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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) undertook an informal consultation, with assistance from Project Centre Ltd (PCL) to gain the views of local residents within the proposed Zone W in the Boxmoor area of Hemel Hempstead.

1.2 A total of 130 items of correspondence were received during the consultation. Residents and businesses in and around the study area completed 99 questionnaires and submitted 31 emails.

1.3 The online questionnaire and consultation material offered a proposed parking scheme designed to stop all day commuter parking, whilst also protecting resident parking within the proposed zone. Respondents were asked to indicate if they supported the final set of proposals.

1.4 There were four questions for respondents to answer;
- Do you experience parking problems?
- Do you support the introduction of parking controls?
- If surrounding roads were in favour of the introduction of parking controls, would you wish to be included within the proposed scheme?
- Do you agree with the restrictions for your street?

1.5 Of the 10 roads consulted; 6 were in support of the proposals, with 3 (Adrian Close, Green End Gardens and Green End Road) all indicated 100% support for the proposals, however responses were low from Adrian Close and cannot be considered as a true reflection of opinion within the area. Gravel Hill Terrace indicated 96.3% support, Ashtree Way 80% and Cardy Road 72.2%. Responses were also received from Bargrove Avenue and Gravel Lane, located outside of the consultation area; although recorded for the purpose of the consultation process, cannot be considered as support for the proposals.

1.6 The online questionnaire responses indicated significant support for the introduction of some form of parking controls, with 77% of respondents indicating they agree some form of controls are required.

1.7 A total of 31 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone W). Of these, 2 showed support for the proposals, 14 supported the proposals but with concerns and 11 did not support the proposals. 4 emails containing general enquiries were also received. Of the 14 emails which were received showing ‘support with concerns’, the majority raised objections to the operational time of the proposed on street restrictions.
1.8 The results of the consultation have indicated that the majority of residents who responded were in support of some form of parking controls in their street. It is recommended that DBC should implement the proposed restrictions in those roads showing 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.
- To provide an indication of the level of support for the proposed restrictions for each street within the study area.
- To allow further comments on the related 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 an informal consultation, with assistance from PCL to gain the views of local residents within the proposed Zone W 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 final 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 were 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 A scheme providing parking restrictions that would operate Monday to Friday 10am to 11am and 3pm to 4pm 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 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 130 items of correspondence were received during the consultation. Residents and businesses in and around the study area completed 99 questionnaires and submitted 31 emails.

5.2 99 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 31 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 the online 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 B of this report. For analysis purposes, the comments have been categorised into groups to indicate the types of comments provided. 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 93 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 99% (92) of questionnaire respondents indicated they were residents, 1% (1) indicated they were both a business and a resident within the study area.

6.7 There were four questions for respondents to answer;

- Do you experience parking problems?
- Do you support the introduction of parking controls?
- If surrounding roads were in favour of the introduction of parking controls, would you wish to be included within the proposed scheme?
- Do you agree with the restrictions for your street?
6.8 The following pages provide a breakdown of answers submitted for each question.

**Completed Questionnaire Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking problem</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9 66% (61/93) of the respondents indicated they never experienced parking problems in their street.

6.10 Of the 34% (32/93) that indicated they experience parking issues, 10% indicated there was a parking problem all day, 6% indicated the parking problem was during the day time (9am – 5pm), 14% experience parking problems in the evening and 4% indicated a parking problem in the morning.
6.11 77% (72) of respondents support the introduction of parking controls in their street.

6.12 Should the scheme be implemented in surrounding roads, 83% (77) of respondents would want to be included in a scheme.
6.13 62% (58) of respondents agreed with the proposed Zone W restrictions, 32% disagreed with the proposals, 3% gave no opinion and 2% gave no answer.
6.14 The results from each road within the study area have been individually analysed to determine if there is support for the scheme proposals and introduction of parking controls.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>In Support</th>
<th>Not in support</th>
<th>% support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Close</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Gardens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Hill Terrace</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtree Way</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardy Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Close</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farthings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.16 Of the 10 roads from which responses were received; 6 were in support of the proposals with 3 (Adrian Close, Green End Gardens, and Green End Road) indicating 100% support to the proposals, Gravel Hill Terrace giving 96.3% support, Ashtree Way 80% and Cardy Road giving 72.2%.

6.17 50% of responses from Woodland Close indicated support for the proposals.

6.18 A third of respondents from The Farthings supported the proposals.

6.19 There was no support from respondents of Woodlands Place and Woodlands Avenue.

6.20 The following section provides further analysis of the 93 completed questionnaires. The analysis is reported on a road by road basis.
Of the two responses from Woodlands Place, 1 stated they never experienced problems and 1 respondent stated ‘Evenings’ as the time when parking problems occurred.
6.22 There was no support for the introduction of parking controls from Woodland Place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction of parking controls</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.23 Should the scheme be implemented in surrounding roads, 1 respondent would want to be included in the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.24 Both respondents disagreed with the proposed restrictions for Woodland Place.
Neither respondent experienced parking problems at any time in Adrian Close.

Both respondents supported the introduction of parking controls in Adrian Close.
6.27 Both respondents would want to be included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour.

6.28 Both respondents agreed with the proposed restrictions.
6.29 Of the 10 responses, 6 had never experienced parking problems, 2 stated daytime as the time when problems occur and 2 stated that problems occur all day.

6.30 8 out of 10 respondents supported the introduction of parking controls, 2 did not.
6.31 Should the surrounding roads be in favour then 8 respondents would wish to be included, 1 would not and 1 did not have an opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.32 Of the 10 responses, 5 agreed with the proposed restrictions, 4 disagreed and 1 had no opinion.
6.33 5 out of 10 respondents stated there was never a parking problem in Woodland Close, whilst 5 believed there were problems in the evening.

6.34 Half (5/10) of the respondents supported the introduction of parking controls, whilst the other half were not in support.
6.35 Should the surrounding roads be included in the scheme, then 6 out of the 10 respondents would want to be included, 4 would not.

6.36 Only 3 out of 10 respondents agreed with the proposed restrictions, 7 respondents disagreed.
6.37 The only response from Woodlands Avenue stated there were never parking problems in Woodland Avenue.

6.38 The respondent did not support the introduction of parking controls.
6.39 The respondent would not wish to be included in the scheme should the surrounding roads be included.

6.40 The respondent disagreed with the proposed restrictions.
6.41 The majority of respondents (13/18) stated there were never parking problems in Cardy Road, 1 respondent stated problems occur during the day, 3 stated problems occurred in the evening and 1 believed problems occurred all day.

6.42 13 out of 18 respondents supported the introduction of parking controls in Cardy Road, 5 did not.
6.43 12 respondents would want to be included in the scheme should surrounding roads be in favour, 5 would not want to be included and 1 respondent chose not to answer.

6.44 13 out of 18 respondents agreed with the proposed restrictions, and the remaining 5 disagreed.
6.45 There were a total of 27 responses from Gravel Hill Terrace; of these 21 stated they never experienced parking problems, 1 felt problems occurred during the daytime, 2 experienced problems in the morning and 3 stated problems occurred all day.

6.46 26 out of 27 respondents supported the introduction of parking controls in Gravel Hill Terrace, only 1 did not.
6.47 All respondents (27) would want to be included in the scheme should the surrounding roads be in favour.

6.48 A total of 25 respondents agreed with the proposed restrictions. 1 person did not agree with the proposals and 1 chose not to answer.
Out of a total of 11 responses, 7 stated there were never parking problems, 3 believed problems to occur in the evening and 1 stated problems occurred in the morning.

All respondents (11) supported the introduction of parking controls in Green End Gardens.
6.51 All respondents (11) would want to be included in the scheme should the surrounding roads be in favour.

6.52 Only 10 respondents chose to answer this question, 8 of which agreed with the proposed restrictions. 2 respondents did not agree with the proposed restrictions.

6.53 It should be noted residents requested the parking restrictions to operate all day if the proposed yellow line restrictions for Gravel Hill Terrace were implemented.
There was only 1 response from Green End Road, the respondents believed problems occur during the day.

The respondent is in support of the introduction of parking controls.
6.56 The respondent would like to be included in the scheme should the surrounding roads be in favour.

6.57 The respondent disagrees with the proposed restrictions.
There were 3 responses from The Farthings. 1 respondent never experiences parking problems, 1 stated problems occurred in the evening and 1 stated they experience problems all day.

Of the 3 responses, only 1 was in support of the introduction of parking controls. 2 respondents did not support the introduction of parking controls.
Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the surrounding roads be in favour of the scheme, 2 respondents would want to be included the scheme. 1 respondent did not have an opinion.

**Proposed restriction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed restrictions</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed restrictions</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 3 respondents, 1 agreed with the proposed restrictions and 2 disagreed with the proposals.
Responses from Roads Outside of Consultation Area

Bargrove Avenue  No. of Responses: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking problem</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>All day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.62 Of the 2 respondents, 1 stated they experienced problems parking in the morning, and 1 stated they experienced parking problems all day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction of parking controls</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.63 All respondents (2) were in support of the introduction of parking controls in Bargrove Avenue.
6.64 All respondents would want to be included in the scheme should the surrounding roads be in favour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.65 1 respondent agreed with the proposed restrictions, 1 did not.
Of the 2 responses received, 1 respondent never experiences problems parking and 1 respondent experiences problems during the day.
6.67 1 respondent supported the introduction of parking controls, 1 did not.

Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included within the scheme if surrounding roads were in favour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.68 Should the surrounding roads be in favour of the scheme then 1 respondent would want to be included, 1 would not.

Proposed restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Lane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.69 Neither respondent agreed with the proposed restrictions, 1 disagreed with them and 1 did not have an opinion.
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 B of this report.

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

7.4 The comments fall into 2 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>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do Not Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Most notably from the comments received which were not in support of the parking restrictions, respondents suggested current restrictions are not adequate enough to resolve the parking difficulties, with 22 respondents requesting changes to the current proposed restrictions or that their street be included within the proposals.

7.6 Other notable objections included the belief there were no current parking problems in their street, objection to having to pay the cost of permits and the inadequacies of the station car park to deal with commuter demand.

7.7 Please note that not all completed questionnaires included further comments. 74 individual comments were taken from the 93 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 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 B 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>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Do Not Support Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>General Enquiry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 A total of 31 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone W). Of these, 2 showed support for the proposals, 14 support the proposals but with concerns and 11 do not support the proposals. 4 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 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 significant support for the introduction of some form of parking controls, with 77% of respondents indicating they agree some form of controls are required.

9.2 When presented with the proposals, 62% of online respondents agreed with the proposed parking restrictions for their road. DBC may wish to review the proposed design as a number of residents feel the current proposals do not go far enough to alleviating the existing parking issues or could create parking problems within the zone.

9.3 The proposed single yellow line restriction for Gravel Hill Terrace and Ashtree Way was not well received as residents felt this would be too restrictive.

9.4 There was little or no support received from Woodland Close, The Farthings, Woodlands Place and Woodlands Avenue.

9.5 Response rates were generally low, this may be due to a number of factors such as more properties within the proposed zone have off street parking and residents are not directly affected by vehicles parked on street or residents do not feel there is a parking problem within the area and have decided not to respond to the consultation.

9.6 74 additional comments were made by respondents to the questionnaire; there were 19 comments made in support of the scheme and 55 comments which did not support the scheme. Most notably from the comments received which were not in support of the parking restrictions, respondents suggested current restrictions are not adequate enough to resolve the parking difficulties, with 22 respondents requesting changes to the current proposed restrictions or that their street be included within the proposals.

9.7 A total of 31 emails were received expressing views or opinions on the proposed parking scheme (Zone W). Of these, 2 showed support for the proposals, 14 supported the proposals but with concerns and 11 do not support the proposals. 4 emails containing general enquiries were also received. Of the 14 emails which were received showing ‘support with concerns’ the majority raised objections to the operational time of on street restrictions.
10. RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 The results of the consultation have indicated that the majority of residents who responded were in support of some form of parking controls in their street. Response rates were low for the area and as such cannot be considered as a true reflection of the opinion of all residents within the consultation area.

10.2 Due to the low response rate it is recommended no further action should be taken at this time, DBC may wish to re-consult the roads within proposed Zone W at a later date to determine if there is greater support for the introduction of parking controls.
Quality

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

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

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

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

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.
APPENDIX A – CONSULTATION MATERIAL
MAY 2016

Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Amendments to current parking arrangements in Boxmoor.

Further 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, received a number of comments and requests for additional roads and amendments to the proposals to be considered, as a result we are now conducting a final round of informal consultation with residents to determine if these changes are supported and if they wish to be included within the scheme.

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

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

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: www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/BOXMOOR4

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 process will need to go through a statutory legal process before any work can be implemented.

During this informal consultation period, which will run for 21 days, from 11th May 2016 to 1st June 2016, if you do 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

Plans are also on display in the main reception area corridor at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH and detailed information and drawings are available at The Parking Centre at the same address.

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.

If you have any queries regarding the above please contact us: at the address stated below, or telephone Richard Plant at Project Centre Ltd on 020 7430 6985 or e-mail us at dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk

PTO
Parking Centre
Civic Centre
Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire
HP1 1HH

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 W Online Comments

#### Adrian Close
1. It would make sense to implement Zone G and see its knock-on effects, BEFORE assessing Zone W. I say this, in particular, because I would be surprised if Woodland Ave (being 15 - 20 minutes walk from the station) were to suffer any displacement parking at all from Zone G.  
2. (a) At present, Woodland Ave is used to some extent by visitors to Adrian Close, and for overspill from Adrian Close. However, under the plan, Woodland Ave will be "No waiting 8am - 7pm", which would therefore pose a problem.  
   (b) However, as indicated in paragraph 1 above, it may prove unnecessary to include Woodland Ave in Zone W in the first place, which would avoid the problem.  
   (c) On the other hand, it may prove necessary to include Woodland Ave in Zone W. In this case, two possible solutions come to mind:  
      (i) residents of Adrian Close, even though a private road, could be made eligible for resident permits and visitor vouchers for the north side of Woodland Ave (the south side can remain "No waiting 8am - 7pm").  
      (ii) alternatively, the north side of Woodland Ave could be made "No parking Mon - Fri 10am - 11am or 3pm - 4pm", which would stop commuter parking, whilst allowing to some extent the current parking practices to continue.

#### Ashtree Way

Ashtree Way has wide verges. If the proposal goes ahead and parking restrictions are imposed between 8am and 7pm, is there any way of stopping parking on the verges?

I strongly believe that Ashtree Way should have been included in the original Zone G plan. Residents of Ashtree Way will be impacted much more than residents of most of the other streets included in this Zone W Plan by sheer proximity to station and leading directly off the the street where many commuters are currently causing problems parking on Green End Road. I do not believe the residents of Ashtree Way face the same issues as those of Cardy Road or Woodland Close so grouping responses together would be very misleading. I am extremely concerned that this will result in Ashtree Way being left out of parking controls as the majority of h/holds surveyed will not be greatly impacted by displacement caused by Zone G going ahead. Ashtree Way is a busy cut through from Northridge Way, road and pedestrian safety will be significantly compromised if Zone G goes ahead without restrictions being included for Ashtree Way. While I have answered 'no opinion' of the suggested restriction for in Zone W for Ashtree Way - this is because I am unclear of the thinking behind it being a 'no waiting at anytime' (over other options available). I assume this is because you recognise how busy this road can be and what a hazard parked cars on this road can cause. However, I have a real concern that this would result in cars, delivery vans etc parking on grass verges causing further problems for residents. I would like consideration of which parking restriction would be the least likely to cause this to happen. Otherwise parking restrictions will lead to other knock-on problems for residents.

I agree with the proposal to proposed parking restrictions in Ashtree Way although I believe no waiting between 8am and 7pm is unnecessary. Perhaps no waiting for 1 hour a day (mon-fri) would suffice? Furthermore, what action will be undertaken to avoid cars being parked on the grass verges?
If Ashtree Way were to be included in parking restrictions all of our household are shocked that it is proposed that there would be a complete prohibition on parking on the street between 8am - 7pm all week long. We REQUIRE street parking, as we have many visitors as do our neighbours opposite and next door. Our road is a very wide road and does not necessitate not being allowed to park when we have always done this. It would likely affect the values of our properties and this is absolutely ridiculous. If to avoid commuters using our roads, the council should build a multi-storey carpark near to the train station (and charge sensible prices). If not, at the very least there should be prohibitions similar to Horsecroft Road and Kingsland Road between certain hours, as this would achieve the same effect and residents here would not have to somehow have to find other places to park which in due course would most likely have the same knock on effect.

Ashtree way is already experiencing problems with Cars parking all day on our road due to people going to the Train Station. Our road will obviously get worse if the proposed Zone 'G' is implemented. If Zone 'G' is implemented then you must include Zone 'W'.

I support the plans to extend parking controls to Ashtree Way and Gravel Hill Terrace. However, even if these proposals are not adopted I would strongly urge you to consider restricting parking around the junction of Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Green End Road. This is already a difficult junction for pedestrians to cross (particularly with young children) as it is difficult to see cars coming from Gravel Hill Terrace (often very fast) as the view (from the south west corner of the junction) is obstructed. I fear that if there is a displacement of commuter parking from proposed G-Zone on to this junction it will become very dangerous. I would make similar comments about the junction between Gravel Hill Terrace and Cowper Road.

We don’t think it needs to be an all day restriction but an hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon Monday to Friday would prevent commuter parking.

There is currently a serious commuter parking problem in Green End Road between the St John’s Road/Northridge Way roundabout and Ashtree Way. This makes access to Ashtree Way difficult as during the day only one car can use the road at any one time. People park on both sides and mothers taking their children to St Roses Infants School are sometimes forced to walk on the road because they cannot use the pavement. Visibility for pedestrians crossing the road is very poor. Buses use this road and when one is coming down, cars have to reverse a long way between parked cars in order to give way. This part of Green End Road definitely needs a parking restriction. I am absolutely certain that preventing commuters from parking in Green End Road would displace the parking to Ashtree Way and Gravel Hill Terrace. If this were to happen, it would generate another very dangerous and inconvenient parking problem in Ashtree Way/Gravel Hill Terrace. Problems already arise from the existing parking in Ashtree Way. Cars have to weave in and out in order to get along the road where-ever cars are parked as there is not room for parked cars and two way traffic. The junction between Ashtree Way/GHT and Green End Road is already a difficult junction. The road bends so visibility for cars using the junction is already reduced: if there were cars parked along Ashtree Way/Gravel Hill Terrace, the situation would be positively dangerous. This road junction is already dangerous for pedestrians as cars driving from Gravel Hill Terrace and turning left down into Green End Road approach the junction quite fast but cannot be seen by pedestrians approaching from the opposite direction, from Ashtree Way crossing Green End Road into Gravel Hill Terrace. Ashtree Way/Gravel Hill Terrace is a walking route for students going to Hemel Hempstead School (my own included) and Boxmoor School and they have to cross Green End Road at the tricky junction. The houses in Ashtree Way have garages and off street parking. Many houses have enlarged their off-street parking since they were originally built and have room for two or more cars on their drives. Reversing out of drives onto Ashtree Way is already difficult because of cars parked either opposite (thus restricting road width) on the same side (seriously restricting visibility). Accidents happen. We are aware of two incidents of cars hitting a tree and one of someone hitting a car parked directly outside our house. We have had several ‘near misses’ trying to reverse out of the drive. WE WISH TO VERY STRONGLY SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL THAT PARKING IS NOT PERMITTED IN ASHTREE WAY BETWEEN 8AM & 7PM.

Please could you make sure that double yellow lines are extended well beyond the immediate intersections with these roads and the roundabout. In particular the Green End Road/Roundabout intersection where there is an 'island' between the carriageways of Green End Road - cars park right on the roundabout making it very difficult to pass, in particular for the bus which comes down Green End Road and turns left at the roundabout along St John’s Road.

My job implies people parking on the road in front of the house during the day as I teach the violin at home. I could lose students if parking wasn't authorised during day time.
### Bargrove Avenue

We support the lighter proposals of 9-10 and 2-3 for Bargrove Avenue. We do not support the full proposal of 8-5.

Some parts of Bargrove are more affected by parking than others. At the entrance to the street parked cars cause cause difficulty accessing driveways, parking on yellow lines during school times pose a danger to pedestrians crossing the road and pushchairs/mobility scooters have to go into the road. I support the parking restrictions all day as Bargrove Avenue is a residential street and cannot safely cope with the increased traffic that occurs during school drop off and pick up times.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cardy Road

Based on the proposals this is not a long term solution to solve the parking issues for station users and will only ‘defer’ the issue to other streets not included in the proposal. The core issue that needs addressing is increasing the amount of parking at the Station (Which has actually decreased in recent years) and having a fair charging solution for this parking.

As the proposed restriction for Cardy Road is one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon I do not think there should be a charge if Dacorum wishes to implement the parking zone. At the moment we have people from the new housing in Albion Close and business vehicles from The Farthings, park in Cardy Road because of restrictions already in place. Dacorum needs to provide better parking facilities near the Railway Station rather than moving the parking issues further afield.

It is essential to resolve the problems in Green End Road. At times neither trucks nor buses can get through. Parents parking for the school are as much to blame as commuters leaving cars all day. The school (St Roses) has ample grounds to develop a ‘drop off’ system. Many schools have already done this! Boxmoor school also could develop a ‘drop off’ system.

We don’t feel that Cardy Road has any significant parking problems, and we do not anticipate that commuters would want to park this far away from the railway or bus stations. Also, we were not included in the informal consultation held last year, so we did not know that permit parking was being considered for our road. I have not received any reply to my email asking how much a permit would be likely to cost each household; this was not indicated on the letter that was sent out.

I think it is wrong headed to address the basic problem - reconciling genuine commuter need and resident need - by parking restrictions that push commuters from one area to another and all the time further away from the rail station. This policy will, potentially, have negative consequences for the town (e.g. why would someone who has to commute want to live in Hemel if they can’t get to the station etc). The Council should really be providing parking at a reasonable cost for commuters close to the station. The corner of Boxmoor in front of station would be an ideal parking area. If restrictions were to go ahead I also don't understand the logic of restrictions in various roads, including mine, from Monday to Friday between 10-11am and 3-4pm. Why not just 12am to 1pm? It would be simpler to understand and I suspect achieve the same objective just as effectively.

I feel that this is the thin end of the wedge. Will our council then decide that the whole of Boxmoor will be parking for permit holders only. They may even extend the hours for permit holders only parking. Increase the cost of the permits beyond any measure like CPI, claiming that it is in the resident’s interest. Is this a revenue generating exercise?

Agree that residents of private roads (who are usually the cause of the parking difficulties in Cardy Road) should not be able to participate in the scheme.

There are sometimes a few cars at the top of cardy road, but its a 15-18 min walk down to the station from cardy and that would surely deter some parkers.

Parking in Woodland Avenue especially on the bend in the road is highly dangerous as visibility is restricted. Drivers must be made to slow down at this point and I welcome the reminder which is clearly visible. To clear the road of parked vehicles would greatly improve the visibility problem here.

Cowper Road and Green End Road are terrible all day at the moment and need to be sorted. The opening stretch of Cardy Rd and parts of Gravelhill Terrace/Woodland Avenue are also dangerous due to parking. Something certainly needs to be done.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gravel Hill Terrace**

With restricted parking, we would like confirmation that we can have day permits for our visitors to park. Parking is sometimes slightly awkward but will be impossible if commuters are forced into our street from restrictions in surrounding streets.

> With restricted parking, we would like confirmation that we can have day permits for our visitors to park. Parking is sometimes slightly awkward but will be impossible if commuters are forced into our street from restrictions in surrounding streets.

If Zone G is implemented Gravel Hill Terrace will have to have some parking restrictions. It is a narrow street with a path only on one side for the most part and we would not be able to park on our drive if cars were parked. There would also be a danger to the schoolchildren and pedestrians if the paths were partially blocked. My only concern is if we had visitors at the weekend.

> If Zone G is implemented Gravel Hill Terrace will have to have some parking restrictions. It is a narrow street with a path only on one side for the most part and we would not be able to park on our drive if cars were parked. There would also be a danger to the schoolchildren and pedestrians if the paths were partially blocked. My only concern is if we had visitors at the weekend.

As it is only commuters that will cause a problem when displaced from the adjoining road that you cannot even walk down on the footpaths as cars park on them (buses have immense problems & a fire engine would not be able to get through) is it possible to have unrestricted evening parking still?

> As it is only commuters that will cause a problem when displaced from the adjoining road that you cannot even walk down on the footpaths as cars park on them (buses have immense problems & a fire engine would not be able to get through) is it possible to have unrestricted evening parking still?

I have no comment, as I am not very good at reading the plans. But I am happy enough to rely on the good sense of the organisers and thank them very much.

> I have no comment, as I am not very good at reading the plans. But I am happy enough to rely on the good sense of the organisers and thank them very much.

If Zone G proposals are implemented, we strongly support also having parking controls in Gravel Hill Terrace. Without these controls the high volume of commuter parking and associated substantial disruption would move from Zone G to roads in Zone W, in particular Gravel Hill Terrace.

> If Zone G proposals are implemented, we strongly support also having parking controls in Gravel Hill Terrace. Without these controls the high volume of commuter parking and associated substantial disruption would move from Zone G to roads in Zone W, in particular Gravel Hill Terrace.

Will there be permit parking to allow guests to park outside our house?

> Will there be permit parking to allow guests to park outside our house?

Our house is on the corner of Gravel Hill Terrace and Cardy Road - the latter being considered for permit holders only between certain times. All the houses in Cardy Road have driveways like us, and from time to time we find it useful to be able to park in this road, as do also any of our visitors. So when it comes to applying for permits, I hope we would be able to apply too.

> Our house is on the corner of Gravel Hill Terrace and Cardy Road - the latter being considered for permit holders only between certain times. All the houses in Cardy Road have driveways like us, and from time to time we find it useful to be able to park in this road, as do also any of our visitors. So when it comes to applying for permits, I hope we would be able to apply too.

We are in full agreement with the Council’s proposals. We believe that, if implemented, they need to be controlled much better than current rules seem to be enforced e.g. Vehicles parked partially on double yellow lines, vehicles parked on corners and vehicles causing a hazard by parking on directly opposite sides of roads.

> We are in full agreement with the Council’s proposals. We believe that, if implemented, they need to be controlled much better than current rules seem to be enforced e.g. Vehicles parked partially on double yellow lines, vehicles parked on corners and vehicles causing a hazard by parking on directly opposite sides of roads.

Overall I think that they are pretty well thought out although I foresee that if they are implemented both Gravel Lane and Green End Road (the upper section linked to Gravel Lane) will suffer a serious influx of commuter parking. This factor should be taken into account now.

> Overall I think that they are pretty well thought out although I foresee that if they are implemented both Gravel Lane and Green End Road (the upper section linked to Gravel Lane) will suffer a serious influx of commuter parking. This factor should be taken into account now.

I think that commuters will park in Wrensfield as it is still only a 10 minute walk to the station. There is also an easy path to walk through from Green End Road / Gravel Lane, which leads straight down towards the station and hence may attract commuter parking too.

> I think that commuters will park in Wrensfield as it is still only a 10 minute walk to the station. There is also an easy path to walk through from Green End Road / Gravel Lane, which leads straight down towards the station and hence may attract commuter parking too.

We do not want to see cars parked on the pavement, anywhere.

> We do not want to see cars parked on the pavement, anywhere.

By extending the parking restrictions from the area surrounding the railway station into the residential area, is just pushing the problem further out. What alternatives are being offered for commuters who need to drive to the station? We live close enough to walk to the station, but are being penalised because of the lack of parking and excessive costs at Hemel Hempstead station.

> By extending the parking restrictions from the area surrounding the railway station into the residential area, is just pushing the problem further out. What alternatives are being offered for commuters who need to drive to the station? We live close enough to walk to the station, but are being penalised because of the lack of parking and excessive costs at Hemel Hempstead station.

If zone G goes ahead it is very important that parking controls in Gravel Hill Terrace are implemented.

> If zone G goes ahead it is very important that parking controls in Gravel Hill Terrace are implemented.

Although we do not suffer any parking problems currently, the Zone W proposals are essential if Zone G is implemented as the problem would merely be moved to our roads. On the downside there have been occasions when we have had major works carried out on our property, we have then parked in the road so that contractors can use the driveway. These proposal would mean having to locate our cars some way from our property and in front of other residents houses.

> Although we do not suffer any parking problems currently, the Zone W proposals are essential if Zone G is implemented as the problem would merely be moved to our roads. On the downside there have been occasions when we have had major works carried out on our property, we have then parked in the road so that contractors can use the driveway. These proposal would mean having to locate our cars some way from our property and in front of other residents houses.

If zone “G” parking is restricted and zone “W” is not, there will be a serious danger point outside 1-5 and 22-26 Gravel Hill Terrace. These properties are on the brow of a hill and traffic traveling in either direction will be unable to see the parked cars. We already have problems if individual cars park in this area.
Whilst I am in favour of parking control in the proposed “Zone W”, I was very surprised to see the proposal for a blanket “No Waiting” zone to be implemented along the entirety of Woodland Avenue, Gravel Hill Terrace and Ashtree Way. Whilst the areas you have suggested for “No waiting at any time” make sense, I would strongly recommend and request the addition of an area opposite the splay into Woodland Close. Here, there is a relatively blind bend, on the brow of a hill, and at a road junction. I have witnessed a number of near-accidents here. Cars (travelling in either direction) frequently straddle the white-lined centre of the road. For the remainder of these three roads, I feel that a “Permit Parking” scheme of some type should be implemented. A blanket “no waiting” makes it difficult or impossible for deliveries, visitors or tradespeople to attend the properties along these roads. A permit scheme, on the other hand, ensures that only those with a genuine reason to park in the vicinity will do so. Talking with owners of properties in roads including Alexandra Road and Astley Road, this seems to be a viable solution to them. A similar scheme should also work for Zone W. I would therefore prefer such a scheme for “Zone W”.

We live on a dangerous corner where school children cross, where Green End Road meets Ashtree Way and Gravel Hill Terrace is a blind corner and cars frequently speed/emergency stop and we feel speed bumps would be helpful to prevent accidents / deaths.

Gravel Lane

The propose plan does not resolve the issue of railway station commuter 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. Cardy Road is further from the station than other surrounding roads, such as Northridge Way, Green End Road, Wrensfield and Gravel Lane. Any scheme that includes Cardy Road must also include these roads or the side effect of displaced commuter parking will otherwise be unacceptable. We understand the need for people to drive to the railway station and propose that a larger and more cost effective car park is provided on railway station land.

The parking zone restrictions must be wider. As they stand, they will only move the problem to Gravel Lane, Robinsfield, Wrensfield and Green End Road and we’re back to square one. These roads also must be restricted otherwise nothing will be achieved.

Green End Gardens

We believe we will disadvantaged by the proposed no waiting restrictions on surrounding roads - notably Gravel Hill Terrace and Ashtree Way. The obvious alternative (nominally overnight) parking option for residents/visitors of these impacted areas will be to park in Green End Gardens - therefore effectively negating any control we (Green End Gardens residents) have on our/visitor parking in our own street!

I am very concerned and do not support the proposal for Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue to become ‘no waiting between 8am and 7pm’ throughout each day and seven days a week. Residents of these roads (and their visitors), have a legitimate need to park on road where drives / on residence parking is insufficient. With the current proposal, these residents will park in Green End Gardens during the weekdays / weekends at times when our restrictions do not apply. As a result, we residents would not be able to park in our own road, despite the requirement to purchase permits. Also, our currently child friendly, safe street scape would more resemble a car park. This would be an unacceptable and intolerable position for us as residents, and one I would not support. I understand the need to deter commuters from parking along Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue, so suggest that their ‘no waiting times’ should mirror ours – i.e. no waiting Monday to Friday between the hours of 10am and 11am and 3pm to 4pm.

Rather than the proposed no waiting 8am-7pm, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue needs to be made permit holder only past this point Mon - Fri 10am-11am and 3pm-4pm so it is brought in line with Cardy Road and Green End Gardens otherwise if no waiting 8am-7pm, the residents on these two roads will always park in Green End Gardens and Cardy Road outside the restrictions making the two roads busy and congested.

100% agree with proposal for Green End Gardens. Our close is currently a lovely quiet close where the children play outside. If we did not have these restrictions the traffic in our close would increase due to the restrictions in the surrounding roads. Noise would increase at all hours as commuters park early in the morning and collect their cars in the afternoon/evening. Also it would be more dangerous for the children playing outside with the increase of traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Watkins</td>
<td>Just wanted to confirm that we are in favour of the Permit scheme in Green End Gardens - However for the scheme to work in our road we must have the same &quot;No Waiting&quot; restriction times as Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue. As it stands people will be able to park when they get back from work after 4pm in Green End Gardens and leave the car in our road overnight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are still fully in favour of the Permit Scheme in Green End Gardens (Richard Plant received unanimous votes and letters from all residents last year via myself) however we must object to the times of the ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions in Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue. For the Scheme to work and be of any benefit to those paying for Permits and Visitor Vouchers then the ‘No Waiting’ times need to be bought in line with the times of the Permit Scheme otherwise Residents/Visitors/Commuters who cannot park in these roads between 8am-7pm will simply park in Green End Gardens after 4pm after returning from work and will be long gone before the enforcement of Permits starting at 10am. There are currently many residents from the Flats at Woodland Avenue who park on the road, they would probably fill our street, just those alone. These points have been discussed with Richard Plant who agrees that this perhaps wasn’t looked at after residents were returning home from work. In order for this scheme to work the enforcement times for both ‘Permit’ and ‘No Waiting’ must be the same or it just isn’t going to work and Permit Holder’s particularly Green End Gardens which comes out onto Gravel Hill/Ashtree Way/Woodland Avenue, we would be swamped with additional cars from these roads alone let alone commuters. Also the ‘No Waiting’ scheme appears to be proposed for weekends too the Permit Roads only run between Mon-Fri, clearly this would cause a huge problem for us in Green End Gardens and we must ask that the Weekend idea for ‘No Waiting’ is scrapped otherwise this scheme is not going to work, if anything the ‘No waiting’ is going to cause more havoc for us in Green End Gardens. The only solution is to have both times and days for ‘Permits’ and ‘No Waiting’ to be exactly the same. We must ask that this is amended immediately and changed to coincide with the times of the Permits, we would be grateful if you could inform us as soon as possible or at least before the consultation period ends. Deborah Watkins - 8 Green End Gardens (the liaison for our residents group in Green End Gardens).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d like the ‘no waiting times’ on Ashtree, Gravel Hill and Woodland to work with our planned permit times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in favour of the Permit scheme in Green End Gardens. I do object to a no waiting restriction in Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue. I will send an email to <a href="mailto:dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk">dacorum-consultation@projectcentre.co.uk</a> with a list of my concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with what is proposed but hope this is linked with a long term strategy for station parking otherwise further restrictions will be required. It would seem sensible if the suggested residential tower adjacent to the station is eventually approved it is linked to a new station car park development with some private funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green End Road</td>
<td>I have lived in Boxmoor for over 40 years and have watched the the most pleasant area of Hemel being progressively clogged with parked cars. It should be maintained as an area that people aspire to live in. It should not be reduced to a parking lot with added ‘rat runs’ for commuters in a hurry. The area for parking restrictions needs to include the upper part of Green End Road/Gravel Lane and possibly surrounding roads. These roads are narrow residential roads. often with grass verges. The current plan will simply push the commuter parking into these roads, thereby spoiling the area and creating problems for local traffic. Commuters will simply park on the footpath causing a dangerous narrowing of the space available for buggies or wheel chairs. This already happens in the lower portion of the road and creates difficulties for vans/lorries/buses as well. Our portion on Green End Road is the dangerous/near blind bend at a point where very many school children cross to access 3 secondary schools and at least 2 primary schools. It is tricky to cross to the cutting with current levels of casual parking. A simple ‘Not between certain times’ notice would be sufficient. Such a scheme exists in Harpenden near the station and shops. The traffic flows and people can park for a short time but not all day. Surely the real answer to this problem is a decent ‘park and ride’ scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Farthings

The farthings is unadopted and has only 5 visitors parking spaces which are always taken up by residents second cars. This means that visitors of ours that can cope with the hill of the farthings have to park in cardy rd. The farthings are also covered by a covenant banning commercial vehicles simply because des ignited parking spaces are too small to cope. I would like too know why roads west of cardy rd. are not in an earlier zone since it is obvious it is the station commuters that you are attacking.

I have written to the parking services team leader about my concerns I have with the proposals. I am parking in an area already effected by parking restrictions and rely on parking in a road which is very vary used by non residents.

Woodland Place

What is the cost of a parking permit per car. Very relevant yet no mention of this important consideration. If parking permits apply how does this effect visitors in terms of cost and convenience as visitors often come casually not at a particular time. It is unfair to ask agreement without cost implications being discussed.

The main problem with parking in Woodland Place (and on Woodland Avenue behind Woodland Place) is due to the people from the Adrian Close parking in both Woodland Place and Woodland Avenue. As Woodland Avenue will a longer restriction rather Woodland Place on parking 1) the residents/visitors from Adrian Close will park in Woodland Avenue resulting in dangerous parking on the corners and 2) no where for our visitors to park. I don't see the need to introduce parking restrictions in the area W. Looking at the map any displacement will go to Crouchfield, Wrensfield etc. Lastly the no waiting at any time should be introduced regardless as there's currently a lot of dangerous parking on the corners already.

Woodland Close

absolutely crazy to consider making gravel hill terrace and ashtree way "no waiting zone" so many residents and their visitors cars will be displaced to the next available parking areas. commuters are more likely to choose to park in gravel lane/green end rd than as far away as i live. Common sense would mean tackling the problem of commuter parking at it's ROOT CAUSE!!! Network Rail must be persuaded to increase the number of car parking spaces at Hemel station. They did so at Berkhamsted. Its just so totally unacceptable that the number of spaces(under 500 for an ever growing town) has not been increased for over 45 years!!!!!!! In addition very few buses go to the station now including the Boxmoor H10/11. There are a lot of people who cannot walk for 20 mins up and down the hills in this area. Please do some "joined up thinking". These parking schemes cause more problems than they solve. If a car is parked in an unsafe manner we have traffic wardens who can ticket the car.

The basis of the problem needs to be addressed ie insufficient & expensive parking at the rail station. Each new restriction pushes the problem to the neighbouring area. If the scheme goes ahead then the restrictions in Woodland Close need to be 24/7 otherwise it will become an overflow for Adrian Close flats & Gravelhill Terrace especially from 16:00-09:00. I suggest that no restriction is necessary in Gravelhill Terrace between Woodland Close & Beechfield Road. This will allow for Adrian Close overflow.

If the aim of the restrictions is to stop commuter parking it is illogical to make Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue a no waiting zone from 8am to 7pm. There is no parking problem on these roads at any time so why make one? Please do not do this. Make Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue Permit holder only the same as the side roads. The restrictions for Woodland Close and Woodland Place MUST match Woodland Avenue, otherwise the cars from Adrian Close that currently park on Woodland Avenue will cause a problem in Woodland Close.

If you are proposing residents permits or visitor vouchers will there be a charge? If so why was the cost of this not stated in the letter/survey? It needed to be stated in the letter and not a referral to the website as not everyone has access. This information is required to make an informed decision. The obvious solution is a multi-storey car park at HH station with reasonable parking charges!

Our preference is to have a much longer parking restriction period as the "no waiting" restriction on woodland avenue and gravel hill terrace will then spill into woodland close and create a separate problem to commuter overspill.
I think Woodland Close should have 24/7 permit parking. At present (Sunday) there are 10-12 cars and 2 lorries parked on Woodland Avenue. The two lorries are parked from late afternoon until the following morning. On Thursday 11.30am there were 12-14 vehicles parked on both sides of Woodland Avenue including 2 vans and one lorry that is parked overnight and during the day. These vehicles will obviously move into Woodland Close when parking restrictions apply. One lorry which is usually parked on the bend of Gravel Hill Terrace/woodland Avenue has recently parked in Woodland Close. **THE ONLY SOLUTION IS 24/7 RESIDENTS PARKING IN WOODLAND CLOSE.**

I do not feel that I am close enough to the station for parking to be an issue. Also if there are restrictions for a couple of hours every weekday, I will have nowhere to park my car while I am at work and will be a huge inconvenience.

1. Where are people supposed to park to pick up their children from Boxmoor primary at 3.15?  
2. Disagree with no waiting restrictions on gravel hill terrace

**Woodland Close**

*The current situation on Woodland Close does not see any unusual activity of commuter parking all day but either residents parking in the street or visitors to residents parking in the street. What is a major road safety issue and cause for concern is the indiscriminate parking by parents dropping children off or collecting children to or from the scout hut during the evenings. The tendency is to park as close as possible to the footpath to the scout hut; including on the entrance to the footpath, both sides of Woodland Close at its junction with Woodland Avenue. Coupled with the street parking on Woodland Avenue by the residents at the recently built dwellings in Adrian Close it is only a matter of time before we have an accident with potential fatal consequences judging by the number of near misses. I appreciate that parents will dropping off or collecting will only be a few minutes but to park both sides of the road effectively blocking the entrance - this is poor lunacy! It would appear to me that the Dacorum Borough Council have not thought this through they are treating the symptoms of the problem, to increase their revenue and not the route cause of the problem, surely the cause is the cost of parking at the station or the availability of sufficient parking space at the station. Other cities with this problem have a "park and ride" facility, surely a cost effective system could be introduced without the necessity for some residents to have to purchase a parking permit to park on their own drive way (on this point I notice that residents in Wrensfield are not included in the scheme is this by design or on the direction of the Council to facilitate their staff and members?) I thank you for the opportunity to comment but do not believe based on their consultation process used before the Adrian Close development the council have any interest in road safety or the interest/opinion of the existing residents in the areas under the parking consultation. The scheme is more than likely to be implemented as the increased revenue the council achieves will help to balance their books, perhaps this additional revenue might spur them into action to provide road surfaces fit for purpose on Beechfield Road, Woodland Avenue, Gravelhill Terrace, and Ashtree Way: we residents live in hope!*

I strongly object to the proposed no waiting 8am-7pm outside woodland Avenue. This would restrict visitors to our home with parking. There does not seem to be a problem with parking currently across the street to our home. It is utilised periodically throughout the day, and more so in the evening with people home from work, and when the scout house behind our properly has their meetings. I haven’t struggled to get a park when needed, therefore don’t see the need to restrict it. If it was restricted, a resident permit parking would be more preferable to no parking during the day, so as not to disadvantage the current residents.
Email Comments

Adrian Close

1. It would make sense to implement Zone G and see its knock-on effects, BEFORE assessing Zone W. I say this, in particular, because I would be surprised if Woodland Ave (being 15 - 20 minutes walk from the station) were to suffer any displacement parking at all from Zone G.
2. (a) At present, Woodland Ave is used to some extent by visitors to Adrian Close, and for overspill from Adrian Close. However, under the plan, Woodland Ave will be "No waiting 8am - 7pm", which would therefore pose a problem.
   (b) However, as indicated in paragraph 1 above, it may prove unnecessary to include Woodland Ave in Zone W in the first place, which would avoid the problem.
   (c) On the other hand, it may prove necessary to include Woodland Ave in Zone W. In this case, two possible solutions come to mind:
      (i) residents of Adrian Close, even though a private road, could be made eligible for resident permits and visitor vouchers for the north side of Woodland Ave (the south side can remain "No waiting 8am - 7pm")
      (ii) alternatively, the north side of Woodland Ave could be made "No parking Mon - Fri 10am - 11am or 3pm - 4pm", which would stop commuter parking, whilst allowing to some extent the current parking practices to continue.

Ashtree Way

Hi Richard further to our conversation last week can you please advise me on where I am supposed to park my very heavy van if a parked restriction is put in place outside my house at 30 Ashtree way Boxmoor Hemel hp11qs. As mentioned I am home everyday from 4 pm as I do the school run. My van has all ready ruined my original drive which I am replacing at the moment with a much more expensive one. I always park outside my house and have done for a few years. I await your early response on this matter.

See attached letter in email

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the proposed parking plans.
We agree that Zone G needs implementing but it will definitely result in displacement commuter parking in Ashtree Way and Gravel Hill Terrace. These roads are used as rat-runs by drivers with little regard to the speed limit, and as there is a bend in Ashtree Way we can foresee an increase in the number of accidents on this road if commuter parking is allowed.
Whilst we realise that any restrictions will inconvenience us to some extent it might be best to limit parking from 10am-11am and 3pm-4pm on Monday to Friday which would prevent commuters from parking all day.
We are also concerned about the parking all day on the London Road from the junction with Roughdown road to Stratford Way. Not only do they make it very difficult for lorries and Buses to get through but they are blocking the pavement so that pedestrians have to walk on the road.

As residents of Ashtree Way we are broadly in agreement with the parking restriction proposals, however we have two concerns, specifically relating to Ashtree Way
The plan proposes to have no waiting on Ashtree Way between 8am and 7pm.
Is it really necessary to have this in place at weekends? It appears the the scheme is aimed at stopping commuter parking, so would parking restrictions from Monday-Friday be adequate. This would lessen the impact on weekend visitors to Ashtree Way.
Ashtree Way has wide grass verges. If no waiting restrictions are put in place, what prevents parking on the verges?
We are residents in Ashtree Way and have just received the letter regarding parking in Boxmoor. We were aware of proposals to introduce residents parking in what we now know to be the G-Zone. We have only just (obviously) been informed of the proposals for additional roads including Ashtree Way into a proposed Zone W, where it would appear you are proposing to prohibit parking on our street between 8am and 7pm Monday to Sunday!! Can you clarify what is meant on the legend as “Proposed no waiting 8am – 7pm”. We have always used the road for parking, as we are a large family and have many visitors using their cars as do many of our neighbours! We find it outrageous, given that other streets are proposed to have permit holding between 10am and 11am and 3pm to 4pm, to suggest that we are not allowed to use our street for parking at all and that any visitors who may come to us and wish to leave their cars overnight would have to pick them up before 8am!

We are strongly opposed to this absolute prohibition. Ashtree Way is an wider than usual street and we do not see that it is viable for our visitors and family would have to find spaces on surrounding roads, which we suspect will eventually also become part of a parking zone.

Please can you clarify exactly what the proposal is and also the full reasoning behind it and who has decided that this is a viable proposition.

Cardy Road

Could you please answer the following questions:

1. Are residents parking permits linked the address or car? We are concerned that as our company cars are changed on a regular basis there may be a cost to change the details if the permits are linked to registration numbers.
2. Will we able to park over the entrance to our drive (where there is a dropped kerb) without a permit?
3. What is your rationale for proposing this change for Cardy Road but not Wrensfield? Wrensfield is closer to the station than Cardy Road and station parkers would potentially have to drive past Wrensfield to get to Cardy Road - this does not make sense.
4. If displacement parking affects Wrensfield how are those residents affected? Is it “unlikely that the council will consult again for a number of years” for them too? If this is not the case why can't Cardy Road residents have the same chance to wait and see what happens?

I look forward to your early response.

As a resident of Cardy Road I have recently received a letter concerning the proposed extension of parking restrictions from G-Zone to an area edged in red on the plan and I believe called W-Zone. That zone incorporates Cardy Road.

I will complete the online questionnaire. Before I do so, perhaps you can clarify a few points for me.

What does “no waiting” actually mean? For example, would it be illegal to drop someone off? What about buses where there are no official stops eg on Gravel Hill Terrace and Green End Road? What about taxis? What about the huge number of delivery vehicles/couriers or service engineers that visit a road daily etc?

The proposed parking restrictions in Cardy Road, Woodland Place and Woodland Close seem overly complicated, and particularly so if they are at different times to other roads in the area. Restricting parking just between 12am and 1pm would seem to me work just as well if the objective is to deter commuters. Is there a specific reason for having two restricted times?

What is the current cost of resident permits and visitor vouchers where such systems are already in place and how have those costs changed since those schemes were introduced?

Just as a matter of interest, why is Wrensfield, Gravel Lane, Gravel Close etc not included? They will become popular parking areas for commuters if X and W-Zones go ahead.

Thanks

Could you please tell us what the proposed annual resident permit fee is likely to be if the scheme is introduced in Cardy Road? Also, would that be per household or per car, and what protection would residents have against uncontrolled increases in fees over future years?
We recently received your letter regarding the proposed introduction of residents parking in Boxmoor. We were shocked to see that you are proposing that there be no waiting along Gravel Hill Terrace from 8am to 7pm. We strongly object on the following grounds:

1) This would make it difficult when we have visitors. Even if we bought visitor parking permits that would put additional pressure on residents parking places in adjoining roads.
2) With no cars parked along Gravel Hill Terrace cars are likely to be travelling faster & make it more difficult & dangerous for pedestrians to cross the road.
3) There is at least one house along Gravel Hill Terrace that has regular Health Visitors & it would hamper their task if they had to park further away.
4) There are many mature trees along Gravel Hill Terrace. How are Tree Surgeons to work on them?

Please reconsider your proposals. Thank you.

For the avoidance of doubt we did not sign the petition requesting the extension of residents parking to Gravel Hill Terrace.

My name is [redacted]. I am the Liaison for the Permit Parking for Green End Gardens, Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead. I sent documents from every resident last year, with a unanimous vote and signed letters to include Green End Gardens into the above Permit Scheme. Thank you for now included us in the scheme. I spoke to Richard Plant yesterday with regards to the new proposal which concerns the road at the top of ours which runs through, Gravel Hill Terrace, Ashtree Way, Woodland Avenue, please see the following that was discussed with Richard and my neighbours who are all of the same opinion and will be contacting you with the same objections regarding the timings of the ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions:-

We are still fully in favour of the Permit Scheme in Green End Gardens however we must object to the times of the ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions in Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue. For the Scheme to work and be of any benefit to those paying for Permits and Visitor Vouchers then the ‘No Waiting’ times need to be bought in line with the times of the Permit Scheme otherwise Residents/Visitors/Commuters who cannot park in these roads between 8am-7pm will simply park in Green End Gardens after 4pm after returning from work and will be long gone before the enforcement of Permits starting at 10am. Also at weekend that would be free to park in our road at all times. There are currently many residents from the Flats at Woodland Avenue who park on the road, they would probably fill our street, just those alone. These points have been discussed with Richard Plant who agrees that this perhaps wasn’t looked at after residents were returning home from work. In order for this scheme to work the enforcement times for both ‘Permit’ and ‘No Waiting’ must be the same or it just isn’t going to work and Permit Holder’s particularly Green End Gardens which comes out onto Gravel Hill/Ashtree Way/Woodland Avenue, we would be swamped with additional cars from these roads alone let alone commuters. Also we note that the Permits run Mon-Fri yet the proposal for ‘No Waiting’ appears to run through the weekends, this would cause Green End Gardens a huge problem, this would cause all vehicles from this busy through road of 3 different streets with no parking during those times to park in our road, we would be even worse off than we are before permits, it would completely defeat the object. The only solution is for the ‘Permits’ and the ‘No Waiting’ to completely mirror each other in both days and times ie run from Mon-Fri between 10-11am and 3-4pm otherwise this scheme is simply not going to work, it would infact cause more parking problems for us in Green End Gardens even without the commuter element. As a group of residents we must ask that this is amended immediately and changed to coincide with the times of the Permits, we would be grateful if you could inform us as soon as possible or at least before the consultation period ends, this is going to be extremely important to us and therefore we must ensure that our road is not going to become a car park for the additional vehicles caused by the ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions.

I would be grateful if you could contact me as soon as possible so that I can go back to the group with some factual information.
Thank you for your consulting us regarding the proposals for Zone W which my wife and I have reviewed with interest. Our feedback is as follows below.

We are happy and fully in favour of the plan to include Green End Gardens in the resident’s scheme at our request. However, we are very concerned and do not support the proposal for Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue to become ‘no waiting between 8am and 7pm’ throughout each day and seven days a week.

There are residents of these roads (and their visitors) who need to park on the road, as not all drives are big enough / parking is unavailable, so this would result in those cars parking in Green End Gardens during the weekdays and at the weekends at times when our restrictions do not apply.

This would mean a situation where we as residents would not be able to park in our own road, despite the requirement to purchase permits. Also, our currently child friendly, safe streetscape would more resemble a car park.

As I’m sure you can appreciate, this would be an unacceptable and intolerable position for us as residents, and one we would not support.

We fully understand the need to deter commuters from parking along Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue, so suggest that the scheme be amended so that their ‘no waiting times’ should mirror what is proposed for resident permits – i.e. no waiting Monday to Friday between the hours of 10am and 11am and 3pm to 4pm.

Thank you for taking the time to gather feedback, and we look forward to your response.

I am still in favour of the Permit Scheme in Green End Gardens however I object to the times of the ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions in Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue.

For the Scheme to work and be of any benefit to those paying for Permits and Visitor Vouchers then the ‘No Waiting’ times need to be bought in line with the times of the Permit Scheme otherwise Residents/Visitors/Commuters who cannot park in these roads between 8am-7pm will simply park in Green End Gardens after 4pm after returning from work and will be long gone before the enforcement of Permits starting at 10am.

There are currently many residents from the Flats at Woodland Avenue who park on the road, they would probably fill our street, just those alone. In order for this scheme to work the enforcement times for both ‘Permit’ and ‘No Waiting’ must be the same and Permit Holder’s particularly Green End Gardens which comes out onto Gravel Hill/Ashtree Way/Woodland Avenue, would be swamped with additional cars from these roads.

I agree that your proposal will certainly stop commuters parking their cars in boxmoor. I also feel that it will move cars from elsewhere in boxmoor over to Green Gardens/Cardy Road/Woodland Close as soon as 4pm is over and we will just become the car park for other residents who can no longer park on Woodland Avenue.

Rather than the proposed no waiting 8am-7pm, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue needs to be made permit holder only past this point Mon - Fri 10am-11am and 3pm-4pm so it is brought in line with Cardy Road and Green End Gardens otherwise if no waiting 8am-7pm, the residents on these two roads will always park in Green End Gardens and Cardy Road outside the restrictions making the two roads busy and congested.

I am in full support for permit holder parking in Green End Gardens
Whilst reluctantly agreeing to support the permit parking scheme in Green End Gardens (as an act of self-preservation in the light of appalling mismanagement of parking in the Boxmoor area), I believe residents of Green End Gardens will be disadvantaged by the proposed timings of ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions in Ashtree Way, Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue. For any parking proposals to be viable they need to take into effect the impact on surrounding streets. Green End Gardens residents paying for permits and visitor vouchers could be entirely compromised as a result of the proposed ‘No Waiting’ times in adjacent streets who are likely to simply park in Green End Gardens after 4pm and could leave vehicles overnight before the enforcement of permit parking the following morning starting at 10am. Should parking at the recently built flats at Woodland Avenue have been adequately considered then the current situation of on street parking on Woodland Avenue could have been avoided. Instead the only thought process evident appears to be to simply pass the issue on? Where are these vehicles going to be parked given a ‘no waiting’ restriction?

I am advised these points have already been discussed with Richard Plant who is in agreement that this deserves reconsideration? Perhaps a realignment of enforcement times for both ‘permit’ and ‘no waiting’ might be a start?

Another concern is the proposal to alter street parking arrangements on Green End Road. Again, what consideration is being given to the dozens of cars who park here on a daily basis prior to walking to the station? Where do you think they might now park? What consideration is being given to the parents of those dropping children at St.Roses School?

In short, this is a continuation of a unsatisfactory process whereby issues (perhaps cost driven?) around station parking have simply been moved up the surrounding streets rather than being addressed at source! Residents such as us pay a premium council tax levy which is completely undermined when faced by the prospect of a) Having to pay for permits for visitor parking b) the likelihood our cul-de-sac being full of parked vehicles from surrounding streets, or from station commuters. I am not satisfied impact analysis has taken place sufficient to address all current issues, and to adequately consider residents parking needs. I suggest a thorough reconsideration is required?

The Farthings

I am writing with my concerns of the proposed parking restrictions in Cardy Road.

As a resident of The Farthings we rely on parking one of our two cars in Cardy Road as we have one allocated parking space per household, and only five parking spaces for visitors. In a road of approximately 20 households or so.

I was very surprised that there is a suggestion of a parking permit in this road, Cardy road houses all have drives for 1 or 2 cars and most of them have garages so are not suffering any parking issues. It is only used my Cardy Road and residents of The Farthings. During the day you will see very few cars parked along the road, which suggests that the road is not being used by people parking for the station or for the town centre. Which makes me think that parking scheme is to stop a very small amount of cars from The Farthings parking in the road.

I would like to know the reasons why this has been proposed and by who?
Where you would suggest my Husband parks his car?
Would you offer parking permits to residents of The Farthings?

As I mentioned before we are very limited on parking and I have concerns for family and friends visiting if we are not issued with a permit we will not be able to have parking vouchers to give out when we have people visiting etc.

I am very much aware that many roads benefit from this scheme and can see that it is nesesscary for certain areas. I am extremely worried that this will effect where we can park our car, we will have to park our car in Wrens field which is a 5 minute walk to our home.

Please re think putting parking restrictions on this very quite no through road as it is not needed.

I would be very happy to show the parking in TheFarthings so you are fully aware of the parking situation.

I look forward to a reply to my questions, and would very much like to be kept up to date in this parking issue as it has such an impact on where we live.
We live at 9 Woodland Avenue, at the East end of Zone W. This house has its own garages and parking space. We would naturally benefit from any or all of the suggestions you make and thus are entirely in favour of your suggestions.

In view of the number of vehicles parked on Woodland Avenue during the day and overnight, I would stress that Woodland Close needs permit parking 24/7. Woodland Avenue now is virtually one lane only for moving traffic. When lorries, particularly, park on the bend of Gravel Hill Terrace late afternoon through until the following morning, cars turning into Woodland Close have no option other than to move to the right hand side of the road without being able to see oncoming traffic. This is an accident waiting to happen!

Woodland Close can hardly cope with residents’ parking. There is certainly no space for parking for residents of Adrian Close, Woodland Avenue or Gravel Hill Terrace to park here, which they already try to do and will, no doubt, if your present proposals are enforced.

Only parking permits 24 hours a day, 7 days a week will ensure that we can park in our own street!

I vividly remember a meeting when the proposed plans for the development - now Adrian Close - were discussed. It was pointed out that there was not enough parking there for the number of units. Even Mike Penning said how dangerous it would be for vehicles to be parked anywhere near the top of Woodland Avenue. We were also told that traffic calming measures would be put in place.

You, as a council, are permitting more property developments without sufficient parking places. That, added to the unbelievable numbers of commuters parking in the vicinity, is creating nothing but chaos on our roads......and footpaths! Perhaps try to enforce development of multi storey car parking at the station rather than yet more multi storey housing developments.

24/7 permit parking for Woodland Close PLEASE.

I would like to express my objection to the planned parking restrictions in relation to Woodland Avenue, Boxmoor. As a resident I currently don't have any problems obtaining a parking spot outside our home or across the road from our home. The proposal would restrict the street to no waiting 8am-7pm which would significantly disadvantage my household if parking near our home is needed during these hours. We quite often have visitors during the day, and there does not seem to be a current problem with the parking on the street. It is utilised periodically throughout the day, and more so in the evening when the nearby scout house has meetings and people are returning home from work. Taking the parking away during the day will force more cars into the permit holder only areas, therefore making parking more congested and not as easy to obtain, forcing residents and their visitors to park further away or struggle for parking altogether. If the restrictions were to come into place, permit holder parking would be preferable across woodland avenue as an alternative to no parking at all.
### Restriction Times

The proposed restriction times of 10:00-12:00 and 14:00-16:00 are unfair on the local residents. They are also almost certainly unnecessarily restrictive. These would be the times when a daytime meeting would be arranged (be it a coffee morning or as in my case a committee meeting). I assume that the restrictions are being introduced to discourage parking for people travelling by train. If the restrictions were over lunch hour this would discourage all but a very few of these. In addition, perhaps a short restriction at the beginning and end of the day.

One possible set would be 8:30-9:30, 12:30-13:30 and 16:30-17:30. I have not suggested 12:00-14:00 for reasons set out below (U3A).

### Safety

The join between Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue is very dangerous as, from the West it is a blind corner immediately followed by a steep hill. To allow parking on this corner and given the traffic speed is an accident waiting to happen. I feel that parking should not be allowed on either side here rather than only on the south side. This should probably finish opposite the end of Woodland Close.

You should note here that, when planning permission was granted for Adrian Close, we were assured that traffic calming measures would be introduced. This could be part of those measures.

### U3A

The University of the Third Age is an educational charity for elderly people. The Dacorum branch is supported by the Borough Council and the Mayor is the President. The education takes place in halls or private homes normally in the morning or afternoon. Although there are currently no meetings in the immediate area, there are meetings in Wrensfield and St Francis Church Hall just outside the area. Unless there is a good reason to the contrary, it is important that parking is available anywhere in Dacorum during the morning and afternoon, especially in areas with poor public transport. It is also important that the parking is available before the meeting starts and after it ends.

### With reference to the proposed new parking zones ('W' for example) would I be expected to purchase residents permits for parking on my own driveway and not on the road? Nothing about permits is mentioned within the letter put through our door from Project Centre Ltd, not very good PR.

I am very concerned that the proposed parking restrictions must not go ahead in their current form.

I live in Woodland Close. We do not currently have a regular parking problem but this proposal will certainly create one. - this is why:

A relatively large number of vehicles belonging to residents from Adrian Close park on Woodland Avenue between 4pm and 8am. The proposal to make Woodland Avenue a ‘no waiting zone from 8am to 7pm’ will push all these vehicles into Woodland Close and Woodland Place when people arrive back from work before 7pm, with most of these then remaining during the evening and overnight.

If the aim of the restrictions is to stop commuter parking it is illogical to make Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue a ‘no waiting zone from 8am to 7pm’. Please do not do this - please make Gravel Hill Terrace and Woodland Avenue ‘Permit holder only’ the same as proposed for the side roads. In short the restrictions for Woodland Close and Woodland Place MUST match Woodland Avenue.
**Woodland Place**

I live at Woodland Place, Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead. I am disabled (unable to walk un-aided) as of 2014 and am being looked after by my two daughters who each have a car and need a parking space at my house. I also have visits from carers and others during the day who come to look after me. Additionally, due to my mobility issues I have recently been advised that I should consider entering my house via the side entry gate (as the main entrance has a high step), which means whoever is transporting me needs to be able to park the car directly in front of my front garden and house - a proposed permit holder zone. This zone has and is being used by my daughters and visitors to park their cars. 

The proposed permit holder only past this point Mon-Fri 10 am -11am and 3pm to 4pm to be applied to Woodland Place, Boxmoor is therefore going to adversely impact on how I am being looked after and how easily I and people who look after me can come and go. Not only is a proposed permit required for the above hours for parking in front of my house (I am presuming only 1 permit is needed to cover all visitors and residents? - please confirm) but I am also concerned about the overflow of parking which could occur from Adrian Close/Woodland Avenue outside the proposed permit hours (i.e. this concerns non commuter based overflow parking into the cul de sac ), which would also impact on the parking in front of my house and in front of the other houses in the cul de sac too. 

Please can you therefore take the above concerns into account? I strongly feel that the parking zone directly in front of my front garden and house should be allocated 24/7 and solely for the use of my household going forwards given my circumstances.

---

**Wrensfield**

With reference to the above I wish to object to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. The consultation was restricted to the residents of the roads contained in the ‘study area’ without due regard for the residents in the obvious displacement zone ie Wrensfield.
2. It is suggested that this is both unconstitutional and a reckless disregard of the right of quiet enjoyment to the residents in Wrensfield.
3. In particular at the south end of Wrensfield, where there are large frontages and uninterrupted kerbs, this will attract commuter parking that will destroy the outlook for residents and will cause further traffic problems to add to the already ‘cut through’ that drivers use to get to and from Warners end.
4. The proposed establishment of the residents parking zone will displace the problem to one of the nicest and most expensive residential roads in Hemel Hempstead- the premium that we pay to live in Wrensfield should be protected by the council to ensure that Hemel Hempstead has a variety of residential areas to attract a broad and diverse workforce and investment to the town.
5. Residents and bone fides visitors in Wrensfield already cause problems with cars parking in the road causing passing problems to the flow of traffic.
6. It is noted that Cardy Road is included in the ‘study area’, which is further away from the station than Wrensfield and therefore we would like to know why Wrensfield has been omitted.

We therefore request the following:
1. Consultation with the residents of Wrensfield - we did not receive letters and did not know about the consultation in November
2. Either no parking restrictions or an inclusion to consult Wrensfield residents into being included in the ‘study area’
3. A more appropriate solution to the commuter parking problem- restricted parking between 11am and 2pm only on ALL residential roads within a 1.5 mile radius of the station

To conclude, we strongly object to the proposal as it stands and believe that the inclusion of Wrensfield to be a reckless act by the council and fails to safeguard residents in Wrensfield who have not been consulted. Such actions are both unconstitutional and discriminatory to a ‘particular group’ of residents ie Wrensfield residents.
It has been brought to our attention that there are proposals to introduce residents parking in the Boxmoor area. We agree this is a good plan as some of the roads such as Green End Lane are becoming dangerous with commuter parking for the station, however we have concerns about the displacement parking this may cause.

With the roads that the proposals cover there is a definite potential that parking could be displaced further up into Boxmoor – including the south end of Wrensfield. Wrensfield could also be affected by parking for vehicles displaced from Woodland Avenue – especially if Cardy Road has restricted parking.

We would therefore request that should the plan go ahead – the effect on Wrensfield is considered and that that it is included in the plans. A short part of the day with a restriction should be sufficient – possible 10-12 each morning to prevent all day parking for the station, however longer restrictions may be required if Woodland Close and Cardy Road have all day restrictions – to deal with the issues of the displaced parking for Adrian Close which currently occurs in Woodland Avenue. We would like to point out that this issue was caused by allowing plans for the development of the convent without sufficient parking, in 2012/13 – a point raised by many local residents at the time.

I have several comments/objections to the new parking zones G and W proposed for the Boxmoor area.

1. It is assumed that many (but not all) of the individuals displaced by the proposed parking restrictions (Zone G and W) will simply move further from the station to an unrestricted zone. The basis appears to be that if one proceeds further and further from the station eventually commuters will not park as they have too far to walk. Assuming also that the majority of those parking are commuters using the station.

2. Cardy Road has been included in the restricted parking zone but not Wrensfield yet Cardy Road is further from the station. If Cardy road is considered as a potential parking area then so must Wrensfield.

3. Wrensfield is used as a short cut by many travelling to Warners End shopping center or to Potten End. All day parking would make it hazardous for residents to use their cars. This would encourage parking on pavements or the grass verge at the side of the road to allow greater room for car drivers in Wrensfield. Pedestrians would be restricted in the use of pavements and cars on grass verges would bring mud on to the street.

4. Parking in non restricted zones could be reduced by simply allowing free parking except at specified times during the day say 1 to 3 pm. This would allow local businesses to flourish and prevent all day unrestricted parking.

5. The consultation appears to have been confined to only those resident in the areas considered for new parking restrictions. This despite the fact that those displaced would simply move to an unrestricted parking zone. I only found out about the ones proposed in discussions with neighbours. Presumably this was an attempt to reduce criticism of the proposals. A more widespread consultation on this very important topic is required including the areas adjacent to the proposed no parking zones.
Following an earlier email which I sent regarding the effect that the introduction of the Zone would have on Wrensfield I have been able to take some photographs which illustrate the effect that street parking would have on Wrensfield especially at the end of Wrensfield where it joins Gravel Hill Terrace. Copies of the photographs are attached.

This evening a function took place at a hall on Gravel Hill Terrace. The hall has insufficient parking space so a number of people parked cars in Wrensfield in the location mentioned above.

Photo No.10
Shows the non-resident parked cars on the West side of Wrensfield looking towards Gravel Hill Terrace with car proceeding West towards the junction

Photo No.11
The car has progressed towards the junction with Gravel Hill Terrace and another car is approaching in the opposite direction

Photo No.12
The car shown in Photo No.10 has to pull into Linden Glade to allow the car proceeding East to pass

Photo No.13
The road is now clear but shows how narrow is Wrensfield.

Photo No.14
A view looking East again showing the narrowness of Wrensfield.

I trust these photographs illustrate the effect that unrestricted parking in Wrensfield would have on traffic which passes through Wrensfield en route from the West of Hemel Hempstead to Warners End and Potten End as it avoids the congestion at the Magic Roundabout. This is in addition to the general degradation of the so called Birdland of which Wrensfield is a part.

I would point out that the council are spending millions, no doubt on re-vamping the Water Gardens in order to improve the town's image. Parking in Wrensfield would seem to be taking this area, which is an outstanding 1960's development in the opposite direction.

Yours sincerely