people using our parish centre and church hall facilities which contributes significantly to parking easement and therefore hope you will carefully consider our concerns and ideas.

Location pictures can be provided if required to support.

Please ensure that any further communication arising from the above is sent to my email address as I am the church site manager. My mobile number is 07515943615. Feel free to ring me.

Many thanks,

Geoff Doyle.
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