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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) undertook a third and final round of informal consultation, with assistance from Project centre (PCL) to gain the views of local residents within the proposed Zone G in the Boxmoor area of Hemel Hempstead.

1.2 A total of 174 items of correspondence were received during the consultation. Residents and businesses in and around the study area completed 133 questionnaires and submitted 41 emails.

1.3 The online questionnaire and consultation material offered a final 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 final set of proposals.

1.4 There were only two questions for respondents to answer;
   - Do you support the final scheme proposals?
   - Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?

1.5 Of the 14 roads consulted; 7 showed clear support for the final proposals, with 4 (Alston Road, Bulbourne Road, Halwick Road and Rosehill Court) giving 100% support to the proposals, Green End Road, Sebright Road and Bargrove Avenue gave 82%, 80% and 78% support respectively. It is recommended to proceed with those roads that indicated clear support for parking controls.

1.6 The online questionnaire responses indicated there was inconclusive support across the proposed Zone G, for the final scheme proposals. 48% of respondents did not support the final scheme proposals.

1.7 98 additional comments were made by respondents to the questionnaire; there were 34 comments made in support of the scheme and 64 comments which did not support the scheme. Most notably from the comments received, respondents suggested current restrictions would not resolve the parking difficulties, with 25 respondents requesting changes to the current proposed restrictions, 11 comments suggested there was no need for restrictions and 9 comments were concerned with the effects of displacement parking as a result of the introduction of the scheme.

1.8 A total of 41 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone G). Of these, 2 respondents showed support for the proposals, 8 supported the proposals but with concerns and 24 do not support the proposals. 7 emails containing general enquiries were also received.
1.9 It is recommended that DBC should only implement the proposed restrictions in those roads showing clear support. The roads which did not support the proposals should be removed from the scheme.
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2. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Online 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

On this occasion no public drop in sessions were held.
3. **INTRODUCTION**

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

3.2 The consultation took place between 11th May 2016 and 1st June 2016.

3.3 Letters containing the scheme proposals were hand delivered to all properties within the proposed area, during the week commencing 9th May 2016, inviting responses to the online 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 online in order to seek the views of residents and businesses in relation to the final set of changes 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 online 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 On this occasion no public drop in sessions were held.

3.9 A dedicated telephone number and email address was available for any queries or questions residents and businesses may have had.

3.10 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 increased parking issues 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 8am and 5pm, Monday to Friday, has been proposed.

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 Residents were also invited to comment on a revised design to reduce any negative effects the proposed new zone may have on St John's Road. Due to the number of comments received during the previous round of consultation (held between 26th October 2015 and 22nd November 2015) a new proposal was put forward for consideration by residents and businesses.

4.6 Additional roads were also included within the final round of proposals, these included Thorne Close and Halwick Close as residents felt their roads may suffer from displacement parking should Zone G come into effect.

4.7 Minor changes were made to the proposals in some roads following feedback from the previous consultation. Roads include Grosvenor Terrace, Sebright Road and Alston Road.

4.8 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 174 items of correspondence were received during the consultation. Residents and businesses in and around the study area completed 133 questionnaires and submitted 41 emails.

5.2 137 online questionnaires were received in total (4 were not completed correctly and therefore cannot be considered). It should be noted only 1 online questionnaire response was permitted from each household within the study area to prevent multiple responses being received.

5.3 41 emails were received via the dedicated pre-consultation email address. Comments received addressed concerns across the proposals.
6. **ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Options proposed:**

6.1 The online questionnaire and consultation material offered a final 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 final set of proposals.

6.2 The following paragraphs provide a breakdown of the responses received to questionnaire.

6.3 Respondents were asked to provide further comments as they felt necessary. Analysis of all the comments submitted via the online questionnaire 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.

6.5 133 online questionnaires were completed up to and including questions which sought to identify if the respondent was a resident, business or both and their address.

6.6 98% (132) of questionnaire respondents indicated they were residents, 1% (1) indicated they were a business within the study area, 1% (1) indicated they were both a resident and a business.

6.7 There were only two questions for respondents to answer:

- Do you support the final scheme proposals?
- Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?
Completed Questionnaire Responses:

6.8 The following section provides the analysis of the 133 completed questionnaires. The analysis is reported on a road by road basis. A breakdown of responses can be found in Appendix B of this report.

All Responses  No. of Responses: 133

Support for Final Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree with proposed restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.9 64 (48%) respondents indicated they did not support the final scheme proposals, 62 (47%) indicated they supported the proposals and 7 (5%) respondents had no opinion.

6.10 Only 129 respondents chose to answer this question. 64 (49%) respondents indicated they did not agree with the proposed restrictions for Zone G. 60 (45%) respondents indicated they supported the proposed restrictions and 5 (4%) respondents had no opinion.
Boxmoor Zone G Consultation Responses

6.11 The results from each road within the study area have been individually analysed to determine if there is support for the final scheme proposals and introduction of parking controls.

6.12 The following table provides a breakdown of the number of responses received in support or not in support from residents within the proposed Zone G in Boxmoor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>In Support</th>
<th>Not in support</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>% Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alston Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bulbourne Close</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Halwick Close</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rosehill Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Green End Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sebright Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bargrove Avenue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Puller Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cowper Road</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 St Johns Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grosvenor Terrace</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Thorne Close</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The Poplars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sheridan Close</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.13 Of the 14 roads consulted; 7 were in support of the proposals with 4 (Alston Road, Bulbourne Road, Halwick Road and Rosehill Court) giving 100% support to the proposals, Green Hill Road, Sebright Road and Bargrove Avenue gave 82%, 80% and 78% support respectively.

6.14 50% of responses from Puller Road supported the proposals.

6.15 There was less support from Cowper Road, where only 22% of respondents supported the proposals and only 17% of respondents from St Johns Road supported the proposals.

6.16 There was no support from respondents of Grosvenor Terrace, Thorne Close, The Poplars and Sheridan Close.

6.17 The following section provides further analysis of the 133 completed questionnaires. The analysis is reported on a street by street basis.
St. Johns Road
No. of Responses: 12

Support for Final Proposals

St Johns Road - Do you support the final scheme proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree with proposed restrictions

St Johns Road - Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.18 9 respondents indicated they did not support the final scheme proposals, 2 indicated they supported the proposals and 1 respondent had no opinion.

6.19 9 respondents indicated they did not agree with the proposed restrictions for St. Johns Road. 3 respondents indicated they supported the proposed restrictions.
6.20 A number of residents indicated their objection to double yellow lines being placed across driveways which may have influenced the responses.
Support for Final Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree with proposed restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.21 All 4 responses received indicated support for the final scheme proposals.

6.22 All 4 respondents also indicated their support for the proposed restrictions for their street.
Sebright Road

Support for Final Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 of the 5 responses indicated they supported the final scheme proposals, 1 response was not in support.

Agree with proposed restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 of the 5 responses indicated they agreed with the proposed restrictions, 1 response did not agree with the proposed restrictions for Sebright Road.
Green End Road

No. of Responses: 11

Support for Final Proposals

Green End Road - Do you support the final scheme proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree with proposed restrictions

Green End Road - Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.25 9 responses indicated they supported the final scheme proposals with 2 against.

6.26 8 responses indicated they supported the proposed restrictions for Green End Road while 3 responses
Bargrove Avenue

No. of Responses: 15

Support for Final Proposals

Bargrove Avenue - Do you support the final scheme proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.27 14 responses support the final scheme proposals with 4 not supporting the final scheme proposals.

Agree with proposed restrictions

Bargrove Avenue - Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.28 13 responses indicate their support for the proposed restrictions, while 5 did not support the proposed restrictions.
6.29 All 6 responses from Bulbourne Close indicated their support for the final scheme proposals.

6.30 All 6 responses also indicated their support for the proposed restrictions.
Grosvenor Terrace - Do you support the final scheme proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grosvenor Terrace - Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.31 All 4 responses received from Grosvenor Terrace indicated they did not support the final scheme proposals.

6.32 All 4 responses also indicated they did not support the proposed restrictions for Grosvenor Terrace.
Of the 18 responses received from Puller Road 9 indicated they supported the final scheme proposals while 9 were against.

When asked if there was support for the proposed restrictions, the results also indicated 9 were in favour and 9 were against.
6.35 23 responses were received from Cowper Road, 18 indicated they did not support the final scheme proposals, 5 responses indicated they did support the final scheme proposals.

6.36 19 responses indicated they did not agree with the proposed restrictions for Cowper Road, 4 indicated they did agree with the proposed restrictions.
**Thorne Close**

No. of Reponses: 6

### Support for Final Proposals

**Thorne Close - Do you support the final scheme proposals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.37 6 responses were received from Thorne Close, 5 indicated they did not support the final scheme proposals, 1 response indicated they did not have an opinion.

### Agree with proposed restrictions

**Thorne Close - Do you agree with the proposed restrictions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.38 5 responses also indicated they did not agree with the proposed restrictions for their street, 1 response indicated no opinion.
6.39 6 responses were received from Halwick Close, all responses indicated they supported the final scheme proposals.

6.40 6 responses also indicated they supported the proposed restrictions for Halwick Close.
**The Poplars**

**Support for Final Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agree with proposed restrictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.41 Only 2 responses were received from The Poplars, 1 response indicated they did not support the final scheme proposals and 1 response had no opinion.

6.42 1 response indicated they did not agree with the proposed restrictions while 1 response did not have an opinion.
6.43 2 responses were received from Sheridan Close with both indicating they did not support the final scheme design.

6.44 The 2 responses also indicated they did not agree with the proposed restrictions for their road.
6.45 Only 1 response was received from Rose Hill Court, the response indicated support for the final scheme proposals.

6.46 The single response also indicated agreement for the proposed restrictions.
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.

The comments fall into 2 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>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Most notably from the comments received, respondents suggested the proposed restrictions would not resolve the parking difficulties, with 25 respondents requesting changes to the proposals, 11 comments suggested there was no need for restrictions as there are no parking issues and 9 comments were concerned with the effects of displacement parking as a result of the introduction of the scheme.

7.5 Please note that not all completed questionnaires included further comments. 98 individual comments were taken from the 133 completed questionnaires.
8. EMAIL CORRESPONDANCE

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

8.2 In much the same way as the comments which were received via the online questionnaire, the comments received via email were collated, analysed and a code applied to each.

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

8.4 Some people chose to both email and fill in the online questionnaire.

8.5 The comments fall into 4 broad categories of which:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>COMMENT TOPIC</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Support Parking Restrictions – but with concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Do Not Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>General Enquiry</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 A total of 41 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone G). Of these, 2 showed support for the proposals, 8 supported the proposals but with concerns and 24 do not support the proposals. 7 emails containing general enquiries were also received.

8.7 Whilst supporting the scheme in principle; of the 14 emails which were received showing ‘support with concerns’ the majority raised objections to the operational time or location of on street restrictions.

8.8 Included in the emails which did not support the parking restrictions were objections to the need for restrictions at all, the cost of permits and the impact displacement parking would have into surrounding roads.
9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1 The online questionnaire responses indicated there was inconclusive support across the proposed Zone G, for the final scheme proposals. 48% of respondents did not support the final scheme proposals.

9.2 When considering the results on a street by street basis; 7 of the 14 roads consulted showed clear support for the final proposals, with 4 (Alston Road, Bulbourne Close, Halwick Road and Rosehill Court) giving 100% support to the proposals. Green End Road, Sebright Road and Bargrove Avenue gave 82%, 80% and 78% support respectively.

9.3 50% of the overall responses from Puller Road supported the proposals with the further 50% of responses indicating they did not support the proposals or support parking controls.

9.4 There was little support received from Cowper Road (22%) and St Johns Road (17%). No support was indicated by respondents from Grosvenor Terrace, Thorne Close, The Poplars and Sheridan Close.

9.5 98 additional comments were made by respondents to the questionnaire; there were 34 comments made in support of the scheme and 64 comments which did not support the scheme. Most notably from the comments received, respondents suggested current restrictions would not resolve the parking difficulties, with 25 respondents requesting changes to the current proposed restrictions, 11 comments suggested there was no need for restrictions as there are no parking issues and 9 comments were concerned with the effects of displacement parking as a result of the introduction of the scheme.

9.6 A total of 41 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone G). Of these, 2 showed support for the proposals, 8 supported the proposals but with concerns and 24 do not support the proposals. 7 emails containing general enquiries were also received.

9.7 Whilst supporting the scheme in principle; of the 14 emails which were received showing ‘support with concerns’ the majority raised objections to the operational time or location of on street restrictions.
10. RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 The results of the consultation have indicated that there is no consensus of opinion across the proposed Zone G. As a result it is recommended that DBC should only implement the proposed restrictions in those roads showing clear support.

10.2 The roads recommended to be included within the scheme are Alston Road, Bulbourne Close, Green End Road, Sebright Road and Bargrove Avenue.

10.3 Responses from Halwick Road indicated clear support for the scheme but surrounding roads, which include Cowper Road, St Johns Road, Grosvenor Terrace, Thorne Close, The Poplars and Sheridan Close all indicated they did not support the proposals.

10.4 The roads which did not show clear support for the proposals should be removed from the scheme proposals and no further action should be taken at this time.

10.5 Where possible, the scheme proposals have been amended to take into account any suggestions or requests provided by respondents. A plan showing the final proposed scheme can be found in Appendix D.
APPENDIX A – CONSULTATION MATERIAL
Zone G

RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION

IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS ENCLOSED
Dear Householder/Proprietor,

_**Proposed Zone G – The next steps.**_

We write to you with reference to the recent informal consultation held between 26th October and 22nd November last year with residents in roads situated between Green End Road and Cowper Road, Dacorum Borough Council in partnership with their specialist consultants, Project Centre Ltd have now analysed the responses and identified areas where changes to the original proposals are required.

As part of the consultation process we received a number of comments and requests for additional roads and amendments to the original proposals to be considered, as a result we are now conducting a final round of informal consultation with residents in your area and those in roads adjacent to the proposed zone to determine if these changes are supported and if they wish to be included within a separate scheme. The following roads are proposed to form a separate zone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashtree Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravelhill Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardy Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes to the original proposals include operating all parking restrictions between 8am and 5pm Monday to Friday, the inclusion of Thorne Close, Halwick Close and St. John’s Road within the scheme, offering shared use parking to allow residents of St. John’s Road to park near to their properties and up to 3 hours limited stay parking for those who wish to visit the shops and businesses. The proposals also now include 30 minutes limited stay for non permit holders on Cowper Road and Alston Road. In order for us to determine if the proposals are supported by residents and businesses please take the time to complete a very short on line survey which can be found at: [https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/BOXMOORG](https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/BOXMOORG)

The final round of informal consultation will run for 21 days, from 18th May 2016 to 8th June 2016, in the roads where further changes to the proposals have been made, if you do have any concerns or comments please feel free to 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](mailto:dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk)

PTO
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.

Enclosed with this letter is a plan of the proposed restrictions.

The plans can also be viewed on line, please visit: www.dacorum.gov.uk/parkingconsultation

At the end of this round of the informal consultation period, all responses received will be reported to Dacorum Borough Council and a decision will be made to either continue as proposed or to take no further action, we will write to you informing you of the final decision and what happens next.

If you have any queries regarding the above 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

Dacorum Borough Council working in association with 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.
APPENDIX B - CONSULTATION COMMENTS
**Zone G online comments**

**St Johns Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our concerns regarding the current unrestricted parking along the full length of our frontage have only partially been addressed. The introduction of a 3hr restriction will be beneficial in stopping commuter all day parking but the greater overall concern of hazards to pedestrians and motorists arising from double parking by wedding/funeral vehicles when they set down their occupants has not been addressed. We have AT LEAST one such event weekly - sometimes more - with resultant road blockages and road rage incidents. Our proposal is that DOUBLE YELLOW LINES be installed along the frontage with a TWO HR Parking bay along the remainder of the designated section.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I personally can not see the need for any form of permit parking however what I object to the most is the proposed double yellow lines in front of drive ways. As a resident that paid extra for a drive I see no reason as to why double yellow lines are needed. The single white line means that only myself or my son can park their vehicles. We are reducing pressure on parking. It also means if guests are visiting like my elderly parents they can park easily and close to house. In addition with the reduced parking proposed in other streets in area to effectively remove parking areas for those with drives and increase pressure further seems to me to mean only one thing and that is that this scheme is simply a money raising effort and not truly a response to parking issues.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the primary objective is to stop commuters the introduction of all day parking is unnecessary and will have an adverse affect on local business thusly affecting the appeal of the area to both business and resident. It would be good to understand the learnings from the previous activity South of St Johns to have a complete understanding of the escalated position (ie extended permit hours) North of it.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALLY DISAGREE to double yellow lines over my drive. You are REDUCING the amount of parking in the Boxmoor area because of a small number of commuters, who should have additional parking made available for them at the STATION car park. More housing means more cars but no additional parking being made available - this proposal will hit residents of St Johns Road MORE than the people you are trying to stop. I do not want to have to PAY to park in my Road, even though the space I find most probably won’t even be outside my own house! The letter states ALL restrictions will be 8.00-5.00 Monday to Friday. This is patently UNTRUE if double yellow lines are put over driveways! We are not stupid.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We welcome a resident’s parking scheme in this zone but the current plans have significantly reduced the amount of parking available which is detrimental to residents and shops. We need fewer double yellow lines and we do not need less parking on Cowper Road, Grosvenor Terrace, Seabright Road and Green End Lanes. We do not want the white line in front of our drive to be a double yellow line with no parking at any time as parking over our drive is often the only way a visitor to my house can park. We have two children and so parking over the drives is essential to residents to get kids into the house safely without them crossing busy St John’s Road and to unload shopping without having to carry heavy grocery bags far. As there is less parking available in the zone we believe that using parking bays on St John’s Road is not a credible option as they will be oversubscribed. We strongly feel that the single white lines on St John’s Road should not be turned into double yellow lines and that fewer places to park in the zone is not a good idea. Instead we would urge the council to consider a scheme for zone G like zone X which is residents only during two restricted hours on weekdays without reducing the amount of parking available and without removing white lines over drives. This way people visiting the shops will be able to park in the area except for the short restricted hours when they can use the car park. If this was adopted then it would stop train commuters parking in the zone so more parking would be available for shoppers who normally only need a short stay and for residents to park near their properties.

Proposed Parking Zone

1. Mrs Reason has care visits 3 times per day, every day. 2. We have space for 2 cars for carers (my car is garaged) but sometimes for health reasons or catheter change, a district nurse must call at the same time. 3. No problem now with white line. 4. What will happen with double yellow? 5. White line affords me 24 access to road. It trumps blue badge holders, but will all blue badge holders be allowed to park on double yellow lines at any time, and what is my recourse if they do? 6. Provision of a disabled space will not do, as any blue badger could use it.

I’d like to start by pointing out that your letter incorrectly states that all of the restrictions will be 8am-5pm Monday to Friday. Unfortunately this is not true. If you look closely at the map, you still plan to replace all single white lines over driveways on St John’s Road with double yellows. No Parking at any time. The letter is misleading. If you have a drive and park over it, this is dreadful news and shows that you haven’t listened properly to all the issues expressed by residents. There is no need for this to be the case, on other roads such as Horsecroft, Kingland or even Heath Lane for example white lines have been kept. I understand that single white lines are not enforceable, but have served us well for 20 years with minimal trouble. This also has implications for residents that don’t have driveways, because all those people that were previously parking over their own, or have guests, friends etc, will now be in a permit bay, reducing the residents parking further. The only change you have made is to allow St John’s Road residents to park elsewhere within the zone. Whilst this is welcome and should have been included the first time, the fact that you are reducing off-street parking by what looks like up to 50% means permit parking will cause more problems than the commuter traffic is trying to deter. You must realise this yourselves, so I would question the real motives behind the scheme. Reading through the feedback you got last time I can find very little evidence of your proposals being wanted, except around Green End Lane and Barge Grove Ave, where the problem is mainly St Roses School. It would be grossly unfair on the residents of Boxmoor to confuse 72% of respondents saying they would be in favour with ‘some form’ of parking control with people ‘approving’ what is being put forward. Very little has changed, the people on Cowper Road have complained that you are reducing their available parking and that commuters are not a problem. But the proposal remains the same. Puller Road has said that their problem is with local cars and pub traffic, not commuters. St John’s And Sebright have said similar, so why are you pushing ahead? I would also like to make a point about the amount of street furniture that will inevitably be installed around Boxmoor. Horsecroft Road and Kingsland Road have been blighted by it. Poles and signs stuck up without regard, right in front of people’s Windows and next to their front doors, relentlessly, every 10 yards. There are far too many of them. Nothing about this scheme will enhance our local area. It will only detract and cause more problems than there currently are. There must be a better solution to station parking than this current proposal. I’d like to repeat, it seems that, to stop a small number of commuters, we’re having to loose quite a lot of our current on street parking, which seems nonsensical. I don’t support this scheme and look forward to your new ideas on how to reduce the small problem of commuter parking at one end of Boxmoor without making a huge impact on everyone else’s lives.
All residents should have the same opportunity to park as others, but there are those who are blocking spaces for themselves by putting notices on the garage of the Electricians on the corner of Puller Road which they reside at also. This garage is not used as a garage but storage and there is no dropped curb but they have a notice saying parking for VW Camper Van only, NOT right besides they have three vehicles parked there and this should be addressed before these restrictions come into force.

From looking at the plan it is difficult to see but we think there is a single yellow line in our part of the road, "no waiting Monday to Saturday 8.30am to 6.30pm" which is fine. If we have misunderstood the plan please let us know.

I think these proposals are grossly unfair on residents of St John's Road. It is difficult enough to park as it is, particularly as the public car park in Cowper Road is a maximum of four hours stay on a Sunday and Bank Holidays which makes it incredibly hard to find parking in our own road at weekends as it is. What you are proposing is that the only way we residents would be able to park close to our home is to have permits? I disagree with permit parking, the cost of living is high enough, sadly salaries don't increase at the same rate and this would mean an additional expense to our household for the luxury of parking in the road we live in. I think it's disgusting and grossly unfair. If permits were to be introduced would we benefit from the revenue generated from parking permits and the fines for those who go over the three hour stay?

**Alston Road**

We fully agree with the restricted parking proposals for this road. The inconsiderate parking of St Roses School parents have made this road increasingly more dangerous for our children to walk to their school in recent months so I personally would prefer a permit holders only zone. However I am aware that living close to a school there needs to be some short term parking facilities available. Therefore I am happy with the suggested restrictions.

We presume that the "30 minutes limited stay for non permit holders on Alston Road" would not apply to the proposed "no waiting at any time" outside our house.

Wonder why Alston Road has changed from original plan. Feel it will be more difficult to enforce the new plan, however will be pleased to have any controlled parking sooner rather than later.

The present situation is chaotic. We hope a decision on the Council's proposal will be made without delay.

**Sebright Road**

Current proposals are an improvement as regards hours but falls short on 2 points

1. Restrictions need to be extended to include Saturday this will stop commuters leaving their cars for the weekend which does happen
2. The road needs to be the same category as Puller Road (Proposed permit holder only past this point)

Pleased that our comments on the first plan have been taken into account.

I am hoping that permits all the way down left side and no parking between 8 and 5 on the other should ease residents parking problems

We do not agree with the parking restriction 8am to 5pm. Why has this been changed from two separate one hour slots in the morning and afternoon. The current issue is commuters and extending the period 8am to 5pm will mostly affect visitors or trades people of the residents themselves.

The changes can't happen soon enough, as the parking situation is only getting worse for local residents.

**Green End Road**

A number of issues and suggestions have been made in an email from my neighbour Stephanie Bradley, addressed to Richard Plant, which I support.
Due to the proximity of St Rose's Infants School the area gets very congested around 9.00 am & 3.00 pm on weekdays during term time. This can become dangerous when current parking restrictions are routinely ignored by motorists delivering or collecting children. The new proposals will only work if some level of enforcement is used.

This issue has been lingering for many months. We live on a bus route; vehicle drivers have used the pavement to pass each other and all we ask is that a decision to implement the proposals for Green End Road is taken quickly before a serious accident occurs.

Allowing 30 minute parking near the school in Green End Road and surrounding roads is very dangerous. The school parkers will park in the allowed bays and on the opposite corners. If emergency access is required for a fire engine it will not be able to get access at speed if at all. Often buses and bin lorries struggle to pass these roads at this time. It is only a matter of time until emergency services are blocked. Parking both sides needs to be stopped altogether.

Although my family is unaffected by the proposals because we have sufficient off road parking, I have the same concern as I had when you first proposed limited waiting in Green End Road. 30 minutes is not long enough for customers of The Grapes, or parents visiting St. Roses School for an assembly / sports day / Christmas concert etc. I think we are all agreed that this whole exercise is to deter rail commuters from parking in Boxmoor residential streets so surely a 3 hour waiting restriction for Green End Road - the same as proposed for St. Johns Road - would prevent commuter parking without disadvantaging legitimate local activities.

Very happy with proposals - they cannot come soon enough as Green End Road has become dangerous.

I am concerned that there is still no parking for the disabled near the new sub post office. I have to get others to help me as parking nearby usually full

Although this does not resolve the issue of people not parking at the station (it will just displace the problem), I am in full agreement with the proposals. It's been a long time coming so lets implement it as soon as possible before there is an accident on Green End Road and someone gets hurt.

Since this consultation started Parking in Green End Road is getting even worse and I have numerous occasions where it has become very difficult to get my car onto my drive with vehicles parked both opposite my home and on either side of my drive. Keeping the parked vehicles to one side of the road will make a huge difference to me and my family especially at busy times of the day when I often leave not being able to see if any traffic is coming up or down the road when leaving my drive.

Very happy with proposals - they cannot come soon enough as Green End Road has become dangerous.
ASAP please!

Yes I have written to the Council in this regard: Here it is:- I have today returned home and found the latest communication and plan. I live in Bargrove Avenue. I would be delighted if this proposal proceeds particularly as this very day (18/5**), I was unable to use my own drive as a vehicle had parked so close it had effectively obstructed access. This has happened before at which time I did approach the driver on their return. They were extremely rude and unpleasant. I would add that the abuse is extremely distressing - especially as it concerns access to my own drive! I have left polite notices on car windows and just find it screwed up and littering the road. Today I had with me an 84 year old man with age related health problems - mental and physical. We had been to an appointment at the Hospital Cardiology Department in Watford. A long day for an elderly and not well man. I had to park someway from my own drive and then negotiate him and his tri-walker through the maze of parked cars nearby and in Bargrove Avenue. He became confused and understandably, quite upset. It was approaching school finishing time. Parents and carers with small children, prams etc., were endeavouring to negotiate the parked cars. It is really very concerning. It is really very dangerous with all the parked cars. The situation is getting worse. There is a lot of aggression from the cars that are trying to park from very early in the morning. Refuse and delivery lorries and vans have to negotiate extremely badly parked vehicles. A lorry delivering a skip had to just give up. He knocked at my front door to enquire about a vehicle but it had been left very early morning and obstructed access because of its width. Please can my concerns be noted and something done to implement the permit parking plan without delay. For the safety of the general public particularly the young, elderly and infirm before a very nasty accident happens. **I have actually delayed sending this till this morning because I was so upset yesterday evening and had to ensure my elderly friend was ok. Thank you for taking the time to read this. Sincerely

The corner turning right out of Bargrove Avenue is blind and dangerous having almost had several collisions over the years. I would like to see the proposed parking bay nearest to the corner moved downhill a little further to make this corner safer for all concerned.

Please make sure the junctions/corners of Bargrove/Green End Road are clear of parked cars at all times, at the the moment the view is very restricted when pulling out of Bargrove onto Green End Road.

I believe that Bargrove Avenue should have parking restrictions to discourage station parking but this could be for a lesser time 7-10 am would be a better idea.

Please increase parking capacity at Hemel Rail station and make it affordable so that commuters will use it. Please introduce speed bumps along Green End Road to prevent speeding.

The parking issues effecting Green End Rd and Bargrove Avenue are serious, and cause real inconvenience and possible risk of accidents. Please hurry to implement the changes. Thanks.

The proposals are designed to stop parking - both from the station and parents from the local school. It is therefore suggested that the restrictions apply between 8.30 - 9.30 and 2.30 - 3.30. This will give residents the opportunity to have trades persons between 9.30 and 2.30, otherwise permits will be required if the parking ban is between 8am and 5pm.

I hope there will be more traffic wardens to ensure the new zone actually works especially during the times of 8.30am-9.30am and 2.30pm-3.30pm. And you also need to stop cars parking half on the pavement, blocking the way for pedestrians.

The parking on Green End road is dangerous, it restricts a drivers view when pulling out of Bargrove avenue, also causes problems at the end when coming off the roundabout with Northridge Way and St Johns road. I don’t want permits down our road a one hour no parking would suffice.

We note in your letter that you leave yourself the option to ‘take no further action’. We would be extremely disappointed if this was the outcome. The congestion and inconsiderate parking continues to increase, and has definitely reached the point where it is dangerous for both pedestrians and drivers.
### Bulbourne Close

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>I would like to request that the 'no waiting at any time' restriction which is outside our house (no.2 Bulbourne Close) be continued along into the close to the hedge at the side of our property. Parking there restricts access to our neighbours driveways &amp; also means those parking there walk across our front garden. Many thanks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>This scheme is very welcome and we would like it to be introduced as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I have today spoken to Richard who has agreed that the plans will be changed so that the red line at the beginning of Bulbourne Close with extend to the end of my property No3 and just by No5's drive and on the opposite side the red line will extend to the boundary of No 2 by the hedge - this would then negate people parking and blocking the road and the drives of numbers 1,2,3 and 5. I therefore agree in principle with this plan once this change has been made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Following discussions and a visit by Richard Plant, it was agreed that the Double Red lines shown on the plan for Bulbourne Close be extended to where the garden hedge of No.2 starts and opposite, beyond the lampost to where No.5 driveway starts. I discussed this with Richard today (18th May) as on the latest proposal the lines end earlier,( as on the previous plan ) to which he apologised for the error. Can you please ensure they continue up as discussed Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>We feel that this new proposal is the better option for our close as is it is only a small close and cannot sustain all day parking by commuters, and even parking by the parents from St Rosa's School block the close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grosvenor Terrace

| B | The coloured lines seem to limit parking between 8am and 5pm (which stops commuter parking) but then allow parking after 5pm. This time onwards is when parking gets bad. Residents and pub customers return to park their cars and vans which cause blockages and problems for us to actually get to park on our drive. What does the pink line outside 12 Grosvenor Terrace mean? Is it proposed no waiting at any time? Is this like double yellow lines? Does this mean we would not be allowed to park on our own dropped kerb? At the moment we do this with our second car on days when it is actually possible to manoeuvre to get in there! If we cant park our second car across our drive, we will be taking up another parking space in one of the adjoining streets. If we cant park our second car across our drive, we will be taking up another parking space in one of the adjoining streets. What does the pink line outside 12 Grosvenor Terrace mean? Is it proposed no waiting at any time? Is this like double yellow lines? Does this mean we would not be allowed to park on our own dropped kerb? At the moment we do this with our second car on days when it is actually possible to manoeuvre to get in there! If we cant park our second car across our drive, we will be taking up another parking space in one of the adjoining streets. What does the pink line opposite us mean? Apologies, but both online and on our paper copy of the plans it is not clearly visible as to which pink line is marked. Is it proposed no waiting at any time? Does this mean double yellow lines? As both sides of the roads are always full with cars and vans in the evenings (once the commuters have all gone home) and quite a lot of that parking capacity will be taken away by your new proposed parking plans, has thought been given as to how residents parking will spill over into the surrounding streets? Even now, we sometimes have had to park in Crouchfield which is two streets away. AND we have a driveway and we park our second car on our dropped kerb if there is no parking obstruction stopping us from getting in. Your new proposals look like they might halve the parking spaces for residents. This will have serious implications. WE accept parking needs to be reduced so that emergency vehicles and bin lorries can actually get through as they often can't. But ending parking restrictions at 5pm means that pub traffic will still take spaces outside our house and in Puller Road. That is the main reason we are disagreeing with your current proposals. Restrictions might be better lasting until later in the evening. |
| B | We do not support the proposals for permit parking, as there are far too few parking bays for the number of residents with cars on Grosvenor Terrace and surrounding roads. Happy to discuss further should you wish to contact us. |
I have opposed this scheme at every consultation. I state again that there is no significant problem with parking in this street. The school run can be a little busy, but most of the time there is ample parking in Grosvenor Terrace. Cars rarely park with two wheels on the pavement of the North side of this street, but when they do, pedestrians are able to walk past on the pavement without difficulty. Creating unnecessary restrictions will only create problems, both for street residents and the wider public. From my own perspective, I own a double-fronted cottage on this street, so the proposals would impact on my family very significantly. I own three cars, two of which are on the drive and the other is kept on the street. The one at the top of the drive is used daily, so I cannot block it in with the one kept on the street, except at night. My neighbours at no.5 keep one of their cars across the other half of my house, and this works really well for us both. We are all able to leave a space open and come back to it later, rather than there being a rush of strangers wanting to dive in as soon as space becomes available. (In fact there is a space outside their house now at the time of writing, and it is the weekend.) There really is no significant problem here. However, for my family, the proposal would present a significant problem. I do not want to have to buy a permit in order to park outside my own house, nor to have the hassle of filling in a card whenever a relative pops by, and my neighbours feel the same. I also believe that the relatively large amount of Council Tax we pay should give us some say in the matter. What is the purpose of holding a consultation if residents’ views are then ignored?

Parking Bays over drives, insufficient space for parking, parking available for residents of other streets, no need for parking restrictions, money making scheme for the council

Puller Road

For Puller Road, I would like to see a similar scheme to Horsecroft and Kingsland Road where there is a period of one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon where resident permits are needed. It is unnecessary and inconvenient to have the parking restrictions 8am to 5pm and I am completely against this. I am a parent and my family helps look after my children and it will be very expensive for me to pay for permits for them for 8 hours per day. Also, for Puller Road, please can you retain the parking spaces outside 76 and 83 as this does not cause and obstruction and means that we are losing vital parking spaces. For Cowper Road, too many parking spaces have been replaced with double yellow lines. This is unnecessary as the road is not difficult to drive up when cars are parked on both sides and it will take away too many parking spaces for residents. Again, restrictions should be limited to two one-hourly periods per day – not 8am to 5pm. For St John’s Road, too many parking spaces have been replaced with double yellow lines and there will not be enough parking for residents or customers using the local businesses. Once again, restrictions should be limited to two one-hourly periods per day – not 8am to 5pm. I am very supportive of the double yellow lines on the corners of Grosvenor Terrace and Alston Road as it is very difficult to get round those roads at times. I also support the introduction of parking on only one side of the road on Green End Road.

Restriction Timings make no impact to the lack of parking. Cars either belong to the residents or are visitors for the care home. There is plenty of parking during the day. The restrictions are just an inconvenience to residents rather than helping congestion in the area.

We think that you should implement the same restrictions that apply in Horsecroft and Kingsland Rd for the whole of the proposed zone (2 one hour slots during the day to prevent commuters). People with driveways should also not be punished by not being allowed to park over them, they should be white lined but if anyone other than the resident parks over the driveway then the resident should be able to request a parking attendant issue a ticket (please see southwark council as they do this). The current system works like this already so why change something that is not broken. Parking restrictions should be used on corners/junctions where packed traffic prevents safe access for example ambulance and fire engine access (eg corner of Hanover Green and corners near the Alston Rd blind centre). Local business owners should also get a couple of permits to allow either them or their staff members to park at the same price as a resident pass. However I would suggest that more than 2 vehicles per business should then be charged at a ‘business rate’. This would keep businesses in the ‘village’ and keep the customers coming to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puller Road residents will be adversely affected by Cowper Road residents parking with permits in Puller Road under current proposals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't agree with parking bays being put across our drive, we have paid for the dropped kirb. Does not look like they will be enough parking places for residents with the proposed no waiting at anytime on Grosvenor Terrace. We disagree with the whole scheme. I feel you are using the railway commuter's as a reason to make us pay money to park outside our own houses, with no guarantee of a parking space. (or get our car off the drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very disappointed with the revised plans. Whilst comments have been taken in to consideration regarding the side of the road where parking takes place on Grosvenor road I am incredibly disappointed with the end result. Continuing to block driveways with parking bays is not an acceptable solution. Whereas I was previously concerned that this was happening on other residents driveways the revised plans now show a parking bay across mine. I don't understand why you are allowed to proceed on this basis as it means there is a greater risk of me not being able to enter or exit my driveway. Surely this just increases the number of calls to the police when residents have to ask for cars to be removed as people believe they are allowed to park there. Overall I find this to be very lazy planning and as a result I have changed from a supporter of the scheme to being completely against it. Thank you for taking in to consideration my comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like the restrictions to be 08.00 -18.00 to ensure adequate evening parking for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to have all day restrictions as this will impact on those who require regular childcare, also the no waiting at any time area is too big. Puller Road Does NOT need these restrictions, it would be much more sensible to have similar restriction as Kingsland Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We believe we should be able to park our car in front of our house without having to pay for a permit. We are also concerned about the cost and inconvenience of having to acquire permits for visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reason I disagree with the proposed Parking restrictions in Puller Road is that the permit holders only 8am-5pm will affect my employees loading and unloading of materials and tools to to and from their vans which is carried out between 8am-9am and 4pm-5pm each day. The original proposal for permit holders only 9am -10am and 2pm -3pm was more suitable for my business use. I don't see why this has changed from the original proposal?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cowper Road**

We find it difficult to understand how massively reducing the number of parking spaces available is going to help the residents of Cowper road if the new plans are implemented. During the daytime we don't have much in the way of parking issues or problems with commuter parking. Your new proposed scheme will personally lose our household 2 parking spaces we presently use. If the scheme is implemented we will have to park in neighbouring road outside of the scheme.

We are happy with the proposals, but for info, there is a possibility that some time in the future, we may decide to have the front garden converted to a drive, which would mean there could no longer be parking outside our house. (At present the plan shows permit/restricted to 30 mins)

I categorically reject this proposal on the grounds that despite the parking permit, the restrictions will half the available space for us residents in our particular street (Cowper). This will obviously have a knock on effect on neighbouring streets which in turn are now also being considered for parking restrictions. Where are the residents supposed to go? To have to pay for a permit which will inevitably only give us a “right “ to park in a road many blocks away from where we live because all the available “shared” space will be taken up already, seems to me an insult. It is just another scheme to make more money out of the local residents to justify avoiding hiking up the council tax.

We live at 81 Cowper Road and have two cars. The driveway can only park one car off road. The second car we use the road. Your proposal has stated no waiting outside our house and all the way down Cowper Road on one side. This is going to seriously affect us and all the residents that live in Cowper Road. I propose you change the no waiting to resident parking only in Cowper Road on both sides of the road not just one side. Where are all the residents going to park because they do not have driveways or garages.
Having spoken to Richard and clarifying a few points about the proposed plans for Cowper Rd, we can only agree to having something in place as the knock on effect of all the roads in the area being permitted and ours not being will be the same that has occurred in our surrounding area since the likes of Kingsland and Horsecroft were made permit zones. I understand that we effectively will be losing spaces to park as NO cars can park in the zones marked as no waiting 8am to 5pm. That means we could park outside our house but as our neighbours next to and opposite can’t then they will be finding a space where they can so effectively the chances are even narrower then they are now. In the last 4 days I have parked on Crouchfield with two small children and had to walk back to my house, this was due to no spaces on the road and this was before 5. The families on our road are not made up of people who leave the house and work full time, in which the 8/5 zones would accommodate. We have many neighbours who are part time workers, work from home and are not conventional 9-5 roles. I feel you haven’t considered this or the impact it will have. The permit holder will be able to park in the zones which has the 30 mins waiting in. I understand the bays will be marked on the road and it is for the cars to be parked on the road, not on the pavement which I support and understand our road is too narrow to accommodate more spaces, but then we do not support the 30 mins waiting for non permit holders. We would prefer it to be only permit holders. There is no longer a bakers on the road and the school traffic can use the car park at the bottom or parents walk, again, if you were to find the demographics of the school I would suspect the majority of parents do walk. Anyone using the estate agents or shops can park in the car park or on St. John’s. I don’t see the need to be on our road especially if parking will be limited. I do feel that Cowper road being straight and connecting two roads is used as a cut through and traffic is fast. As I said the lolly pop man almost got knocked over at the school a few weeks ago at school time. I would like this zone to be made a 20 mph for the safety of children walking and we would support a watch your speed sign, I think less cars parked on each side of the road will increase the speed on the drivers and the risk. Overall we have to support this scheme otherwise we will end up with all the knock on effects of the commuters which you see outside St Roses and the blind centre and even parked on paths on Northridge way. This proposal does not take into consideration the needs of the residents in Cowper Road and potentially could lead to tension between neighbours. There will not be enough parking for residents Monday to Friday between 8am - 5pm with the new no waiting proposals at certain points in Cowper Road and in turn this will create new bottle necks in neighbouring roads such as Crouchfield that are not in the scheme. There is a clear lack of understanding in this scheme of the dynamics of Cowper Road, in that we do not suffer from commuter parking, but estate agents and residents of St Johns Rd. In addition, an assumption has been made that houses with drives should have restricted parking outside. Indeed on both the two previous consultations I queried the no parking zones outside my property, only to be told I had a drive, so I would be ok. Well the drive in question services three houses to the rear and is so narrow a family car is too wide to pass, therefore street parking is essential. You do not seem to be listening, this scheme is not wanted, I strongly object you are proposing to put a no waiting area outside my house which means I will have to pay in order to NOT be able to park outside my house. And now you are proposing to allow anyone to park in the remaining parking spaces in cowper road for up to 30 minutes - where is the consideration for the residents of cowper road? Also I have asked numerous questions via email which have not been answered, you seem to be trying to push ahead without properly taking account of residents concerns no one I have spoken to in the road wants this. Are you going to publish the results of the October consultation? I suspect you didn’t get the answer you wanted last time so you are trying again to try and get the answer you do want this is just a money making exercise with no thought for residents or their concerns. You are more interested in making money out of this and placating parents who cant be bothered to walk their kids to school and want to park in cowper road, its the people in cowper road who are being penalised and you don’t seem to care.
we live near the bottom of Cowper Rd and having looked at the latest consultation info we would please like to know how many parking permits the businesses who work on St Johns Rd each can buy? We mailed you last week-see above- and have not had a reply.How many businesses are you taking into account? There are about to be 4 estate agents all without their own parking facilities, the 3 at the moment all use Cowper Rd to park, and now that the consultation plans have removed over half of the possible places to park in the road, the proposed parking plan will mean that there are not nearly enough spaces for residents to park. And if businesses can buy permits, that will make it even more difficult. We were told at the consultation at St John’s Church last year, that any new plan would allow parking on one side of the road only, to make it easier for emergency access. On the proposed plans, it appears that parking on one side only is from 9am-5pm, so parking is possible in the evenings and overnight on both sides? Who will control the 30mins only parking-traffic wardens staying around the area that frequently? The obvious solution is to return to the car park at the bottom of Cowper Road being free for 7 hours during the day-business could use it, but it wouldn’t be long enough for commuters to park there then walk to the train station. Please can we have a reply to our email?

I agree in principle with a parking scheme but taking half the parking away in Cowper rd will not help. Would b better if it was all permit holders only as puller rd is.

We support a resident’s parking scheme. We DO NOT support removing existing parking places from residents on Cowper Road. Cowper Road will need residents parking to protect us from commuter parking once restrictions are put in place on Green End Road, but Cowper Road residents NEED double parking at the south side of the school as there is insufficient parking space for the residents with parking single side. THIS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE - the south end of Cowper Road road is comparable in dwelling type (Victorian terraces) to Kingsland Road, or Horsecroft Road, both of which have residents parking both sides. We live at the top (north side) of Cowper Road and single side parking is OK, and the existing convention - HOWEVER this is currently by convention, and should remain so, on the WEST SIDE only, as this is suitable parking for the school, and avoids children having to cross the road when dropped off. We have made all these points each time there has been a consultation, and they have been completely ignored which is very frustrating. These points are helpful, practical ones, without a particular personal axe to grind, and they should be incorporated into the plan. Cowper Road residents have lived with double parking at the bottom of the road for years and years; people have bought their homes relying on this; local traffic is used to working with this and there is no justification to change it.

The proposals seem to be suggesting much reduced parking capacity on Cowper Road which is a really big problem. Parking is difficult enough at the moment, the proposals appear to reduce options down to one side of the road during 8am-5pm Monday to Friday, this is completely unworkable and will significantly negatively impact residents. Please think again.

Parking is difficult enough without reducing the available parking spaces. If the plan is to discourage parking in our road for the station I think this is an overreaction. I am at home most of the time in the restriction period and can only think of two cars to which this would apply, one of which works at the school. Also, the proposals do not make it clear what are the permissible parking arrangements outside the 8am-5pm period.

I think the proposal won’t work and will upset residents and businesses. People won’t be able to park outside their houses and there will be no where else for them to park. We do not need permits in this road. We will end up upsetting each other, parking a long way away from our own homes, parking infront of other people’s houses, blocking driveways etc. Permits in this road is not necessary, nor are proposed no waiting time zones. There is a car park and parking for the businesses in the village already which is adequate. Do not make our road a car park please. It is not fair.
This proposed scheme is ridiculous and makes no sense, other than a new revenue stream for DBC. How can reducing the amount of parking available by 50% (or more) elevate any parking issues that may currently exist? I live on Cowper Road, currently we are able to park on both sides of the road. In your ill thought out proposal, you have marked shared use parking bays on Cowper Road, but only on one side of the road, therefore reducing the number of parking spaces available by half. This isn’t going to work and won’t make life easier for anyone. We have very few commuters that park in our road, some local workers park in Cowper Road, but I have no issue with this as where else are they supposed to park? Instead of introducing this ridiculous plan, why not spend the money on improving/increasing the parking at Hemel train station? I and all other residents I have spoken to do not want this scheme and believe it in no way supports our needs. I do not support this proposal.

I cannot follow the logic in including 30 minutes limited stay for non permit holders in Cowper Road. As we know the problems in Cowper Road are due to people parking who work in St Johns Road and people who go to the station who work in London etc and who park all day. How would you control 30 minutes parking only - no return within 30 minutes - it would take a lot of monitoring. Also why limited parking of 3 hours in St Johns Road. Anyone shopping in St Johns Road does not need 3 hours to shop at the Barbers, Estate Agents, Fast Food and Grocery Stores etc.

I live at the top of Cowper Road and am very concerned about the effect of displacing the cars at the bottom of Cowper Road on both the resultant effect of on street parking at the top end of Cowper Road and nearby Crouchfield Road. The current Cowper Road parking proposals shown on the plan received will reduce the current ability to park cars on both sides of the road. These cars will need to park somewhere. If a similar scheme was to be adopted on Cowper Road than is proposed on Puller Road this would not reduce the availability to park cars at the bottom end of Cowper Road and therefore mitigate any impact on both Crouchfield and the top end of Cowper Road. Also, if there are any restrictions to be provided on Cowper Road could you advise why the waiting time is limited to 30 minutes as this seems only to apply to Cowper Road. If we have visitors to our house that stay longer than 30 minutes then this will cause a parking problem.

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE stop trying to do this!!!!!!! Cowper Road doesn’t need permit parking or any other restrictions, it is ridiculous, please don’t do it, it will ruin our road. It is absolutely atrocious that you are suggesting taking away the parking in front of our entire rows of houses, where we should have the right to park our cars as we have always done - without any trouble or fuss or problems. All we can see this as being is a money grabbing exercise, there is absolutely no need to restrict the parking and make it double yellow lines for the majority of Cowper Road.

The current proposal for Cowper Road is unworkable, as the restriction on waiting on one side of the road at certain times on weekdays doesn’t demonstrate whether there would be sufficient parking for residents at those times.

I agree with the proposal of introducing parking permits to the local area, but not at my expense. My vehicle is taxed, insured and registered to my property. Technology exists that allow local authorities to check these details (remotely) if they wish to do so to confirm if my car should be there during the restricted time. Further to that I don’t use my vehicle to get to my work place, so therefore it will always be parked near my property. So I would have to buy a permit for a vehicle, just to park my vehicle all day. My wife uses her car for work and is out all day, so would have to buy a permit to park her vehicle in our street when she is on annual leave etc. For us to have to purchase two permits at a cost of £65 (additional costs to our current vehicle running costs) to park outside our property is absolutely outrageous. Why should one permit be any more expensive than a second permit? This is basically the local authority penalising residents for having more than one car. A parking permit, is a parking permit and should not cost anymore that the other. For the cost of consultations and putting these permits/restrictions in place, it probably would be a lot cheaper just to issue permits to the local residents, and then if vehicles don’t display a permit, a pcn should be issued to that vehicle. No doubt there will be an additional charge for visitors permits. If 45 houses in my street have one vehicle, and 45 houses have two cars (90 house approx). The annual income to the local authority would be £4050, taking into account others roads under permits aswell, this would bring a health sum of money into the local authority. Year on year this is a good earner, but if this going to be put in place the scheme should not be run for profit making purposes. If I HAVE to purchase parking permits, I will only do so at a cost of £25 per permit. Visitors permits should be issued free, due to the profit involed in running this scheme.
**Thorne Close**

- Email sent from Thorne Close Residents’ Association to Richard Plant detailing main concerns
- Residents of Thorne Close have had a meeting and an email with comments have been forwarded to Richard Plant at dacorum-consultations@projectcentre.co.uk
- They should encourage Network rail to improve parking facilities at Hemel Hempstead station
- The 5 visitors parking spaces are there on our deeds for our family’s to park when they visit
- I do not wish to have permit parking we have 5 visitors parking in our road which I do not agree to be changed to permit parking and I WILL not pay any money towards the scheme

**Halwick Close**

- Please also consider adding Anchor Lane to the scheme.
- My property, number 22 has parking allocated on land adjacent to the property which is shown on the land registry drawing as part of the property. This area is excluded from your proposal drawing however additional signage is essential to point out that this is private land as people will park on my private area to avoid the permit parking area. I request this signage is included in the scheme.
- At present there are five visitor parking bays in the upper end of this Close - presumably they will be affected and there will be no provision therefore for friends of residents who may have travelled some distance to visit. Could residents be provided with special permits for such visitors?
- Parking got noticeably worse when restrictions were brought in for other parts of Boxmoor recently. Due to the layout of the road we believe that commuter parking only affects numbers 1-10, but the road is ‘full’ on most days now. This becomes a problem for my son who works shifts and cannot park if he finishes work during the day, and causes the same problem for our visitors too. At worst, we witness cars being left for days upon end, sometimes so badly parked they cause an obstruction for residents attempting to get on their drives. We would wholly welcome parking restrictions, even outside the hours of Mon-Fri 8-5, as we get many pub-goers to The Three Blackbirds that leave vehicles (often large vans) overnight when they are over the drink-driving limit. We’ve also witnessed these same people use the road as a toilet, which is quite revolting! Thank you for the proposal to fix this problem.

**The Poplars**

- We in the poplars feel we are being unfairly disadvantaged by the current proposal. Cowper is heavily used by residents during the day, in that cars are parked while owners take public transport to work. The proposal for Cowper will see the amount of all day parking for residents significantly reduced, leading residents to have to park Off Cowper. We foresee Cowper residence using the poplars to park as nothing will stop them, with us the poplars residents unable to park on Cowper and being blocked from parking in our residents bays. The poplars will be further impacted by the staff of the pre-school and primary school that will also look for parking, with the poplars being the closest they will be able to park in without consequences. The simple issue is that even if this is pushed through the problem will only be moved on again, the root cause of the problem will never be addressed with these schemes. Sufficient affordable parking next to the station will only ever be a real solution to the parking issue on residential streets.
At present there is insufficient kerbside parking for everyone who lives in Cowper Road. As a consequence, a number of residents in Cowper Road who live south of The Poplars ignore the “Private Road” signs and use The Poplars service roads as an overspill car park. The proposed “shared use” and “no waiting” restrictions along Cowper Road will undoubtedly result in a dramatic increase in that abuse. The introduction of CPZ “Zone G” will therefore mean The Poplars service roads will be a “parking oasis” for commuters and residents in nearby roads, and the proposed new “Zone W” will add to that pressure. In addition, the revised proposals no longer allow residents in The Poplars to obtain permits to park within Zone G, and that increases the need to ensure that the service roads are kept free for estate residents. As the intention of the proposed CPZ is to benefit the residents of Boxmoor generally, it would be iniquitous for us to be severely and unnecessarily disadvantaged. In the Final Consultation Report published in January 2016, the Commercial Assets & Property Development Dept. of Dacorum Council acknowledged their responsibility to prevent misuse. As managers of the estate we look forward to hearing their proposals.

### Sheridan Close

The only effect I can see of the proposals is to displace existing residents vehicles but there is no provision made for this and therefore the proposals are flawed. Leave the existing arrangements in place.

### Zone W

- at the moment we have not and have never had any parking problems at our end of the road.

- The no waiting zone from the bottom of Woodland Avenue up to Gravehill Terrace is the section of the proposal that I most disagree with. As a resident in a private street, which already has restricted parking, this will cause more problems and will only push our parking issues (which are currently resolved via the road mentioned) further down onto Glenview Rd/Beechfield Rd. Especially as we will be unable to apply for a parking permit.

- I live in ashtree way and I’m unsure if this will be included in zone G or zone W and therefore what parking restrictions apply

### Outside of consultation area

- The scheme restricts the overall available parking with the introduction of yellow lines making the overall situation worse

- The propose plan does not resolve the issue of station parking, it only displaces the cars. The roads not covered by restrictions will become the new roads used for parking. This will make these roads more dangerous.

- I have not seen or received any information on this and am concerned at what this proposal means.

- The zones outlined do not take into account the residents of Wrensfield who will be confronted with individuals who cannot park in the Proposed Zone G and Zone W and simply be displaced to a new location (Wrensfield). It is difficult to believe that Cardy Road has been included in the proposed restricted zone and Wrensfield has not as Cardy Road is further from the train station.
Email Comments

Alston Road

I am writing following on from our recent telephone conversation where I expressed concerns with the proposed parking scheme in relation to 1) the accuracy of the drawings which have been presented and 2) the changes from the scheme that myself and my neighbours were asked to vote on.

Drawing accuracy
My concern is that the drawings that have been used do not reflect the latest land registry information. In my case, as I mentioned, I have a garage and drive with a paid for dropped down kerb, as shown on the attached file. This land now belongs to Newstead Cottage. The dropped kerb has been in place over a year, my neighbour at 12 Alston road, also has off-road parking and a dropped kerb. I know you reassured me this would be corrected but wanted to record this issue.

Scheme Changes
I am very disappointed with the process which has been used to gain acceptance of the scheme. That is gaining agreement to a scheme and then fundamentally changing it. I voted for the scheme but with the revisions. Would have voted against and I believe this approach is unfair and undemocratic. I have particular concern with 1) the proposed no wait and permit areas being for the whole day rather than for 2 one hour periods during the day, and 2) the extension of the no waiting area from Monday – Friday to include Saturday. The scheme is surely supposed to benefit the residents and these changes will make it more awkward for local residents to park or drop back to their properties and increase the likelihood of infringing the parking regulations. I feel this area needs reconsideration and at minimum agreement, by vote, which scheme is preferred.
I would also highlight that the available parking with the scheme seems to leave significantly less parking than currently available and I would welcome your views as to where these vehicles will go to park?
I have today returned home and found the latest communication and plan
I live in Bargrove Avenue
I would be delighted if this proposal proceeds particularly as this very day (18/5**), I was unable to use my own drive as a vehicle had parked so close it had effectively obstructed access.
This has happened before at which time I did approach the driver on their return.
They were extremely rude and unpleasant.
I would add that the abuse is extremely distressing - especially as it concerns access to my own drive!
I have left polite notices on car windows and just find it screwed up and littering the road.
Today I had with me an 84 year old man with age related health problems - mental and physical.
We had been to an appointment at the Hospital Cardiology Department in Watford.
A long day for an elderly and not well man.
I had to park someway from my own drive and then negotiate him and his tri-walker through the maze of parked cars nearby and in Bargrove Avenue.
He became confused and understandably, quite upset.
It was approaching school finishing time. Parents and carers with small children, prams etc., were endeavouring to negotiate the parked cars.
It is really very concerning.
It is really very dangerous with all the parked cars.
The situation is getting worse.
There is a lot of aggression from the cars that are trying to park from very early in the morning.
Refuse and delivery lorries and vans have to negotiate extremely badly parked vehicles.
A lorry delivering a skip had to just give up. He knocked at my front door to enquire about a vehicle but it had been left very early morning and obstructed access because of it’s width.
Please can my concerns be noted and something done to implement the permit parking plan without delay.
For the safety of the general public particularly the young, elderly and infirm before a very nasty accident happens.
**I have actually delayed sending this till this morning because I was so upset yesterday evening and had to ensure my elderly friend was ok.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

---

I could not get on to my drive because of the parking - in fact I could not park at all.
I could not reverse safely without hitting another vehicle or, more concerning, hitting a child/adult being taken to school.
The situation is now reaching crisis point.
I want it clearly noted on file my concerns of a pending incident or accident if action is not taken very soon.
I am sorry to bother you again but this is a very serious matter. Please help.
DBC Boxmoor Councillor

I wish to respond to the above consultation as a DBC Councillor for Boxmoor. My only 2 comments at present are:

1. 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.

2. The elderly persons complex known as Hanover Green comprises 33 flats but only 18 parking spaces. Unfortunately it was built when such residents would generally not have cars. At present, carers (who for some residents are visiting 3 times a day) struggle to find parking spaces nearby to make their very quick visits. I suggest therefore that consideration be given to making the public road known as Hanover Green shared use bays.

Cowper Road

I have just filled in the surveymonkey survey regarding the parking scheme. This is the 3rd survey I have completed, and seemingly my comments have been completely ignored twice, so I am emailing them as well, in an effort to be heard.

We do support having a residents parking scheme. We are well aware that the parking is out of control on Green End Gardens due to commuters parking for the station. We appreciate that once commuters are unable to park there, they will move elsewhere into surrounding roads, including ours, therefore we would appreciate parking protection. We do not however believe it is feasible to remove existing parking in Cowper Road.

We live at the top of Cowper Road. We currently see very little commuter parking, however we see school drop off and collection traffic. Our part of the road is never double parked; residents have good sized drives and very rarely need to park on the road. ALL parking however, is by convention on the west side of the road. This is because it is mostly school drop off and collection, and all parents want their children to get out of cars onto the pavement side, on the same side of the road as the school, to avoid crossing the road between parked cars. This is just common sense.

Why the parking scheme has parking areas on both sides of the road, I do not know. If it is intended as traffic calming, it is completely unnecessary and unsuitable for the location. All parents want to be on the school side. The fact that this is the 3rd scheme which has perpetuated this, despite the comments from residents, leaves me mystified!

Also – it is not at all feasible to remove residents parking from both sides of Cowper Road on the south side.

These are my comments, which were included on the survey:

We support a resident’s parking scheme. We DO NOT support removing existing parking places from residents on Cowper Road. Cowper Road will need residents parking to protect us from commuter parking once restrictions are put in place on Green End Road, but Cowper Road residents NEED double parking at the south side of the school as there is insufficient parking space for the residents with parking single side. THIS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE - the south end of Cowper Road is comparable in dwelling type (Victorian terraces) to Kingsland Road, or Horsecroft Road, both of which have residents parking both sides.

We live at the top (north side) of Cowper Road and single side parking is OK, and the existing convention - HOWEVER this is currently by convention, AND should remain so, on the WEST SIDE only, as this is suitable parking for the school, and avoids children having to cross the road when dropped off. We have made all these points each time there has been a consultation, and they have been completely ignored which is very frustrating. These points are helpful, practical ones, without a particular personal axe to grind, and they should be incorporated into the plan. Cowper Road residents have lived with double parking at the bottom of the road for years and years; people have bought their homes relying on this; local traffic is used to working with this and there is no justification to change it.
Dear Mr Plant

Responding to your most recent correspondence of May 2016, I see that despite the various consultations that have taken place, the views of Cowper Road residents continue to be ignored. Not one resident I have spoken to is in favour of the proposed ‘no waiting’ zones, as this restricts their ability to park during (the now) extended 8am-5pm period Monday to Friday.

My views haven’t changed from below. Basically this scheme penalises residents and will create ‘parking’ tension between neighbours. Please, just replicate Puller Road and make it permit holders only.

Many thanks

To: Parking Services Team Leader

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 26 and am one of three houses sharing the driveway between 26 & 28. 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.

We are writing regarding the parking control proposals for Zone G, in particular the proposed changes to Cowper Road where we live. We cannot get over how ridiculous this proposal is but the fact it is still being looked at suggests there are people that have replied to the surveys and consultations with positive responses to this, so we appreciate other people may feel quite differently to me! Do you issue the statistics/results of these surveys and consultations so that we have a clear view over how this proposal has progressed as from conversations we have had with neighbours we just cannot understand how the restrictions for Cowper Road are still being positively considered. Please could you confirm where these statistics are shared online or made publicly available?

Also, please could you outline what plans/reviews have considered for the impact these changes will have; there are currently cars lining both sides of the street pretty much all the way up between any driveways and it’s not people commuting to London or using the village centre for long periods of time, it’s residents because the hardest time to park is after 8pm - where exactly do you think all our cars are going to go if you apply the double yellow lines? Please could you provide me with a copy of the analysis that has been done as part of this process as we would be very keen to understand how this has been reviewed and that the impact of any suggested changes have been fully considered and analysed.

We might as well do some more shameless begging while we’re at it... PLEASE DON’T DOOO THIS!! We love our road just the way it is, please don't ruin it!! Thanks and we look forward to receiving the above requested information in due course.

As a resident of Cowper Road I fail to see any benefit from this scheme. You will no doubt want payment from us for a residents permit and non-permit holders will have 30 minutes parking allowed anyway. So the chaos caused by the school run will not be averted.

We will effectively be paying you for the status quo, which is free, because the main parking issue is lack of space due to too many resident’s cars. Please tell me how this benefits anyone other than DBC?

Incidentally I have been in contact with my local councillors concerning speed restrictions in our road since my wife’s car was written off nearly four years ago and nothing has changed. Cowper Road remains a 30mph limit despite the presence of a junior school and nursery and despite it being the only through road from Gravel Hill Terrace to St Johns Road making it a busy thoroughfare. Also the slope of the road encourages excessive speed given the lack of restrictions. Is it any wonder we become cynical?

I write in reference to the letter I received regarding proposed parking plans on Cowper Road Boxmoor. As you're probably aware, there is an urgent need for parking spaces as most residents own multiple vehicles which can cause real issues with the limited space available currently.

The plan indicates that 1 side of the road would be a ‘no waiting’ zone. I'm unsure if I interpret this correctly but I am uncertain how this would mitigate the problem if the parking spaces are further reduced? Where would the cars that currently park on that side of the road move to?

I was hoping you could introduce parking permits which we would be happy to pay for and would ensure that people commuting to the station or local shops did not park and use up resident’s spaces.

Kindly communicate via email your plans as to how you propose catering for the cars which would be affected by introduction of the ‘no waiting’ zone.
we live near the bottom of Cowper Rd and having looked at the latest consultation info we would please like to know how many parking permits the business s who work on St Johns Rd each can buy? How many businesses are you taking into account? There are about to be 4 estate agents all without their own parking facilities, the 3 at the moment all use Cowper Rd to park, and now that the consultation plans have removed over half of the possible places to park in the road, where is everyone meant to park?
Your website does not work by the way!

Regarding communications we have received by post, I have some questions about the proposed parking controls on Cowper Road. We live at 30A Cowper Road, which has its own off road parking. I would like to confirm with you that we will be eligible for parking permits that allow us and a guest to park anywhere on Cowper Road? What is the proposed cost of these permits?

Green End Road

Since early this morning two cars have been parked outside my house on opposite sides of the road. One straddles the pavement, but even so there is insufficient room for some vehicles to pass. Attached is a picture of a coach that got stuck this morning. This is not an uncommon situation.
Now, the point I want to reinforce, is that the proposed Monday to Friday waiting limit is inadequate. The commuter/traveller parking is a seven day a week problem. The road is too busy, and too narrow to have cars parked on both sides at anytime. Also, the road is a bus route Monday to Saturday, so there is the likelihood of service disruption on Saturdays.
I think there must be a strong case for no waiting at anytime on one side of the road.

thank you for taking the time to talk on the telephone today. As discussed on the phone here are the photos of the H10 bus unable to pass down the road due to the cars. Hopefully this will strengthen the case you present to Dacorum Borough Council for a double yellow line to be on placed on one side of the road to prevent parking on both sides 24 hours/7 days a week. The cars parked on the opposite side off the road are straddling the pavement and still the bus cannot pass. As the proposals stand, if cars are permitted to park fully in the road in the shared bay and on our side of the road then on a Saturday the bus will not be able to pass as will nothing bigger than a Ka!! (and the situation will be worse than it is now)

Yours sincerely,
Thank you for the latest update on proposals for Zone G. We have examined the latest plan and are very disappointed to learn that our suggestions to modify the parking bays outside our homes have been declined. As we were the main instigators in asking for a solution to the parking issues outside our homes, it is a bitter blow that the plans you have suggested will make the situation worse rather than alleviate them. At the last consultation we spoke at length to Mr McCrory, who indeed understood the issues we raised.

We can see that the proposed shared long parking bay at the foot of Green End Road, has been left in situ so that parents do not need to cross the road to lead their children to their cars. However we note that the proposed pink ‘no waiting’ line on the opposite side, our side, of the road only applies Monday to Friday. This will mean that at weekends travellers/commuters will certainly resume parking outside our homes, as well as filling the designated parking bays. This literally blocks the road to all cars and of course the bus too. You may think that surely drivers would have more sense than to park both sides of the road, but I assure you it has happened before! Given that there will be a major construction development commencing on the site of the convent, cars parked on both sides of the road will prevent all the large construction traffic from entering and exiting the site.

If you refuse to modify the blue parking bay as we suggested in our original letter below (sent and received by you at both previous consultations), then we instead implore that the ‘no waiting line’ on our side of the road is changed to ‘no waiting at any time’, ie a double yellow line.

We would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email and are happy to discuss the issues raised at any time (in person if necessary).

Since early this morning two cars have been parked outside my house on opposite sides of the road. One straddles the pavement, but even so there is insufficient room for some vehicles to pass. Attached is a picture of a coach that got stuck this morning. This is not an uncommon situation.

Now, the point I want to reinforce, is that the proposed Monday to Friday waiting limit is inadequate. The commuter/traveller parking is a seven day a week problem. The road is too busy, and too narrow to have cars parked on both sides at anytime. Also, the road is a bus route Monday to Saturday, so there is the likelihood of service disruption on Saturdays. I think there must be a strong case for no waiting at anytime on one side of the road.

Grosvenor Terrace

With reference to our telephone conversation, I strongly object to parking bays across our drop down kerb. We have a garage, drive and drop down kerb as passed by the planning department and built over twenty years ago. Note this is not a front garden converted to a parking space, I hope you can assure us that after proper survey there will not be a bay across our drop down kerb.

Can you please acknowledge this email.

Having seen your proposals, I do not support permit parking on Grosvenor Terrace and surrounding roads, as there are far too few spaces for the number of cars. I feel the scheme penalises and inconveniences local residents. Currently, I can park outside my home, however with your proposals this would not be possible. I am happy to discuss this further should you wish to contact me.

I strongly object to the proposals for permit parking zone in G. After reading the consultation documents, it is obvious that there are not nearly enough car parking bays for the number of cars that need to be parked in these roads. If the proposed permit parking is brought into force, it will cause huge inconvenience to myself and my neighbours. We currently do not have an issue with commuters parking in our street, so permit parking will not solve any problems only create them.
We are residents of 5 Grosvenor Terrace.
After reading the proposed parking plan I would like to state that:
- We are happy to have parking permits outside our house.
- On the opposite side to our house we would like to propose a no waiting area from only 8-9am and 2-3pm from Monday - Friday to avoid school traffic and ensure that we have enough car parking spaces for the residents out of these hours and at the weekend, otherwise there will not be enough spaces for the residents to park our cars.
When you have read our proposal can you please reply.

Following a further discussion with my wife, we would like to propose the following solution after receiving your proposed controlled Parking Zone plan.
As per the below email we are residents of 5 Grosvenor Terrace and we are happy with proposed permit bay Mon – Fri 8am – 5pm outside of our house on our side of the road.
However we are highly opposed to the suggested no waiting at any time on the other side of the road due to the large number of cars currently owned by the residents of Grosvenor Terrace this will leave us with in adequate parking of an evening and weekend.
The aim of these permit bays should be for the benefit of the residents of Grosvenor Terrace and prevent people travelling from Hemel Station parking in our road during the working day. Also paramount is the safety of school children and too avoid congestion of the road at peak times. i.e. 8-9am and 2-3pm.
We would be happy for the other side of the road to be amended to the below.
1. Same as the X Zone - Restricted Hours Monday to Friday, 9am to 10am and 2pm to 3pm
2. Proposed shared use bay Mon-Fri 8am – 5pm permit holders only or limited waiting 30 min no return within 30 mins for non permit holders. (Which is the solution for Alston Road and Green End Road due to St Roses School)
We therefore strongly suggest you amend your proposed plan, taking into account the views of the residents of Grosvenor Terrace.

Please note the following objections to the Zone G Parking Restriction Proposals.
1. The majority of residents in Grosvenor Terrace do not want parking restrictions.
2. There are insufficient parking bays to cope with the cars of residents in the road.
3. Residents from other roads with permits can use the parking bays.
4. Parking bays have been proposed blocking residents drives where anyone with a permit can park and block the drive.
5. No provision has been made for disabled parking or pensioners. I am a pensioner who will probably not be able to park outside or near my house. Where will I be able to park?
6. Permit costs are excessive and just a way of making money for the council.
7. Any problem parking could be solved by double yellow lines on corners, a bump up kerb marking to allow 1 wheel width on the pavement without restricting the width of the pavement and getting residents to cut back obstructive vegetation.
We have turned down this scheme a number of times, why is the council still trying to proceed running roughshod over the desire of the residents.

Halwick Close
I have some queries about the recent mailing on Zone G in Boxmoor. I live in Halwick Close.

First, I was surprised to see that an 8am to 5pm limitation is being proposed. There is not a huge problem in this road other than with the occasional (but not persistent) dumping of cars by commuters all day long, and very occasionally when there is an event on at the Catholic Church (though that could just as easily be at the weekend when restrictions are not proposed). I’d have thought that the same type of restriction as in place in roads around Kingsland Road (for which I campaigned when I was a parliamentary candidate) would tackle that problem, rather than an all day limitation. It is also cheaper to administer because you only have to have a warden patrolling during a few limited hours each day. Second, nowhere is it clear what arrangements will be made for obtaining resident permits. Will these have to be bought, or will they be free on proof of address, and if so for how many cars?

Third, what will happen for visitors to residents during this time? Will there be any way they can park on the road, perhaps with a one day permit?

Finally, I am not sure that the wording on your plan (‘proposed permit holder only past this point’) is very helpful as it implies (which I am sure you cannot mean) that only permit holders will be able to go beyond a certain point. This must be nonsense and ‘proposed permit holder parking only’ would surely be more clear?

Staff member, Dacorum Borough Council, Lockers Park Lane

Please could you clarify a point on the proposed Boxmoor Permit Parking Zones. If you have a permit for zone G, can you park anywhere within that zone? For example you live on St Johns Road, but cant park there so you park on Pullers Rd instead – will this be allowed?

Also why on St Johns Road have you suggested that people with drives will not be able to park over their own drives (marked with red lines)?

Thank you for your help in advance.
### Puller Road

I have concerns about the plans for Proposed Zone G in Boxmoor. For Puller Road, I would like to see a similar scheme to Horsecroft and Kingsland Road where there is a period of one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon where resident permits are needed. It is unnecessary and inconvenient to have the parking restrictions 8am to 5pm and I am completely against this. I am a parent and my family helps look after my children and it will be very expensive for me to pay for permits for them for 8 hours per day. Also, for Puller Road, please can you retain the parking spaces outside 76 and 83 as this does not cause and obstruction and means that we are losing vital parking spaces.

For Cowper Road, too many parking spaces have been replaced with double yellow lines. This is unnecessary as the road is not difficult to drive up when cars are parked on both sides and it will take away too many parking spaces for residents. Again, restrictions should be limited to two one-hourly periods per day – not 8am to 5pm.

For St John's Road, too many parking spaces have been replaced with double yellow lines and there will not be enough parking for residents or customers using the local businesses. Once again, restrictions should be limited to two one-hourly periods per day – not 8am to 5pm.

I am very supportive of the double yellow lines on the corners of Grosvenor Terrace and Alston Road as it is very difficult to get round those roads at times. I also support the introduction of parking on only one side of the road on Green End Road.

Thank you for all the updated information regarding the restricted parking Zone G and for taking into account my comments regarding my drive and my neighbour's drive which have access onto Grosvenor Terrace, it's much appreciated. My query is regarding the yellow lines (well red in the diagram) on Puller Road and Grosvenor Terrace. Can you confirm if these are to be double yellow lines? Currently it means that we will lose two parking spaces at the top of Puller Road and a space on Grosvenor Terrace (if you turn towards Cowper Road). The main problem for people turning in/out of Puller Road is when cars park on the corner of Grosvenor Terrace as you turn towards Alston Road and also if people park very close to the corner of Puller Road on the other side.

Finally, can DBC put pressure on whoever is in charge of the car park at the railway station to lower prices and provide more spaces? Luckily I can walk to the station, but I do have sympathy for commuters when parking charges are high and not enough spaces are provided.
**Sebright Road**

We have just received the new proposed format for this zone. There appears to be no consistency in this. In Sebright Road some residences have a broken green line whereas our home, number 27A, has a continuous line. Can you please explain why?

We note that other properties have a white line outside the access to their driveway - in fact the house in Alston Road, "Alston House" has only just had this painted. Can you please explain why?

We have requested a white line outside our property on many occasions, both verbally and by email to you, but it seems to fall on deaf ears. Can you please explain why you are doing this for some and not for others? Please don’t respond by saying that it is a County decision as we were not given the opportunity for this. We need this access as one of us has a medical condition where we are having to undergo many important hospital appointments and this is causing us unnecessary anxiety on accessing these appointments. In fact, this has caused so much anxiety that we were in the process of contacting our MP.

We have extreme safety problems in getting out of our drive and request that a white line be laid (as it has for other residents).

**Whilst in support of some form of parking restrictions in the proposed Zone G and specifically Sebright Road, primarily because of the weekday commuter parking, I have the following comments and observations.**

1. I don't understand or agree with the move from a 9am - 10am and 2pm - 3pm restriction to a blanket 8am to 5pm ban. The evidence of Horsecroft and Kingsland and the available parking there throughout the day shows the two one hour slots meet the desired outcome. The extended ban will be detrimental on the residents, their visitors, and any tradespeople working in the zone.

2. Boxmoor currently has a 100 hour visitor permit maximum. Should the 8am - 5pm ban be implemented this 100 hour limit would need to be increased substantially.

3. The parking bays in Sebright have all been put on the Eastern side acknowledging some past resident feedback, however the parking bays do not continue across two sections of dropped kerb. This means the beneficiaries of the dropped kerb cannot park on the road relieving some of the pressure on the rest of the residents wishing to park in the road. It is a fact that there are more residents cars in Sebright than there are spaces to park so every space counts.

**St Johns Road**

We are objecting to the proposed permit parking Zone G scheme in Boxmoor. We'd like to start by pointing out that your letter incorrectly states that all of the restrictions will be 8am-5pm Monday to Friday. The letter is misleading. As you still plan to replace all single white lines over driveways on St. John's Road with double yellows. 'No Parking at any time'.

If you have a drive and park over it, this is dreadful news and shows that you haven't listened properly to all the issues expressed by residents.

When we expressed our concerns with Mr Richard Plant, he countered that "Some driveways may have a white line across them, this line is only advisory and cannot be enforced should a vehicle park across the driveway" and "we do not want to create the situation where visitors to the area utilise space across residential driveways making it difficult for the occupiers of those properties to be able to access their driveways."

This answer makes little sense. At the present time visitors to the area can park along St. John's Road at any time and none of them park on white lines, over driveways.

I've lived here with the current parking for nearly 20 years and I have not encountered this problem.

The white line does its job. It draws attention to the driveway and deters people from parking there. It doesn't matter to us if it is enforceable or not.
So for example if you left the white lines and put up your new parking notice, residents can park whatever they like and visitors would park in the spaces between - just as they do now - but only for 3 hours.

There would be no need for bays or double yellow lines.

You are removing up to 12 resident’s driveway parking spaces along St. John’s Road to combat a perceived commuter parking issue. How does that make sense?

Doing this of course also has implications for residents that don’t have driveways.

All those people that were previously parking over their own drives, or have guests, care workers visiting etc, will now have to attempt to find a permit bay, or park up the side roads Seabright, Puller, Cowper etc. thus putting more stress residents parking. A self inflicted problem.

The fact that you are reducing on-street parking by what looks like up to 50% means permit parking will cause more problems than the commuter traffic it is trying to deter.

You must realise this yourselves, so people will (and have) questioned the motives behind the scheme.

Reading through the feedback you got last time I can find very little evidence of your proposals being wanted, except around Green End Road, Alston Road and Bargrove Ave, where the problem is mainly St Roses School and the majority of those properties have off road parking for 2 or more cars!

It would be grossly unfair on the residents of Boxmoor to confuse 72% of respondents saying they would be in favour with ‘some form’ of parking control with people ‘approving’ of what is being put forward.

The people on Cowper Road have complained that you are reducing their available parking and that commuters are not a problem.

Puller Road has said that their problem is with local cars and pub traffic, not commuters.

St. John’s And Sebright have said similar, so why are you pushing ahead?

Also why restrict parking around Boxmoor for 9 hours to deter commuters, when a 1 hour restriction in the middle of the day, for non permit holders, will do the same job and allow residents to leave their cars on the road all day rather than rush out at 8am to move their car?

There must be a better solution to station parking than this current proposal, which will create a new parking problem worse than the one you are trying to solve.

I would also like to make a point about the amount of street furniture that will inevitably be installed around Boxmoor.

Horsecroft Road and Kingsland Road have been blighted by it. Poles and signs stuck up without regard, right in front of people’s windows and next to their front doors, relentlessly, every 10 yards.

There are far too many of them. Nothing about this scheme will enhance our local area. It will only detract and cause more problems than there currently are.

It is worth repeating that, because some people lose some on street parking during the day to a small number of commuters, we are all having to lose a lot of our current on street parking, which seems nonsensical. It simply doesn’t make sense.

We don’t support this scheme but look forward to your new ideas on how to reduce the small problem of commuter parking at one end of Boxmoor without making a huge impact on everyone else’s lives.
I have recently completed the Survey Monkey questionnaire on the proposals for the above. I would like to comment that this survey is very limited in its feedback and does not address key issues that the parking proposals raise. I would urge the council to undertake a proper consultation process as the initial round did and not just rely on this current round of informal consultation. Residents and business views on parking in the area are important so can you please can you tell me why the process had not undergone a second round of formal consultation?

I have objected to the plans on the grounds that they reduce the amount of parking available to residents and shoppers throughout the zone. Parking is already limited and the reduction in spaces with more double yellow lines will impact on residents who will have to park further from their homes if they have no driveway. I understand from my conversation with you in early May Richard that the restrictions on Cowper Road are intended to reduce the speed of traffic on this road. I use this road everyday to walk my child to school and I think that the plans will encourage faster driving. Currently cars are cautious on the road as it is narrow due to parked cars. I also used to live on a terrace house with no parking on Cowper Road and it was always hard to find parking on that road whether it was weekends or weekdays. I would also like to object that the white line over my drive will become a double yellow line. Visitors park over my drive as there is often no where else available. I often have to park over my drive myself as we are a two car family out of necessity and I have two children. If there is a double yellow outside my house and as there will be less parking available on the street it will be unlikely that will be able to park near my house so the children and will have to cross St John's Road which is a very busy road. We cannot park down the hill as this is a different zone. Instead of removing the white lines can the council consider traffic calming on the whole of the road in the village not just the current 20mph area?

Instead of the current plans can you please consider a scheme like Zone X where it is residents parking for limited periods in the day. This way the train commuters will not be able to park but visitors to residents and the shops will have more parking available and if they need to visit in the restricted times they have the car park (which should be less full as there will be fewer commuters taking up the other parking spaces).

It is with great concern that I have been informed of the renewed proposal for 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 am aware that there is a suggestion that parking permits can be issued so that places in St John’s Road and surrounding roads where there is parking available for those with permits can be used. This cannot be seen as an adequate solution as there will be a much reduced overall number of parking places with the same number of residents’ vehicles.

The approach being proposed is addressing a symptom of an issue rather than addressing the actual cause of it. That is, the lack of adequate and cost effective parking at the Railway Station. This is the reason that many commuters park in the surrounding roads. It would be a better solution to increase the parking at the station rather than a temporary action to address the result of it. This would be a better solution for the commuters and the local residents.

I therefore urge you to reconsider these changes to parking restrictions and leave those that are currently in place for the future.
St Marys and St Joseph RC Church

We (St Mary & ST Joseph RC Church Boxmoor) are in receipt of your letter dated May 2016 relating to the further period of consultation for CPZ Zone G which we note expires today (08.06.16).

We have given further consideration to our original response (see Email below dated 23rd November 2015).

We recognise that the introduction of the new restriction along our frontage and adjacent business/dwellings should have a beneficial effect ie stopping the unlimited parking by commuters. However, this does not address our concerns regarding the need to reduce the significant risk of a serious accident and/or road rage incident arising out of the congestion which occurs when we have weddings and funerals during the week despite putting out NO PARKING cones and polite messages asking for assistance from the public/residents.

Photos can be provided if required.

Even with the proposed restriction on public use, it seems that permit holders will have unlimited use at all times which negates the new 3 hr restriction.

Since the last consultation, we are aware that the local sub post office has been relocated into the Convenience store next to ourselves and in the letter circulated by the Royal Mail to nearby residents it indicated that provision would be made for certain bays to be designated for disabled persons use only.

Is it the intention to do this within the proposed new Parking Bay?

The new restriction will obviously assist local residents for shopping facilities AND access to a sub P.O. and we fully support this change which has been discussed with our neighbour. We both agree that it will be beneficial to restrict parking to a max of TWO hours with no return within TWO hours FOR ALL USERS as this will encourage shorter visits and increase the footfall to the store/P.O.

Our neighbour has no objection to the introduction of DOUBLE YELLOW lines along our frontage up to the point of his building.

We are unaware of any criteria or precedent that might mitigate against our suggested changes.

Our general points regarding our desire to be 'good neighbours' within the village community remain as stated.

Our parishioner consultation has also raised two other points.

1. Could the church have single or multiple Permits for designated car(s) OR for ANY car to which the Permit can be allocated? If so, what are the terms?
2. Could there be an increase in the ONE HOUR FREE period of parking at Weekends only in the nearby village carpark? Several parishioners have received parking offence docs on a Sunday morning when they have parked there and as Sunday services generally last approx. 1 hr there is a need to allow time for the walk from and to the carpark especially for elderly and/or disabled persons who cannot find any other parking facilities. An increase in the FREE period to TWO hours on SUNDAY would be very helpful.

Please contact ME DIRECT if further information is needed. Our local DBC Councillor, Janice Marshall, is fully aware of our concerns and I believe is supportive of our suggestions.

We look forward to the outcome of this latest consultation,
The Poplars

I am a resident of the Poplars and I am very concerned about the proposed parking for Cowper road and the fact that we would not have any permits and there is no doubt that residents would park in our road.

At present there is insufficient kerbside parking for everyone who lives in Cowper Road. As a consequence, a number of residents in Cowper Road who live south of The Poplars ignore the “Private Road” signs and use The Poplars service roads as an overspill car park. The proposed “shared use” and “no waiting” restrictions along Cowper Road will undoubtedly result in a dramatic increase in that abuse. The introduction of CPZ “Zone G” will therefore mean The Poplars service roads will be a “parking oasis” for commuters and residents in nearby roads, and the proposed new “Zone W” will add to that pressure. In addition, the revised proposals no longer allow residents in The Poplars to obtain permits to park within Zone G, and that increases the need to ensure that the service roads are kept free for estate residents. As the intention of the proposed CPZ is to benefit the residents of Boxmoor generally, it would be iniquitous for us to be severely and unnecessarily disadvantaged. In the Final Consultation Report published in January 2016, the Commercial Assets & Property Development Dept. of Dacorum Council acknowledged their responsibility to prevent misuse.

Puller Road

Dear Sir,

May I make a few valid points -
1. We do not have a car park.
2. We do not have a loading bay.
3. Why is our road, the only road in Boxmoor with these extreme proposed parking restrictions.
4. All the other roads have a 3 hour window, why has Puller road been excluded from that window, as we also run a business.

We do not know why you have come up with this ridiculous new plan.

But one thing is certain, we will take legal action should you persist in implementing your proposals.
Thorne Close

As a resident of Thorne Close since July 1997 to say the proposed new parking permits are unwelcome is an understatement. Family and Friends visiting residents in Thorne Close only have 5 parking spaces to use. Parking on pavements or blocking in other cars is not only dangerous but is antisocial to say the least. If residents from St Johns Road flats and apartments need parking spaces give them permits for the car park which was purchased for use of shoppers wishing to use the shops. When people rent or buy property surely a consideration if you have vehicles is where you park them. It seems to me that the residents of Thorne Close are not being considered here at all. Every day when I return from work there are vehicles parked on the double yellow lines or outside the houses on the pavement at the entrance to the Close. This is not only unlawful but is, dangerous I have never seen a Traffic Warden or the Police taking any action.

Hello,

Further to your recent documentation to the residents of Thorne Close, HP1 1LY, I live at no. 31 and wonder if you would clarify a couple of points please:

Firstly, each property has two designated parking spaces which, according to my deeds, belong to the properties (this excludes four larger properties - nos. 2, 7, 27 and 29 which each have their own driveways and a garage). Can you confirm please that you're not proposing permits for those spaces? (since they are private) Secondly, there are five visitor parking bays near the entrance to the close. Is it those bays only that your proposals refer to?

The blue and white striped area on your map "Proposed permit holder only past this point Mon - Fri 8am - 5pm" extends beyond the five visitor parking bays, right up next to some of the residents' private parking spaces. What does that refer to?

As a resident of Thorne Close please confirm what permit parking would actually mean to me? Confused to wording in letter received. Would there be no permit required after 5 pm? Thus allowing any vehicle to park in Thorne Close?

Please send me a marked street map of where the permit parking will be in Thorne Close?

There is no space for permit parking as all 22 properties own either 1 or 2 off road parking spaces. Any vehicle blocking a vehicle would be obstructing the highway which is a criminal offence according to The Road Traffic Act and is a Police matter.

There are 5 visitor spaces; my deeds indicate these as visitor spaces. When purchasing my property these spaces were for visitors to Thorne Close. The letter indicates parking for shoppers and persons using businesses in St Johns Road. There is already a public car park on St Johns Road providing ample parking. Freedom of Information Act - please provide me with the number of parking tickets issued for vehicles parked on the double yellow lines at the entrance to Thorne Close adjacent to ‘t’ junction to St John’s Road over the last 24 months.

Please acknowledge this email and provide the information requested prior to 8th June 2016 to enable me and the other residents to comment on the proposals.
Thank you for your recent letter informing us about Boxmoor’s proposed parking plans. I live at 7 Thorne Close (HP1 1LY) and had a few queries regarding the new restrictions.

The majority of parking spaces on Thorne Close are privately owned. There are, however, five visitor bays (highlighted in yellow on the attached), which on our deeds are allocated to Thorne Close residents for visitor parking. We wanted to check that these bays would remain, as per our deeds, for use by visitors of Thorne Close only? There is a small stretch of curb outside our property (highlighted in red on the attached). There are no yellow lines on the road and the space is far too small for a car to park, yet we do get people parking their regularly! This not only blocks part of our driveway but also the parking space on the other side. Please can you confirm that this would not be included as a space within the parking restrictions and, if so, is it possible to get a double yellow line painted along this stretch of road to stop people parking there?

Finally, there is one section of road where there is room for a car (highlighted in green on the attached). Please can you confirm that this would fall within the proposed restrictions?

Many thanks for your help in clarifying how the proposals would affect Thorne Close.

I am writing to you on behalf of Thorne Close Residents’ Association. We have recently had a meeting to discuss the proposed Zone G parking permits that could potentially affect Thorne Close, Boxmoor.

As an association, we are in agreement that the permit parking should not affect our visitor parking bays. These five bays were allocated as Thorne Close visitor parking in our deeds and we insist they remain this way. There are 22 properties on Thorne Close and five visitor bays is not a lot of visitor parking for this number of houses. Thorne Close residents are therefore in agreement that we be excluded from the Zone G parking proposals. Instead, we recommend that ‘Private Parking/Thorne Close Resident’s Parking Only’ signage be installed on Thorne Close free of charge. This would allow the very few visitor parking bays that we have to remain as ours.

We are more than willing to meet with you to show you our road and how the parking works - it is quite an unusual layout and there have been many concerns expressed by Thorne Close residents about exactly which areas are to be included within the proposed permit scheme. We feel that if you were to see the minimal amount of spare parking that is on offer to our visitors, you would agree that the five visitor parking bays allocated to our properties should remain as ours. We also would like to clarify whether we will get any more double yellow lines to prevent people from parking in spaces which are unsuitable (blocking parking bays/drive ways etc). Would it be possible to arrange a time for you to visit us?

In addition, as we only have five spaces on offer, please could we suggest that the space on Wharf Road (double yellow lines and a dead end) be used more wisely instead and that the signage for the public car park next door to our road be improved?

We understand that Dacorum Borough Council have identified Thorne Close as a road that could suffer from commuter parking if Zone G is introduced and that in order to deter unwanted vehicles you are proposing to include Thorne Close within the scheme. However, due to its special layout, we feel that Thorne Close would suffer if your proposals were introduced and we therefore request that you listen to our suggestions regarding our individual road.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding our recommendations.
I have recently moved to Boxmoor, and already paid 2 parking tickets, I'm finding this very distressing. I think you are already making enough money with parking settings all around Hemel, I find this absolutely infuriating, There is already a lot of money going in from our taxes too. Please reconsider this proposed and cancel it. The roads are full of potholes, and I can assured you that they will continue like that even with the Dacorum receiving more of our money from parking penalties. I absolutely oppose to this!! thank you for reading and I'll await for your answer.

Please find attached images of available parking spaces in Puller Road at 09:00 this morning. There were also many more spaces that I didn't photograph.

> I believe this reflects the usual amount of vehicles parked between 09:00 and 17:00 on weekdays. After 17:00 and until 20:00 parking is much more difficult and often impossible.

> Having spoken with many residents over the weekend we feel a 09:00 until 17:00 permit will not benefit Puller Road but that a permit that runs through to 20:00 would.

> I believe that other residents have already commented on the amount of early evening parking which is presumably people visiting the Post Office Arms and we feel extending the parking restrictions to 20:00 would be a solution to this problem.

Thank you for the letter and plan regarding the above matter. Whilst we fully support the proposal, we would wish to see the areas of 'on street parking' coloured purple decreased from 3 hours to 60 minutes maximum waiting for non permit holders. As this proposal is in essence an extension to the existing Controlled Parking Zone X, we cannot understand the need for allowing 3 hour on street parking along St. Johns Road when there is a much under used car park at the bottom of Cowper Road should any one wish to stay longer than 60 minutes. Please consider this point carefully before making any final decision.
APPENDIX C – FINAL SCHEME PROPOSALS
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.
Accreditations

- INVESTORS IN PEOPLE | Gold
- INVESTORS IN PEOPLE | Champion
- POSITIVE ABOUT DISABLED PEOPLE
- BSI - UKAS
- CHAS
- constructionline

Memberships

- THE CHARtered INSTITUTE OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION
- Landscape Institute
- Rudi
- BPA - Member of the British Parking Association