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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The informal consultation period ran from 7th November 2016 to 2nd December 2016.

The consultation included properties located on the following roads:

- Stratford Way
- Russell Place
- Catlin Street
- London Road (A4251)

The consultation documentation was delivered to 126 properties in the proposed zone R extension and 51 properties in the existing zone R, in total 177 properties received consultation material.

A total of 58 individual responses were received which equates to a 32.7% response rate...

The majority of respondents 39/55 (71%) were in favour of the proposed extension of Zone R, 11 (20%) of the respondents did not support the extension of Zone R and 5 (9%) had no opinion.

The total number of respondents who agreed with the proposed restrictions in their street was 35/53 (66%), 16 (30%) did not agree with the proposed restrictions for their street and 2 (3.8%) had no opinion.

Respondents from Stratford Way showed less support with only 24% of respondents supporting the introduction of the scheme proposals and 59% of respondents did not support the introduction of the scheme proposals. 17% of respondents stated they had no opinion.

Responses from Catlin Street, London Road and Russell Place showed similar levels of support for the proposed restrictions in those streets as for the overall scheme proposals.

It is recommended to proceed to formal consultation with the proposed parking restrictions as consulted with the additional inclusion of a permit holder only parking place located outside properties 417/419 London Road.

Although Stratford Way residents did not support the introduction of parking proposals we would recommend including Stratford Way within any future scheme to ensure residents parking is protected against commuter parking.
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1. **CLIENT REQUIREMENTS**

**Understanding of brief**

The project will place between October 2016 and May 2017.

To undertake site surveys of the roads within the study area to help inform the drafting of scheme proposals in order to consult with residents, stakeholders and local businesses.

Create and distribute all relevant consultation material, analyse and report all consultation responses to allow DBC to determine if the proposed extension is supported by residents and businesses in the area.

Produce final scheme plans following the initial consultation process and formally consult on the proposals.

Report all formal representations to DBC in order for the portfolio holder to make an informed decision to implement any scheme proposals.

Produce sign and line schedules suitable to be passed to the DBC term contractor for implementation of all signs and lines for this scheme.
2. **INTRODUCTION**

Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) is seeking to extend the existing Zone R Resident Permit Parking Scheme in Dacorum to include the following roads:

- Stratford Way
- Russell Place
- Catlin Street
- London Road (A4251)

Zone R currently covers Roughdown Road and Standring Rise, since the introduction of Zone X in Boxmoor in 2015, the roads listed above have become more popular with commuters wishing to park near Hemel Hempstead station.

Vehicles are now regularly parking on footways, causing obstructions to pedestrians and parking in the residential streets making it difficult for residents to park near to their properties.

The purpose of this consultation was to provide possible solutions to the current parking issues in the roads identified by DBC. Site visits were undertaken by Project Centre (PCL) for the purpose of scheme design and the initial consultation process. Opinions were sought, in the form of an informal consultation, from local residents and businesses on the proposals and a final scheme decision will then be produced, should there be support for the proposals. DBC will then implement these changes.

DBC consulted residents on proposals to extend the R-Zone to a number of neighbouring roads. The scheme proposals were available to view via the Project Centre Consultation Web Portal [www.pclconsult.co.uk](http://www.pclconsult.co.uk) and respondents were also be able to click a link that allowed comments to be submitted.

Residences within private roads would not be eligible to apply for resident permits or visitor vouchers; the Parking Service is unable to enforce restrictions on private land.

The views of residents are important and have been considered as part of the informal consultation process. Any final proposals that result from this consultation will be subject to the statutory legal process before any work scheme changes can be implemented.

The informal consultation period ran from 7th November 2016 to 2nd December 2016.
3. **INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESULTS**

The consultation sought to determine the level of support for the introduction of parking controls in the proposed Zone R extension.

Respondents were asked two questions:

Q3 – Do you support the introduction of the scheme proposals?

Q4 – Do you agree with the proposed restrictions for your street?

The questions may appear to be asking the same thing but Q1 is designed to identify the level of support for the introduction of parking controls across the identified area, and Q2 is designed to identify roads where there are concerns with the proposed design.

The consultation documentation was delivered to 126 properties in the proposed zone R extension and 51 properties in the existing zone R, in total 177 properties received consultation material.

A total of 58 individual responses were received which equates to a 32.7% response rate.

The consultation material can be found in Appendix A.

**Question 1**

This question identifies whether the respondent is a resident, business or both.

**Graph 1 - Are you a resident or business?**

**Table 1 – Q1 Total number of responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2
This question was concerned with identifying where respondents lived so that due consideration could be given to the outcomes on a road by road basis. A total of 55 respondents completed this question.

Question 3
This question was designed to identify the overall level of support for the extension of Controlled Zone R. A total of 55 respondents chose to answer this question.

Graph 2 – Do you support the introduction of the scheme proposals?

Table 2 – Q3 – Total numbers of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents 39/55 (71%) were in favour of the proposed extension of Zone R, 11 (20%) of the respondents did not support the extension of Zone R and 5 (9%) had no opinion.
Question 4

Question 4 was designed to identify whether respondents agreed with the specific restrictions proposed for their street. A total of 53 respondents provided answers to this question.

Graph 3 – Do you agree with the proposed restrictions for your street?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 4]

Table 3 – Q4 – Total numbers of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of respondents who agreed with the proposed restrictions in their street was 35/53 (66%), 16 (30%) did not agree with the proposed restrictions for their street and 2 (3.8%) had no opinion.

Whilst 39 respondents were in support of the extension of Controlled Zone R, when asked if they agreed with the proposed restrictions for their street the number of respondent who agreed fell to 35. This suggests whilst the majority of respondents are in favour of the extension of Controlled Zone R, there are some specific concerns in relation to the proposed design.
Question 5

Question 5 allowed respondents to leave further comments relating to the proposed scheme. A total of 37 respondents chose to leave further comments.

The responses fell into 5 broad categories;

- Support restrictions
- Against restrictions
- Request for additional restrictions
- Request to reduce restrictions
- Concern over permit cost.

**Graph 4 – Do you have any other comments on the Council’s proposals?**

**Table 4 – Q5 - Total number of comments received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment code</th>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>In Support of restrictions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Against proposed restrictions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Requests for additional Restrictions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Request to reduce the restrictions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Concerns over cost of permits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full details of all comments received can be found in Appendix B.
4. **STREET BY STREET ANALYSIS**

The below table details the total number of properties consulted within the proposed Zone R extension, the number of individual responses received and the relative response rates.

A total of 126 properties were consulted within the proposed Zone R extension. A total of 53 individual responses were received, equating to a response rate of 42% for roads within the proposed Zone R extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Addresses</th>
<th>No. of Properties</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catlin Street</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Place</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Way</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughdown Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the proposed Zone R extension there was a varied response rate. Over half of residents from Catlin Street and Stratford Way responded with response rates of 51% and 58% respectively and there was a relatively high response rate from London Road with 40% of residents responding.

Response rates from Russell Place and Roughdown Road were much lower at 18% and 16% respectively.
Street by street analysis

The following section breaks down the responses for questions 3 and 4 on a street by street basis.

Graph 5 – Do you support the introduction of the scheme proposals? (By street)

By analysing the responses to question 3 on a street by street basis clear support is shown for the introduction of the scheme proposals from Catlin Street (73% of respondents in support) and London Road (90% of respondents in support).

Less definitive support was shown by respondents from Russell Place with 4 out of 6 (66%) supporting the introduction of the scheme proposals.

Only one response was received from Roughdown Road. Whilst this was in support, the low response rate means no definitive conclusion for Roughdown Place could be reached.

Respondents from Stratford Way showed less support with only 24% of respondents supporting the introduction of the scheme proposals and 59% of respondents did not support the introduction of the scheme proposals. 17% of respondents stated they had no opinion.
Responses from Catlin Street, London Road and Russell Place showed similar levels of support for the proposed restrictions in those streets as for the overall scheme proposals.

The respondent from Roughdown Road, whilst being in support of the introduction of the scheme proposals did not agree with the proposed restrictions for the street.

**Existing Zone R**

No responses were received from properties located within the existing Zone R.

One response was received from Red Lodge Gardens, whilst showing no opinion to questions 3 and 4 this respondent did leave a comment in support of the implementation of double yellow lines along the A41 London Road.

The consultation also recorded a response from the councillor of Apsley and Corner Hall, the councillor stated she supported the introduction of the scheme proposals and agreed with the proposed restrictions for the streets within the proposed Zone R extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone R Addresses</th>
<th>No. of Properties</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Rise</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughdown Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NOT No.s 12 to 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. CONCLUSIONS

There was overall support for the introduction of the proposed zone R extension, with 71% of respondents showing support for the introduction of the scheme.

Whilst 71% respondents were in support of the extension of Controlled Zone R, when asked if they agreed with the proposed restrictions for their street the number of respondents who agreed fell to 66%. This suggests that whilst the majority of respondents are in favour of the extension of Controlled Zone R, there are some specific concerns in relation to the proposed design.

Catlin Street and London Road showed overwhelming support with 73% and 90% of respondents showing support respectively.

Less support for the Zone R extension was shown from respondents of Stratford Way, with only 24 of respondents showing support, 59% of respondents did not support schemes introduction and 17% had no opinion.

Although not supporting the overall scheme, 52% of respondents from Stratford Way did agree with the proposed restrictions for their street.

Further comments from respondents from the existing Zone R supported the implementation of ‘No waiting at any time’ restrictions along the A41, London Road.

Residents of London Road have requested the proposals be reviewed to determine if there is the option to include some on street parking places outside properties which do not benefit from off street parking.

The introduction of double yellow lines along London Road will ensure vehicles no longer block the pavements and will improve traffic flow, especially at the junction with the A4146.

By providing dedicated residents parking any displacement of vehicles from London Road would not be able to utilise carriage way in the surrounding residential streets.
6. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Overall the responses to the consultation indicated a high proportion of support for parking controls within the roads consulted. The responses also indicated the majority supported the scheme proposals.

It is therefore recommended to proceed to formal consultation with the proposed parking restrictions as consulted with the additional inclusion of a permit holder only parking place located outside properties 417/419 London Road.

Although Stratford Way residents did not support the introduction of parking proposals we would recommend including Stratford Way within any future scheme to ensure residents parking is protected against commuter parking.
APPENDIX A – CONSULTATION MATERIAL
Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Extension of Zone R, to include properties on Catlin Street, Russell Place, Stratford Way and Nos. 413 to 419 London Road, Hemel Hempstead.

Dear Residents/Business Proprietors

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

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

Residences within private roads, marked on the plan with blue hatching, will not be eligible to apply for resident permits or visitor vouchers; the Parking Service is unable to enforce restrictions on private land. However these locales are likely to benefit from being within the zone area.

In order for us to understand if there is support for the proposals, please take the time to complete the short on line question which can be found at:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/BOXMOORZONER

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

During the informal consultation period, which will run from 7th November 2016 to 2nd December 2016, if you have any concerns or comments please ensure you write to us, Parking Services Team Leader, Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

Detailed information and drawings are available at The Parking Centre at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH.

At the end of the 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 the next steps will be.

P.T.O.
If you have any queries regarding the above please contact us: at the address stated below, or telephone Richard Plant at Project Centre Ltd on 07827 256841 or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

Yours sincerely

Dacorum Borough Council working in association with the Project Centre Ltd

Data from this consultation will be collected and held by Dacorum Borough Council and Project Centre. The data will be used to produce a consultation report and to provide feedback to councillors. Individual residents will not be identified in the consultation report without permission. The report will be a public document.
Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Extension of Zone R

Dear Resident,

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

The council is consulting on proposals to extend the R-Zone to a number of neighbouring roads. We are letting you know as you are living within the existing R-Zone area. To view the proposed extension area please visit www.pclconsult.co.uk you will also be able to click a link that will allow you to leave any comments you may have regarding these proposals if you wish to do so.

Residences within private roads, marked on the plan with blue hatching, will not be eligible to apply for resident permits or visitor vouchers; the Parking Service is unable to enforce restrictions on private land (pink hatched areas).

Your views are important and will be considered as part of the informal consultation process. Any final proposals that result from this consultation will need to go through a statutory legal process before any work can be implemented.

During the informal consultation period, which will run from 7th November 2016 to 2nd December 2016, if you have any concerns or comments you can 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

Detailed information and drawings are available at The Parking Centre at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH.

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 the next steps will be.

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 07827 256841 or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

Yours sincerely

Dacorum Borough Council working in association with the Project Centre Ltd

Data from this consultation will be collected and held by Dacorum Borough Council and Project Centre. The data will be used to produce a consultation report and to provide feedback to councillors. Individual residents will not be identified in the consultation report without permission. The report will be a public document.
### Catlin Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sooner the better. It's a nightmare trying to park on our street due to commuters (Catlin St) I also find the parking on London Rd to be dangerous.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are currently double yellow lines outside and to the side of property and they cross over a dropped curb which gives access to my drive. Would it be possible to have these removed as they serve no purpose and would allow more parking spaces for residents.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the disabled parking space in Catlin Street so these proposals may not affect me. But having been involved in previous attempts to obtain restricted parking, I think residents in this street would want assurances that parking would be allowed on both sides of Catlin Street as this was not so on previous proposals.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catlin Street permit plans look agreeable as long as there is enough parking/bays etc for the residents and vouchers for guests to park when visiting. I have a property with NO driveway. I only have 1 vehicle. I hope the plans also take into account some of the properties who DO have driveways but have more than 2 vehicles and park their extra vehicles on the road also. Many thanks.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal is very much welcomed especially sorting out London Road congestion</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This could not come soon enough! Commuters are leaving their vehicles parked for days, sometimes weeks at a time, as they do not want to pay for station parking. The result is that residents end up having no where to park. Added to this the over flow from all small side roads has now overspilled onto London Road, making it not only congested but dangerous. The proposed Permit Holders Parking Zone must be for both sides of Catlin Street as it would be counter productive, and limiting to residents, if yellow lines where introduced... We need the space!</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This appears to be a reasonable proposal as opposed to previous proposals, where there are no double yellow lines in the plan for Catlin Street. This is a much needed and much appreciated proposal for the residents here as we have noticed a dramatic increase in commuter parking and people living in the flats on Roughdown Road, which is only going to get worse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The parking on London road has become dangerous so at the very least there should be double yellow lines all the way from the mini roundabout to the old gas works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We request that Saturday is included as well as people park in the street when going away for a weekend and we loose spaces for the entire weekend and they also use the train to attend Westfield Shopping Centre at a weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have three small children and there are many times that I cannot park and get all three children safely to my home. There has been times that I have not been able to park in my street at all, due to the restrictions at the top of the road as well. One of these occasions I had just been food shopping I had a car load of groceries and could not park any where near my house plus a baby in tow. Every morning I watch commuters arrive in out street and park outside my house and in the street, often parking with little consideration over two spaces meaning two people are not able to park there between the hours of 7am and 7pm whilst they are commuting. The parking on London road has become extremely dangerous, cars double parked and two lanes of traffic trying to use the main road. Something needs to be done before an accident occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow lines in Catlin Street would make the parking in the street much more competitive as both sides of the street are used for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree with yellow lines down one side of street as less parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I disagree with the parking restriction in Catlin Street, I am fully in favour of the plan to restrict parking along parts of London Road because the parked vehicles along the road are causing great danger to pedestrians and moving traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parking in Catlin Street is difficult with a limited number of spaces. the introduction of controlled parking will reduce the number of available spaces as there will be yellow lines on one side of the street. This will make parking in the street much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reason I have not provided an opinion on enforcing a permit parking road along Catlin street is due to the letter providing no information on what this essentially means for the resident within this area. I would like to understand how many cars per household this will accommodate, will I be charged extra for visitor passes or are these free? If I am required to pay anything towards this on top of my current council tax then I will not be in support of this. Thanks, Jennette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's not clear from the plan, but I'm guessing to park on the road outside our house will require a permit at certain times of the day? I fully support this idea to avoid the commuters who don't want to pay to park in the railway station parking on London Road. The situation is getting worse close to the junction with station road with commuters parking on the pavement on both sides of the road forcing pedestrians to walk in the road, and traffic to slow down as cars overtake the parked vehicles on the bend. The restrictions or zonal parking must be put in as far as it can along London Road to avoid these commuters just moving further along to park, therefore just moving the problem somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CODE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly agree the yellow line restrictions along London road. The traffic is terrible and it's going to end up just like Apsley. It stop the flow of traffic. And they all park on the pavements so people in wheel chairs and with push chairs cannot get through. They have to go on the road. An accident waiting to happen.

| **CODE** |
| A |

**ADEQUATE PROVISION MUST BE MADE FOR RESIDENTS WITH NO OFF ROAD PARKING WHO LIVE ON LONDON ROAD, PARTICULARLY THE ELDERY, THOSE WITH YOUNG CHILDREN AND DISABILITIES. DELIVERY VEHICLES, WORKMEN ETC MUST ALL BE ACCOMODATED. CONSIDERATION TO ROAD CALMING AS WELL AS VEHICLES WILL GO BACK TO EXCEEDING THE SPPED LIMIT**
| I live at XX London Rd which you have designated as a private car park, it is not a car park, it is our drive & garden, there is shared access for 3 houses. We are already having problems with people thinking they can just block our access because they will only be there for a short time! I am concerned that people will get the wrong impression from your plans. | N/A |
| We fully back the proposal and welcome it implemented as soon as possible as the current situation is ridiculous and dangerous. | A |
| It is proposed that our home, XX London road, XXXXXXX is not entitled to apply for permit parking. We strongly object to this and feel we should be able to pay for parking permits, even if the need to use these are rare, and would largely only be needed when we had visitors. It is extremely unfair to punish our household by not allowing permits, simply because we have paid money to install some off street parking. We have lived in this property for approx. 18 months and would not have purchased this property if these restrictions were in place. We believe that not allowing us permit parking will devalue our home and make it less desirable for potential purchasers in the future. During the weekend there is no difficulty for households and their guests to park outside, or slightly further down the road towards the roundabout - this means that it is purely people parking for the station that cause difficulty and a potentially dangerous situation as they are now parking back to back along the opposite side of the road - directly in front of the moor. Parking on the residents’ side of the road does not cause a difficulty or a danger outside 423 London road or in the approx. 5 spaces running up to the roundabout. This stretch of the road is straight and with clear visibility ahead. Cars can pass easily and safely in both directions when cars are parked out side 423 or towards the roundabout. If the parking proposal allowed all homes along our stretch of the London Road to apply for permits (despite having some off-road parking), and if permit bays were installed outside 423 and in the approx. 5 spaces towards the roundabout, we would have no objection to this proposal. It is proposed that the entire stretch of road that we live on will have yellow lines. This means that no guests will ever be able to park anywhere near our home and that we can’t even move our vehicles off our drive and into a permit zone so that our guests can use our driveway space. The proposal to make it impossible to park on the entire stretch of road from 8am-6pm Mon-Fri also means that for example we could not have any substantial works carried out in our home because tradesmen would have no where to park - especially if there was a skip on the drive. The restriction of 8am-6pm, Mon - Fri limits residents enormously and does not seem to make | B |
sense when on Mon-Fri the road is only generally busy during rush hour, when Sat and Sun tend to be a steady and continuous flow of traffic due to people travelling back and forth to Aldi, the town and elsewhere. During the weekend there are no station parkers - so the road remains clear enough for this traffic to pass through safely. A simple solution to this would be to allow some permit parking outside 423 and down towards the roundabout and to impose a time restriction that makes it too awkward for station parkers to stay there all day e.g. permits only 9.30-10.30am and 3.30-4.30pm. However it remains crucial to us for our household, 423, to be able to apply for permits to park on our own road, and/or the surrounding roads. The residents must be allowed to park outside their own homes and should not be punished for having a driveway. Further to this I have been informed by a resident on Catlin Street who also has off-road parking, that they will be entitled to apply for permits. This conflicts with what we are being informed about our own home entitlement and is not fair or just. The Council have permitted the build of e.g. Aldi, the upcoming flats just behind Aldi and further flats by the Kodak building. This has and will continue to increase traffic significantly. The Council cannot then choose to punish current residents for this decision because they are trying to reduce traffic.

| I am affected by proposals for both London Road and for Stratford Way because xxxx is a corner plot. Whilst some of my neighbours are keen on an all-day restriction in Stratford Way I disagree with that. Residents were initially keen to have a residents permit parking restriction for only one or two hours during the day, and that would be my preferred option. Commuters parking all day is the problem in Stratford Way, whereas people wishing to park there and use the moor generally only stay for a part of the day, perhaps less than an hour if walking their dog. An all-day restriction would limit use of the moor, and I consider that to be a bad thing. Dacorum B.C. should be promoting the use of these open spaces. If London Road is to have no waiting 8.00 a.m to 6.00 p.m. weekdays then there should be the option for users of the moor to park in adjacent roads if they avoid time-limited parking restrictions. |   |
With the current proposal, houses 419-415 lose parking outside our properties during peak times. I understand there is an option to apply for permit to Russell Place and Catlin Street but there will not be enough spaces available to accommodate our requirements, and even if we did get a place we would have a way to walk to our property which is not acceptable considering we have two small children. We acknowledge that something needs to be done from stopping people parking along the street, which seems to be from those wanting park and walk to the train station, but we don't think this should be at the detriment to ourselves. We bought our property with the facility to park outside and don't think this should be taken away. There must be something that can be done to accommodate us and would appreciate if this is seriously considered. Many thanks.

Russell Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal is very needed, but your consultation paper does not indicate clearly that residents in the green hashed area, as permit holders are able to park in their own road, this needs clarification, from the map it would indicate that you want us to drive and park elsewhere(which is not possible)between the hours mentioned!!! This can't be correct, there are lots of retired people up here with cars, so they don't go off to work. So whilst I agree with the scheme, the residents do need to park here too.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived on Russell place for two years and am constantly struggling to find parking due to the train commuters. Additionally residents who should be using their private car park persist to park on the road instead of there designated parking spaces due to convenience or multiple car use, thus is unfair as I am unable to use the private car park when I cannot find a space to park.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 2 issues. The proposals will encourage those not resident in Russell Place to (illegally) use the private parking in Russell Pl. If the proposals go ahead residents of Russell Pl. should be allowed to apply for (purchase) on street parking permits the same as other non Russell Pl. residents. Russell Pl residents have only ONE private allocated parking place and may have more than one car. They also pay the same council tax as other street residents and hence should be treated similarly (and not discriminated against). 07876 658243

I AGREE LONDON ROAD MUST BE MADE NO PARKING, THIS IS A SAFETY ISSUE. I DO NOT AGREE WITH RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING FOR THE ROADS INDICATED AS THIS WILL INCREASE THE PRESSURE FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND MOVE THE PROBLEM TO ANOTHER AREA.

Stratford Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I personally would like all your proposals that you have sent to me to take effect as the parking in this area is overrun by vehicles that are not residence here. The vehicles that are parking are turning up from 5.30a.m. in the morning so that they secure a parking space. Those of us who have to cross the roads put our lives at risk as we cannot see oncoming traffic. It is the same if you are driver trying to come out of a side turning there are too many cars parked on the main road you cannot see properly.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully support the proposal. As a buggy user I find it really frustrating when people park their cars on the sidewalks of London road between Caitlin street and Stratford way and I have to go onto the road with the baby as I can't pass! I am sure there are more mums in the area that will support this.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the course of the last 6 months there has been a big increase in parking along Station Road adjacent to the bottom of Russell Place &amp; Stratford Way (causing regular traffic congestion) presumably because people can't find room to park in Stratford Way so I wholeheartedly support the Council's proposals.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for addressing our parking problem caused by commuters.  

Please implement the proposed parking restrictions in Stratford Way. It is becoming increasingly difficult for residents to park here and it is not always possible for large vehicles, such as ambulances and refuge trucks, to access the road.  

If the proposals for Stratford Way are supported by the residents, can it be agreed that they can proceed, even if some of the other proposed amendments to Zone R may not be supported?  

We see no problem with the parking situation as it stands. We would not appreciate the restrictions and we do not wish to potentially have to pay for parking permits.  

There aren't any current parking difficulties on our street! We have always been able to find space to park. We are a young family and often have visitors to our property during the day, including work men and childcare. I object to having to pay for myself and visitors to park outside my own home!  

Disagree with all day restrictions Two shorter time slots would be acceptable - morning and afternoon  

Rather than all day 8 to 6 restrictions, would like see two shorter morning and afternoon slots as there are in Boxmoor.  

As a commercial van driver visiting residents all over the south east having permits only 8am to 6pm along the whole street is too restricting. I would propose 2 alternatives A, make the street residents only 11am - 12pm, this would remove the commuters cars but allow residents to have visitors and workmen with vehicles. B, make the street residents only 8am to 6pm but allow pay by phone parking max 2 hour stay again this would remove the commuters but allow genuine visitors and workmen. I am also confused by your proposals along the London Road from the roundabout at Station Road to 130 London Road, according to the plan you have supplied this stretch is subject to an extension of Zone R but you have not defined what this means, will it include any parking restrictions on the stretch? I would like the option to comment further on this when the relevant information has been provided.
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.
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