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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 Following completion of issues and design consultations, Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) appointed Project Centre (PC) to prepare Traffic Regulation Orders for the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ’s) in both Apsley and Boxmoor.

1.2 Statutory consultation commenced in both locations on 18th September 2013 and in accordance with the The Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, ran until 16th October 2013.

1.3 In total, 145 responses were received supporting the proposed Boxmoor CPZ of which 71 were individual letters or emails in support of the proposals (69 from within the zone, 2 from outside) and 74 individual properties were signatories to a petition in support of the proposals (all from within the zone).

1.4 A total of 19 responses were received stating objections and a further 13 made comments that did not specifically state support or objection. Of the objections, 9 were from properties within the proposed CPZ, 8 from roads adjoining or nearby and 2 from rail users.

1.5 In Apsley 3 responses were received relating to the proposed CPZ of which 2 were in support and from within the proposed Zone (both with comments) and 1 was a stated objection from a nearby business outside the proposed Zone.

1.6 This report summarises the comments and objections received to the proposals and concludes on the following key recommendations following consideration of objections:

- Some minor amendments to the Boxmoor Traffic Order are recommended relating to minor yellow line and property eligibility changes;
- No changes are recommended to the Apsley Traffic Orders;

1.7 It is further recommended that, subject to budget being available

- Roads immediately adjoining the north of the proposed Boxmoor CPZ are consulted on potential future parking management options.
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2. INTRODUCTION AND CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY

2.1 Previous issues and design consultations have defined the areas of Boxmoor and Apsley that would be subject to formal Traffic Regulation Orders and related statutory consultation.

2.2 The Boxmoor proposals required publication of one Traffic Order contained the following proposals:

- No waiting at any time;
- No waiting Monday to Friday 9am-10am and 2pm-3pm
- Permit holders only parking places Monday to Friday 9am-10am and 2pm-3pm
- Short stay parking place Monday to Friday 9am-10am and 2pm-3pm 30 minutes no return within 30 minutes
- Shared use parking places Monday to Friday 9am-10am and 2pm-3pm permit holders only or 30 minutes no return within 30 minutes

2.3 The Apsley proposals consisted of two Traffic Orders containing the following proposals:

- No waiting at any time
- Permit holders only parking places Monday to Sunday 10am-10pm and
- No waiting for goods vehicles in excess of 7.5 tonnes, Monday to Friday midnight to 7am and 7pm to midnight and at any time Saturday and Sunday

2.4 In accordance with the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, statutory consultation started on 18th September 2013 and ran until 16th October 2013.

2.5 Statutory consultees were sent copies of all draft Traffic Orders, plans, Statement of reasons and press notice prior to the Orders being published.

2.6 The consultation consisted of:

- Placing all draft Traffic Orders (TOs), Plans and Statement of reasons on deposit for public viewing at the offices of DBC and on DBC’s website;
- A press noticed published in the Hemel Gazette in week commencing 16th September 2013;
- Site notices being erected within the proposed CPZs;
- Consultation leaflets issued to all properties within proposed CPZs and to locations outside proposed CPZ as agreed with DBC (See Appendices A and C);
2.7 Anybody wishing to comment on or object to the proposals were invited to do so via writing to the Council or via unique email which was managed by Project Centre.

2.8 All comments and objections were received within the published deadline except for one which was received the day after.

Responses analysis

2.9 Consultation responses have been grouped into two basic categories (e.g. ‘support’ or ‘objection’.) In some cases responses in the objection category did not actually state they objected but the comments received have been analysed as such as the nature of them is similar to stated objections.

2.10 Some of the responses in support of the proposals contained detailed comments that have also been analysed in this report in order to ensure all matters raised are considered.

2.11 Where multiple responses have been received from the same property (either objecting or in support), only one is counted in either object/support total. This is also true for petition signatures and care has been taken to check that individual responses in support are not double counted.

2.12 In order to ensure no significant issues are overlooked, all detailed comments received have been analysed.

2.13 As specified in the consultation leaflet, none of the responses received have been presented in this report so as to enable identification of individual respondents or addresses.
3. PROPOSED APSLEY CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES

Objections overview

3.1 Of the 3 responses received in relation to the Apsley proposals, 2 were from within the proposed CPZ and 1 from outside. The two responses from within the CPZ were in favour of the scheme in general with some specific comments about individual points of detail.

3.2 No objections were received from any of the statutory consultees, including Hertfordshire County Council (as highway authority) and the Police.

3.3 Appendix B contains details of all objections received and commentary on them. This section of the report contains an overview of issues raised and recommendations (based on the details in the Appendix).

3.4 Concern was expressed about the impact on residents parking of implementing ‘no waiting at any time’ in the turning area at the north end of the road. Whilst this is understood as a change to the current informal parking arrangements, the design of the scheme creates echelon parking which will change the way cars manoeuvre in this area. The location referred to is also required for vehicles to turn so it will be especially important to keep this area clear for larger vehicles in particular.

3.5 Comment was also received regarding long stay parking by mobile homes in the southern end of the road and that this would remain unaffected by the proposals. It is not considered significant, at this stage, to need to address this issue as the impact on resident amenity and road safety is likely to be small.

3.6 The only outright objection to the proposals in Apsley was received from a business outside the proposed CPZ which referred to the consultation process, impact of non-residential parking not being proved and, therefore, no justification for the CPZ. The proposals are also considered dis-proportionate, particularly with regard to the days and times they operate.

3.7 The objection also referred to a lack of available alternative public parking nearby and the negative impact the proposals would have on servicing and deliveries (which sometimes require the use of Two Waters Road).

3.8 Whilst the loss of publically available parking is understood to be a concern for a business in the area, the retention of a significant amount of unrestricted parking at the southern end of Two Waters Road provides a balance between promoting residents’ amenity and providing some unrestricted parking. This parking is also considered to be within reasonable walking distance of nearby businesses.
3.9 As a general conclusion the level of response received and nature of objections is not considered significant enough to merit either significant changes to the draft Traffic Orders or not making and implementing them as drafted.
4. PROPOSED BOXMOOR CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

Objections overview

4.1 There were a significantly larger number of responses to the proposed Boxmoor CPZ consultation. This reflects its size and range of issues and likely demand for parking both within and adjacent to the proposed CPZ.

4.2 Appendices D and E contains details of all responses received and commentary on them. This section of the report contains an overview of issues raised and recommendations (based on the details in both appendices).

4.3 In total, 145 responses were received supporting the proposed Boxmoor CPZ of which 71 were individual letters or emails in support of the proposals and 74 were signatories to a petition in support of the proposals. In total 143 responses in support were from respondents within the zone and 2 were from respondents outside.

4.4 The petition received in favour of the proposals was worded “We, the undersigned, are residents of Boxmoor and support the proposed controlled parking plan as set out in the consultation document dated September 2013”

4.5 A total of 19 responses were received stating objections and a further 13 made comments that did not specifically state support or objection. Of the objections, 9 were from properties within the proposed CPZ, 8 from roads adjoining or nearby and 2 from rail users.

4.6 It is important to note that the number of people responding in favour of the proposals were far more than those who submitted stated objections. In our experience it is unusual to receive such a body of support for proposals at Traffic Order statutory consultation stage.

4.7 This section of the report is intended to provide an overview of issues raised by objections and any other comments received.

4.8 The objections and comments received can be summarised as follows:

- The need for the scheme (its impact within the proposed zone);
- The need for the scheme (its impact on the wider area);
- The cost of implementing and/or cost of permits;
- Detailed design matters;
- Operational days and hours; and
- Permit and voucher eligibility.
The need for the scheme and impact within the zone

4.9 Several properties objected/commented on the need for scheme and, specifically the perceived negative impact it would have on parking or other traffic issues within the zone.

4.10 Some responses within the zone advised that the scheme was unnecessary as no problems had been experienced finding parking. Experience suggests that individual experiences will vary and the amount of support received towards the proposals at this and the previous stage indicates that residents do experience problems with parking.

4.11 Some objections were received from rail users on the basis that station parking was not affordable so use of residential streets was necessary. Whilst this is understood, the primary reason for the scheme is to protect resident amenity so to amend/abandon based on the views of rail users would effectively reject the resident priority policy.

4.12 A number of respondents referred to the need for traffic calming and/or highway maintenance issues. The scheme design seeks, as far as possible, to help keep vehicle speeds down via the ‘natural’ distribution of parking, traffic calming and maintenance issues are matters for Hertfordshire County Council and should be referred to them.

The need for the scheme and the impact on the wider area

4.13 A number of objections and detailed comments were received from residents in Northridge Way, St Johns Way, Cowper Road, Green End Road, Bargrove Avenue and Alston Road.

4.14 Concern was expressed about the impact of displaced parking to the above and other nearby roads. This is an understandable concern and the scope of any future parking consultation in the immediately adjoining roads should take comments received into account.

4.15 Several comments referred to the need to provide more parking at the station and that resources were better spent on that type of project and/or managing the price of parking at the station. The Council does not manage the parking at the station and has no influence over the rail industry. Acquiring land to develop a new car park is also a costly process.

4.16 Despite these comments being well intended, the Council can only manage on-street parking and it is a matter for the rail industry to manage and run its parking in such a way as to encourage rail users to use it, not surrounding streets.

The cost of implementing and/or the cost of permits

4.17 Some respondents referred to the cost of implementing the scheme being unacceptable or paying for permits being unacceptable (i.e. another form of tax/Council revenue generation).
4.18 In respect of the first point, the cost of the scheme has been considered by the Council to be acceptable alongside the cost of administering and, crucially, the benefits the scheme will bring to local residents and businesses.

4.19 There is often a common perception that permit schemes are a ‘revenue raising’ exercise by the Council. The net deficit generated by the on street parking service clearly shows that this is not the case in Dacorum.

4.20 In our experience, the cost of permits is often raised as an objection. Some references were made to costs being unacceptable and even that free permits should be issued. The price of permits is not deemed to be excessive (at 48p per week for a £25 permit and 77p per week for a £40 permit respectively for resident permits) compared to other parking charges and or the annual cost of running a vehicle.

4.21 It is normal practice for Council’s to ask permit users to contribute towards the cost of running the scheme by charging for permits/vouchers. The alternative is to impose the cost of the scheme onto the wider population. The balance of support for the scheme suggests that costs are not a key consideration within the zone.

**Detailed design matters**

4.22 A number of detailed matters were raised. Some relate to location and extent of yellow line restrictions, others to do with location of parking bays and, specifically, the impact of marking bays across private accesses.

4.23 With regard to yellow line restrictions, the scheme has been designed so as to provide ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions in locations where visibility is required at junctions or accesses to side roads and, in Fishery Passage, where the road is too narrow to allow parking and vehicles to pass and exit the junction safely.

4.24 At the north end of Fishery Passage objections to the proposed ‘no waiting at any time’ have been considered in some detail. There is an existing ‘No motor vehicles’ restriction in place in this location so the proposed waiting restrictions are considered unnecessary and could be removed.

4.25 One objector queried whether it was appropriate to have ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions in front of a garage having been advised that this wouldn’t feature in the final scheme. The proximity of a junction, a bend in the road and a proposed parking bay on the north side clearly indicates that ‘at any time’ in the location referred to is required on grounds of avoiding congestion and promoting safety.

4.26 Less restrictive (single yellow line) waiting restrictions are proposed in locations where parking is not considered desirable during operational hours of the CPZ and it is not appropriate to provide parking bays or leave unrestricted areas (which is not possible in a CPZ).
4.27 Outside hours of operation, without the pressure caused by parking by long stay non-residents, parking in these locations may be possible. Leaving unrestricted areas would, in our experience, encourage non-residential long stay parking.

4.28 Upgrading any of the single yellow locations across private accesses to ‘at any time’ restrictions would prevent residents and visitors from having the flexibility of being able to park across their own accesses.

4.29 Loss of parking capacity due to yellow lines was raised as an issue but the removal of long stay non-residential parking should free up capacity. Other safety and access concerns outweigh the need to allow parking at junctions or narrow sections of road.

4.30 Some concern was expressed regarding the location of parking bays (Kingsland Road and Cangels Close specifically) due to widths of road and location of parking bays.

4.31 Again, the removal of long stay non-residential parking should help reduce pressure on parking and the effects currently seen (i.e. footway parking, parking at junctions, parking both sides in narrow roads, unbroken lines of parked cars).

4.32 Pressure for parking should reduce and, therefore, concerns expressed about parking may well be made in the current context. We consider the scheme design to be a good balance between providing parking and giving residents/visitors flexibility and at the same time restricting parking where not desirable.

4.33 Some comment was received regarding the amount and location of shared use parking bays. The purpose of shared use bays is to provide some flexibility for business and resident visitors. There will be nothing to prevent resident permit holders using these bays should they need to. We see no reason to reduce or amend the amount and location of shared use bays at this stage.

4.34 In our experience it is normal that some residents will object to parking bays being marked across their private accesses as they consider this to be an open invitation for anyone to park and block their access.

4.35 Marking bays in this way is in accordance with national regulations and is common practice. It provides residents with the flexibility of allowing them or their visitors to park across their own access. The alternative would be to provide yellow line restrictions across accesses, which removes this flexibility.

4.36 The removal of long stay non-resident parking will reduce pressure on parking and the likelihood of parking across accesses without the owner's consent is reduced. Nevertheless white ‘courtesy lines’ could be marked in bays across accesses to help keep vehicles clear. It is Council policy, however, not to maintain courtesy lines once installed and no further maintenance would be guaranteed.
Operational days and hours

4.37 Some comment was received on the proposed operational days/hours. These varied from only wanting one hour controlled in the day to extending the hours and days to preserve parking more exclusively for residents during evenings/weekend.

4.38 At this stage the primary purpose of the scheme is to promote parking for residents and local businesses, Monday to Friday. The previous consultation support was received on this basis. We consider that extending hours and days changes the effect of the scheme significantly and would require additional consultation to establish support.

4.39 With regard to reducing the hours of operation, with only two hours controlled, the effect of removing one of the hours would be to free up parking for long stay non-resident shift or off-peak rail users. The two hour restriction is, in our experience, common practice and effective. It also provides a degree of flexibility for visitors/customers in the area who can park outside controlled hours should they need to do so.

4.40 One comment was received regarding the controls not being required on public holidays. The scheme has been progressed on the basis that it operates Monday to Friday without exception and support received reflects this. There is the risk that removing controls on bank holidays would encourage off-peak rail users.

Permit and voucher eligibility.

4.41 Some comment was received regarding the number of permits or vouchers that residents were eligible for. Generally this referred to both being insufficient for the amount of vehicles owned and/or likely amount of voucher time required over the year.

4.42 With regard to permits, the scheme proposes a maximum of three per household and 1 per business. This is considered a good balance especially in roads where many properties do not have off-street parking.

4.43 The amount of voucher parking is limited to protect residents from excess vouchers being passed to non-residents. Some individual circumstances may need to be considered on their merits but we are not aware of any significant reason why larger permit or voucher entitlement should be made for this proposal.

4.44 Several properties outside the proposed zone (e.g. on the south side of Northridge Way) expressed concern about the effects on them of displacement and, as they immediately adjoined or had accesses off of roads in the scheme should be included in permit eligibility. Properties with accesses into the CPZ could be offered permits others have adequate off-street parking availability.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General conclusion

5.1 No objections were received from any of the statutory consultees. This includes the highway authority and the Police.

Proposed Apsley Controlled Parking Zones

Conclusions

5.2 The relatively low response rate to the statutory consultation reflects the size of the proposed zone and that the proposals are not considered to be unacceptable to the vast majority of those consulted.

5.3 The issues raised by residents should be noted.

5.4 The objection raised by the business outside the proposed CPZs is addressed by previous survey and consultation data indicating resident support (in line with Council priority). The detailed issues raised are addressed by allowing unrestricted parking at the south end of Two Waters Road whilst still allowing servicing access along the whole length of Two Waters Road.

Recommendations

5.5 It is recommended that:

- The comments and objections as set out in Appendix B are noted and the Traffic Orders are made in line with the detailed recommendations in Appendix B.
- The objector is contacted and advised of this decision.

Proposed Boxmoor Controlled Parking Zone

Conclusions

5.6 The amount of support received at statutory consultation stage is, in our experience, significant and reflects the demand for the scheme to be implemented.

5.7 A range of issues were raised by objectors but none are considered significant enough to merit substantial change or even abandoning the Traffic Order as published.

5.8 A number of minor issues should, however, be considered before the Traffic Order is made as follows:

- Remove the proposed ‘at any time’ waiting restriction at the north end of Fishery Road (from the end of the existing restriction at the junction with St Johns Road to
the bollards). The existing motor vehicles ban in this location makes the proposed waiting restriction unnecessary.

- Note that specific circumstances may need to be considered on an ‘each case on its merits’ basis with regard to permit applications.
- Where residents have expressed concerns about parking bays being marked across their accesses, consider providing one-off ‘courtesy line’ markings.

5.9 There is significant concern about the effect of displacement of commuter parking in roads to the north of the proposed CPZ.

Recommendations

5.10 It is recommended that:

- The comments and objections as set out in Appendices D and E are noted and the Traffic Orders are made in line with the detailed recommendations in both Appendices;
- The objectors are contacted and advised of this decision.

5.11 It is further recommended that:

- Subject to budget being available, all roads immediately adjoining the north of the proposed Boxmoor CPZ is consulted on potential future parking management options.
Quality

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

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

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

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

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.
Accreditations

Memberships
APPENDIX A – APSLEY CONSULTATION MATERIAL
Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Controlled Parking Zone and overnight/weekend goods vehicle waiting restriction in Two Waters Road, Apsley

Following consultation on a proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) last year, Dacorum Borough Council has considered the responses received and decided to proceed towards implementing a CPZ at the northern end of Two Waters Road.

It is also proposed to implement a waiting restriction to prevent goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes in weight parking overnight during weekdays and at any time at weekends in Two Waters Road.

This letter is to advise you that the formal Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) required to make the schemes operational have been published. The publication of the TROs marks the beginning of a statutory consultation period that will last for 28 days from Wednesday 18 September 2013.

During this period anybody may comment or object to the proposals. Comments or objections must be made in writing, stating the grounds on which they are made and sent to the address at the top of this letter or via email to Boxmoor-Apsley@projectcentre.co.uk to be received by e-mail by 23:59 on Wednesday 16 October 2013 or by last postal delivery to the above address on Wednesday 16 October 2013. No significant changes can be made to the scheme from this time; we want to know if you support the introduction of the proposals or whether you object to them so please respond to this consultation.

Summary information on how the scheme will work is set out in this letter. Detailed TROs and drawings are available online at www.dacorum.gov.uk or in person in the main reception area corridor at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH.

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

Yours faithfully,

Steve Barnes
Parking Policy Lead Officer
Dacorum Borough Council

Dacorum Borough Council working in partnership with Project Centre

---

Visitor vouchers cost £4 for a book of 25 one hour vouchers, £12 for a book of 20 five hour vouchers and £3 for a weekly voucher (a maximum of 4 weekly vouchers can be applied for per property).

All properties in the area will receive a letter explaining how to apply for permits and vouchers once a final decision has been made on the scheme.

What about deliveries, traders carrying out work and carers?

Deliveries may be carried out by vehicles using permit parking bays and yellow lines provided this process takes no longer than necessary to load and unload. Anything longer (including traders carrying out work and carers visits) will require visitor vouchers to be displayed during operational times in permit bays/areas. Unrestricted parking will be available in the area outside the zone which may also be used for loading/traders/carers.

How will the scheme be enforced?

Signs at the entrance to both zones will alert drivers to the operational days/hours of both the permit parking and the overnight waiting restriction for goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes. More detailed signs will be erected where permit parking is provided in bays. Double yellow lines do not require signs.

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

What happens next?

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

There is no charge for one disabled badge holder’s resident permit.

Visitor vouchers cost £4 for a book of 25 one hour vouchers, £12 for a book of 20 five hour vouchers and £3 for a weekly voucher (a maximum of 4 weekly vouchers can be applied for per property).

All properties in the area will receive a letter explaining how to apply for permits and vouchers once a final decision has been made on the scheme.

What about deliveries, traders carrying out work and carers?

Deliveries may be carried out by vehicles using permit parking bays and yellow lines provided this process takes no longer than necessary to load and unload. Anything longer (including traders carrying out work and carers visits) will require visitor vouchers to be displayed during operational times in permit bays/areas. Unrestricted parking will be available in the area outside the zone which may also be used for loading/traders/carers.

How will the scheme be enforced?

Signs at the entrance to both zones will alert drivers to the operational days/hours of both the permit parking and the overnight waiting restriction for goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes. More detailed signs will be erected where permit parking is provided in bays. Double yellow lines do not require signs.

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

What happens next?

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

Data from this consultation will be collected and held by Project Centre and Dacorum Borough Council. The data will be used to produce a consultation report and to provide feedback to Councillors. Individual residents will not be identified in the consultation report without permission. The consultation report will be a public document.
What are the proposals?

During the hours of operation (Monday to Sunday, 10.00am to 10.00pm) anybody wishing to park on-street in the section of Two Waters Road shown within the Controlled Parking Zone ‘A’ boundary on the plan above will need to park in a marked bay and display a valid permit or voucher.

Outside the permit parking zone on Two Waters Road bays will be provided but unrestricted and available for anyone to use.

No parking is permitted on double yellow lines at any time.

In addition, Monday to Friday between the hours of midnight and 7.00am and 7.00pm and midnight and at any time at weekends, vehicles weighing over 7.5 tonnes will not be permitted to wait in Two Waters Road.

Permits and visitor vouchers must be clearly displayed on vehicles parked in the permit parking bays throughout the entire time they are parked during the hours of operation.

The proposals do not apply to private roads, off-street parking driveways/hardstandings and private off-street parking in and at garage areas.

Who is eligible for permits and visitor vouchers?

Anybody who lives or has a business in the area shown on the plan above is entitled to apply for parking permits. Residents only may apply for visitor vouchers in addition. Proof of residence will be required on application for permits/vouchers and any permits issued will be marked with the zone’s designated letter ‘A’ and registration number to match the vehicle for which a permit has been applied for. Permits and vouchers are only valid in the zone for which they are issued.

A maximum of three permits may be applied for per residential property. Each permit must be for a separate named individual living at that address. A maximum of one permit may be applied for by businesses. A maximum of 800 hours of vouchers will be permitted per residential property.

How much do permits and visitor vouchers cost?

For residents, an annual permit for one vehicle costs £25 per annum, a permit for a second vehicle costs £40 and a permit for a third vehicle costs £40. Motorcycle permits are £10 per annual permit.

For businesses an annual business permit costs £300.
APPENDIX B – APSLEY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
### Appendix B - Apsley consultation responses

**General comments:**

- No objections from any of the statutory consultees (e.g. highway authority, Police & Emergency Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection(s)</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi. regarding the parking restrictions in two waters road. I have been wishing for residents parking for years so thank you I am all in favour. One minor change would be greatly appreciated. There are two large vans belonging to residents in the road. They have for years been parked in the bay opposite number 10 Two Waters Road which is proposed to be double yellow lines. There never has been a problem for vehicles to turn round in the road except when vehicles have parked on the opposite side of the road to the cottages which is to be prevented. With the vans out in the road it hides all the pedestrians who insist on using the road from the oncoming cars and restricts the width of the road. Allowing the vans to remain in that bay would be beneficial to all.</td>
<td>The location referred to that vans park in is intended to allow turning space for all types of vehicles. This includes waste, emergency and delivery vehicles. The proposed echelon parking bay design provides more capacity in front of property numbers 6 – 15 but will require vehicles to use the turning area to turn and exit Two Waters Road. Overall the Council considers that there is plenty of capacity provided in the road for resident permit holders.</td>
<td>Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in agreement with the majority of the proposal re the above named road but I have one concern regarding the parking of mobile homes that park in the unrestricted part of the road (of which there are two at present) that stay for weeks on end. I am not sure whether these would come into the weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes or not and am trying to find out more from my local councillor. Apart from this it all seems good to me, can’t wait.</td>
<td>The proposed 7.5 tonne overnight and weekend waiting restriction will not affect mobile home parking. At this stage the Council is keen to allow some general unrestricted parking at one end of Two Waters Road and is unaware of any significant loss of amenity to residents resulting from parking of mobile homes.</td>
<td>Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are instructed to and hereby lodge our client’s objection to the CPZ on the following grounds: 1. Consultation We are instructed that our client has not been included in any of the consultation exercises carried out to date (in particular September 2012 and January 2013) despite the fact that our client’s premises is on XX and is clearly Record indicate that the property in question was consulted on the first round of ‘issues’ but may have been inadvertently omitted from the design consultation. Notwithstanding this context, the property in question has been included in the formal consultation and has had the opportunity to respond to the Traffic Order consultation and raise any issues the Council may have been unaware of. The Council’s priority continues to be parking for residents in residential roads. Previous survey work indicates that there is a significant amount of non-residential parking in XX and that this</td>
<td>Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
affected by the proposal. We consider that our client should have been included within the consultation process before now. Accordingly, the consultation exercises that have led up to the decision of the Council in June 2013 to proceed towards the implementation of the CPZ was flawed.

2. Irrelevant Considerations /Reasoning
The basis for the original consultation for the CPZ is stated as being inappropriate commuter parking. However, following the consultation, that hypothesis has been rejected and that should have been the end of the matter. Further, the record of the decision taken by Councillor Julie Laws on 19 June 2013 to proceed with the CPZ recites the background of her decision still inappropriate commuter parking. Whereas, by that time the residents had rejected that allegation and the only basis advanced in the April 2013 report was unproven allegations of parking by our client’s customers. Accordingly, that decision took into account irrelevant considerations and was not properly reasoned.

3. Evidence
Our client notes that allegations of patrons parking in Two Waters Road have been made and according to the April 2013 report those allegations appears to form the sole basis for the CPZ being pursued, whereas the other proposals for Apsley have been dropped.

While our client acknowledges that some of its customers may from time to time park in Two Waters Road, that parking is neither a nuisance nor a serious inconvenience to the local residents. Further, the allegations of the residents do not appear to have been properly tested by any form of objective study. Our client therefore considers that the Council should not have taken this into account when deciding whether to pursue the implementation of the CPZ or not.

4. Affect on business
Our client runs a successful local business. Whilst the premises has parking on site, it cannot always accommodate all customers. There is no other convenient increases as the day progresses (see extracts from 2012 survey below).

Previous consultation on the Apsley Area has shown that there is support for residents’ parking in Two Waters Road (reflected in the design consultation results). In this context judgement of levels of inconvenience caused by non-resident parking are largely a matter for residents and the Council has sought to consider these views alongside the wider parking needs of the area.

The Council has given careful consideration to the wider parking needs within the area and, as a consequence, has retained a significant amount of parking for all users at the south end of Two Waters Road.

This parking is considered to be within reasonable walking distance of residential and non-residential properties nearby.

Vehicles over 7.5 tonnes in weight will not be permitted to park in this area further ensuring that parking space in this area isn’t taken by large vehicles.

The proposals will not affect deliveries to the property referred to. All proposals are waiting restrictions, not access restrictions. Providing vehicles are loading/unloading they will not be affected by the proposals. In fact the proposed yellow line restrictions in the turning area at the north end of Two Waters Way will assist the movement of delivery and servicing vehicles.
public parking provision within a reasonable distance of our client's premises. Our client is very concerned about the effect that the imposition of the CPZ may have on the viability of its business.

In addition, the proposals will have an impact upon deliveries to our client's premises and refuse collection. Heavy goods vehicles frequently have to enter and exit our client's property onto XX, particularly in bad weather conditions. The alternative to this is requiring those vehicles to reverse out onto XX which could be both difficult and dangerous.

5. Proportionality
The CPZ proposal will restrict parking along Two Waters Road between 10am and 10pm 7 days a week. No provision is made whatsoever for non-resident parking on even a temporary/voucher basis or for limited periods of time. Notwithstanding the fact our client disputes that there are parking problems caused by its customers, our client considers that the restrictions proposed are disproportionate and if proven there are more appropriate means of controlling parking in the area. Other roads in the locality are not subject to as draconian restrictions (eg Cotterells, Cotterells Hill, Collett Road).

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this objection letter.
Of the four roads within the core area the majority of non resident vehicles 65 (56%), were observed in Two Waters Road. In addition, 67% of all long-stay non resident vehicles were also observed in this road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>02:00</td>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>06:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Waters Road</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 – Detailed street by street resident v non-resident vehicle split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beat @ 06:00</th>
<th>Beat @ 08:00</th>
<th>Beat @ 10:00</th>
<th>Beat @ 12:00</th>
<th>Beat @ 14:00</th>
<th>Beat @ 16:00</th>
<th>Beat @ 18:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
<td>39 ((88%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>35 ((83%)</td>
<td>35 ((83%)</td>
<td>33 ((72%)</td>
<td>20 ((77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35 (85%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Waters Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
<td>39 ((88%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>35 ((83%)</td>
<td>35 ((83%)</td>
<td>33 ((72%)</td>
<td>20 ((77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 (79%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C – BOXMOOR CONSULTATION MATERIAL
Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Controlled Parking Zone in Boxmoor

Following consultation on a proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) last year, Dacorum Borough Council has considered the responses received and decided to proceed towards implementing a CPZ.

This letter is to advise you that the formal Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) required to make the scheme operational have been published. The publication of the TROs marks the beginning of a statutory consultation period that will last for 28 days from Wednesday 18 September 2013.

During this period anybody may comment or object to the proposals. Comments or objections must be made in writing, stating the grounds on which they are made and sent to the address at the top of this letter or via email to Boxmoor-Apsley@projectcentre.co.uk to be received by e-mail by 23:59 on Wednesday 16 October 2013 or by last postal delivery to the above address on Wednesday 16 October 2013. No significant changes can be made to the scheme from this time; we want to know if you support the introduction of the proposals or whether you object to them so please respond to this consultation.

The plan over the page provides a summary of the proposals and some existing yellow line restrictions that will remain unchanged. The proposed permit parking bays/area, shared use and limited waiting parking bays and single yellow lines (‘no waiting’) will operate Monday to Friday between 9.00 and 10.00am and 2.00 and 3.00pm. Double yellow lines (‘no waiting’) will operate at any time.

Summary information on how the scheme will work is set out in this letter. Detailed TROs and drawings are available online at www.dacorum.gov.uk or in person in the main reception area corridor at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH.

Please note as this is a statutory consultation, correspondence on the proposals cannot be entered into. All comments received will be reported to the Council who will make a decision on how to proceed after considering the feedback from the consultation.

Yours faithfully,

Steve Barnes
Parking Policy Lead Officer
Dacorum Borough Council

Dacorum Borough Council working
in partnership with Project Centre
What are the proposals?

During the hours of operation (Monday to Friday, 9.00-10.00am and 2.00-3.00pm) anybody wishing to park on-street in the roads shown on the plan above will need to park in a marked bay and display a valid permit or voucher (bays shown coloured green on the above plan).

There are two variations to the above arrangements as follows:

- In River Park and Grove Road no bays will be marked and the entire road will be a permit parking area (excluding any yellow lines) so drivers will need to display a valid permit or voucher (areas shown cross-hatched green on the plan above).

- A limited number of bays will be provided in some roads that allows parking to be shared between permit parking and/or general ‘non-permit’ parking for up to 30 minutes (with no return allowed for a further 30 minutes) (bays shown coloured blue or purple on the above plan).

Permits and visitor vouchers must be clearly displayed on vehicles parked in permit parking bays/areas throughout the entire time they are parked during the hours of operation.

No parking is permitted on single yellow lines during the hours of operation. No parking is permitted on double yellow lines at any time.

The proposals do not apply to private roads, off-street parking driveways/hardstandings and private off-street parking in and at garage areas.

Who is eligible for permits and visitor vouchers?

Anybody who lives or has a business in the boundary area shown on the plan above is entitled to apply for parking permits. Residents only may apply for visitor vouchers in addition. Proof of residence will be required on application for permits/vouchers and any permits issued will be marked with the zone’s designated letter ‘X’ and registration number to match the vehicle for which a permit has been applied for. Permits and vouchers are only valid in the zone for which they are issued.

A maximum of three permits may be applied for per residential property. Each permit must be for a separate named individual living at that address. A maximum of one permit may be applied for by businesses. A maximum of 100 hours of vouchers will be permitted per residential property. A single day will require use of 2 hours worth of visitor vouchers. A week will require 10 hours of visitor vouchers.
September 2013

Dear Householder/Proprietor,

Controlled Parking Zone in Boxmoor

Following consultation on a proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) south of St Johns Road last year (i.e. the Boxmoor CPZ), Dacorum Borough Council has considered the responses received and decided to proceed towards implementing the Boxmoor CPZ.

The Council received a number of comments on the draft Boxmoor CPZ from residents in the Green End Road area. As a result, once the Council has made a final decision on whether to implement the Boxmoor CPZ, it will consult you on introducing additional waiting restrictions covering Green End Road, Bargrove Avenue, Alston Road and Sebright Road.

With regard to the Boxmoor CPZ, this letter is to advise you that the formal Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) required to make the scheme operational have been published. The publication of the TROs marks the beginning of a statutory consultation period that will last for 28 days from Wednesday 18 September 2013.

During this period anybody may comment or object to the proposals. Comments or objections must be made in writing, stating the grounds on which they are made and sent to the address at the top of this letter or via email to Boxmoor-Apsley@projectcentre.co.uk to be received by e-mail by 23:59 on Wednesday 16 October 2013 or by last postal delivery to the above address on Wednesday 16 October 2013. No significant changes can be made to the scheme from this time.

The plan over the page provides a summary of the proposals. Detailed TROs and drawings are available online at www.dacorum.gov.uk or in person in the main reception area corridor at Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH.

Please note as this is a statutory consultation, correspondence on the proposals cannot be entered into. All comments received will be reported to the Council who will make a decision on how to proceed after considering the feedback from the consultation.

Yours faithfully,

Steve Barnes
Parking Policy Lead Officer
Dacorum Borough Council

Dacorum Borough Council working in partnership with Project Centre
What are the proposals?

During the hours of operation (Monday to Friday, 9.00-10.00am and 2.00-3.00pm) anybody wishing to park on-street in the roads shown on the plan above will need to park in a marked bay and display a valid permit or voucher (bays shown coloured green on the above plan).

There are two variations to the above arrangements as follows:

- In River Park and Grove Road no bays will be marked and the entire road will be a permit parking area (excluding any yellow lines) so drivers will need to display a valid permit or voucher (areas shown cross-hatched green on the plan above).
- A limited number of bays will be provided in some roads that allows parking to be shared between permit parking and/or general ‘non-permit’ parking for up to 30 minutes (with no return allowed for a further 30 minutes) (bays shown coloured blue or purple on the above plan).

Permits and visitor vouchers must be clearly displayed on vehicles parked in permit parking bays/areas throughout the entire time they are parked during the hours of operation.

No parking is permitted on single yellow lines during the hours of operation. No parking is permitted on double yellow lines at any time.

The proposals do not apply to private roads, off-street parking driveways/hardstandings and private off-street parking in and at garage areas.

What happens next?

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

Data from this consultation will be collected and held by Project Centre and Dacorum Borough Council. The data will be used to produce a consultation report and to provide feedback to Councillors. Individual residents will not be identified in the consultation report without permission. The consultation report will be a public document.
APPENDIX D – BOXMOOR CONSULTATION OBJECTIONS
Appendix D - Boxmoor objections

General comments:

- No objections from any of the statutory consultees (e.g. highway authority, Police & Emergency Services)
- Some specific circumstances that may require individual applications for permits/vouchers to be considered on their merits
- Consider marking courtesy lines across dropped kerb accesses where bays are marked across.
- Consider widening consultation of area north of Zone X for future controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection(s)</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We OBJECT to the proposals on the grounds that it is not needed, that living here since 1991 we have never struggled to find a parking place on the road, and that the proportion of ‘yes’s’ within the low response rate to the survey is not a majority view.</td>
<td>The previous consultation identified demand and support for a controlled parking zone within Boxmoor. 65% of those who responded to the scheme design consultation were in favour of proceeding. A further 23% were in favour of proceeding with changes to the proposals. 11% were not in favour of proceeding.</td>
<td>Comments are noted No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have just received the ‘Controlled Parking Zone’ letter dated Sept 2013 advising of the proposal and the consultation period. I wanted to register my objection to this proposal and ask for clarification on the following matter :</td>
<td>Any vehicles parking across a dropped kerb access without the consent of the property owner can be considered to be causing an obstruction and the matter referred to the Police. If the vehicle in question is a permit holder the Council reserves the right to withdraw a permit from the individual in question. The single yellow line is considered necessary to prevent parking at restricted times in close proximity to the junction with Grove Road and close to the bend of Moorland Road. As part of a package of controls the proposed restrictions seek to promote road safety and allow parking in designated places during the hours of restriction. Outside the hours of restriction parking will be permitted at the single yellow line to provide flexibility for residents and their visitors. Parking on the single yellow line will not be permitted during hours of operation. The only exception to this will be to allow</td>
<td>Comments are noted No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. I'm pretty sure there is a Traffic Management Act that prohibits anyone other than the owner to park over a dropped kerb which provides access from the carriageway to a private drive. Therefore is what you are proposing legal.

3. If the answer to q1 is 'no' you are not allowing cars to park over my drive then why have the single yellow line as this will cause endless confusion and result in commuters etc parking over my drive.

4. Why have you suggested a single yellow here as opposed to a double yellow?

5. Would I as the property owner (or guest with my consent) be allowed to park on the single yellow over my drive at any time and would I be required to purchase a permit for this?

In principle I object to schemes of this nature, as I see no necessity for its implementation at all in this residential area. I consider it as an unnecessary further local authority interference and restriction of freedom for residents and their visitors to legally park vehicles as required immediately adjacent to their homes. Ownership of private vehicles is already expensive enough and the scheme, if implemented, will impose yet another annual cost and stealth tax on ownership of vehicles.

Please note my objection to the implementation above scheme as proposed for the specific reasons as stated below:

If the scheme is implemented, it is not sensible to exclude residents of No's 1-11 Northridge Way, HP1 2AE (Jcn. Grove Road to Jcn. Cangels Close) from the vehicles to load/unload only and disabled badge holders to park for up to 3 hours. Regard should be had to the Highway Code and the safety of all road users.

The Council's priority is to favour the parking needs of residents and their visitors over that of non-residents (i.e. commuters).

In the proposed CPZ 65% of those who responded to the scheme design consultation were in favour of proceeding. A further 23% were in favour of proceeding with changes to the proposals. 11% were not in favour of proceeding.

The cost of permits and vouchers is set to be affordable and solely to help cover the costs of running the scheme. At £77p per week for a £40 permit is considered to be good value when compared with other parking charges and vehicle running costs.

Comments are noted and residents of 1-11 Northridge Way could be included in the next round of consultation on potential parking management beyond Zone X.
proposed scheme. Excluding this small section of Northridge Way and leaving it outside of the proposed CPZ residents boundary of the scheme will just encourage and concentrate all day parking of non residents cars to this small area, being the last remaining unrestricted parking available and convenient to railway station commuters. Also visitors to the adjacent dwellings that are within the scheme boundary will also consider this small area of unrestricted parking as convenient for their use without the need for obtaining visitor parking permits.

I foresee that the scheme, if implemented as proposed, will concentrate demand for vehicle parking on the last remaining available unrestricted zone outside dwellings 1 – 11 Northridge Way and cause great unnecessary inconvenience to the residents of these dwellings.

If the scheme has to be implemented at all, residents of No’s 1 – 11 Northridge Way, HP1 2AE should be included within the CPZ Boundary, thus enabling them to apply for CPZ parking permits should they so wish.

I have read the supporting documents and am dismayed by the conclusions. I live in Cowper Road and did not receive the initial questionnaire or any subsequent information.

To exclude all roads north of St John’s Road from the scheme will merely displace commuters from the area where they currently park to any spaces they can find north of Fishery Road. This would be obvious to anyone who has studied the area, because at the cost of an additional 5 minutes walking, commuters will be able to save £ 5 or £ 6 per day in parking fees.

I would like to know the basis on which this decision has

| Comments are noted and residents of Cowper Road could be included in the next round of consultation on potential parking management beyond Zone X. |
| The Council intends to consult residents of roads immediately to the north of the proposed Zone X on potential parking management in once a decision on whether to implement Zone X has been made. This could include Cowper Road. |
| Comments are noted. Consider consulting residents of Cowper Road on viable parking management options. |
| No Change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
been made and what will be done when my prediction comes true.

I am writing in response to the letter dated September 2013 in relation to the TROs for the proposed CPZs.

Our house (XX XXXXXXX) has a lane alongside our house which allows us and our neighbours access to our garages. We have had an amicable understanding between the two households that we share parking on the lane, given we both have beneficial usage of the lane for our properties. This parking also includes parking on the white line that crosses the lane preventing others from parking there and blocking our access. With the proposed no waiting zones planned for the entrance to ‘our’ lane we would be prevented from parking here. Your plans also do not show what the restrictions, if any, would be enforced along “our” lane.

As such, our household would be in objection of these plans. Should a consideration be made in favour of our households holding the “right to park” here (as others can’t due to the property access), or confirmation that there would be no controls in place on “our” lane, then we may reconsider our opinion.

I am writing with regard to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Boxmoor. The map given seems to show that the parking restrictions will not include Northridge Way. I believe that the people north of Northridge Way don’t have a problem with parking but I live on Northridge Way, opposite Cangels Close and we do have a problem with people parking for the station. Many people also park in Cangels Close, Grove Road, Moorland Road and the roads on the other side of Fishery Road which you are proceeding. A further 23% were in favour of proceeding with changes to the proposals. 11% were not in favour of proceeding.

There are no proposals for the lane referred to as it was considered unnecessary to propose parking controls in this location.

The proposal for a Controlled Parking Zone requires each side of each road to be marked with either a yellow line restriction or parking place of some description. Access to the lane is required by multiple properties so as part of the proposals it was considered necessary to propose ‘no waiting at any time’ in order that access was maintained at all times. This also assists with visibility when exiting the lane.

The provision of waiting restrictions in this location will also provide vehicle passing space.

It is not possible to provide specific households with a ‘right to park’ as suggested. In a Controlled Parking Zone it would be possible to mark a parking place across the access to the lane but as multiple properties require access it was considered that a parking place may encourage parking and prevent access for a number of properties.

The Council intends to consult residents of roads immediately to the north of the proposed Zone X on potential parking management in once a decision on whether to implement Zone X has been made. This could include Northridge Way.

Comments are noted. Consider consulting residents of relevant section of Northridge Way on adding them to the CPZ or other viable options.

Comments are noted.
including in your planned zone. If restrictions are put in place south of us only, then it will just push those people to park in Northridge Way making the situation even worse for us. I believe the parking outside our houses will then become ridiculous. At least residents on Cangels Close have large driveways which means the people parking in the street don’t necessarily prevent them or their visitors parking. Although I understand it is annoying for them, as it is for all of us residents. I personally bought my house near to the station because I use the station regularly and that was a high priority when buying a house. To then find everyone parking outside my house for the station is very frustrating.

I would encourage you to include Northridge Way (especially the south part) within the proposed area for this reason.

I am writing to oppose the proposed permit parking in Boxmoor, as per the notice in the Gazette on the 18th September 2013.

As a commuter I park in roads near to the station in order to travel into London each day, my reasoning for doing this is that on top of £400 a month for travel, I cannot justify an extra £25-30 a week for parking. I also feel safer late at night walking back to my car in a residential street rather than in a large car park.

I have parked in and around Boxmoor for the last 7 years as part of my commute. In that time I have never had any issues in getting parked, there are always spaces. I have never not been able to get parked, no matter what time this may be at 7am or at 9:30am.

I understand residents frustrations, but this is much more for those that are not able to park outside individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Regulation Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council’s priority is to enable residents and their visitors to park close to their homes. This is the main theme that underpins the proposals and in this location this continues to be the priority. The Council prefers to see the needs of rail users met by the railway industry. This should ensure parking at stations is managed in such a way that rail users feel safe and aren’t forced to park in residential streets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
houses, which when you buy a narrow Victorian terrace house, this is not going to always be possible. I have firsthand experience of violence from one particular resident who is intent on reserving a space for his wife 'outside' his house and I gather that his behaviour continues if you are a resident or commuter. I feel that peoples frustrations are personal to their individual houses rather than to commuters and the fact that anyone has the right to park anywhere in those roads.

If parking restrictions were to be enforced, then I would continue to park in Boxmoor but in other locations such as: St. John's road, Green End Road, Northridge way, Chaulden Lane, Seebright Road, Alston Road, Bargrove Avenue, Cowper Road, Anchor Lane, Puller Road, London Road, Felden Lane. All of these roads and many more are just the same walking distance to the station as to being parked at the far end of Kingsland Road. By introducing parking permits you will be just pushing the problem into another area. This would do nothing to help the community and cause traffic problems for local schools and businesses, which as a town is not something that Hemel needs.

I would like to think that the council would be looking to help young people such as myself who work and commute each day. Hemel Hempstead is a commuter town, but by enforcing restrictions you are pushing people away. Yes I can understand residents get frustrated but if you spend a considerable amount of money on a house where it is impossible to put a driveway, then I believe that you need to be realistic that you cannot park outside your own house, and if you have the luxury of living so close to a main line station, then you need to be aware that others will be using the area for the same reason.
I feel that more consultation needs to be undertaken with commuters and not just residents, we all pay road and council tax within Dacorum.

So I ask you to consider all of my points above when making a final decision and I am willing to provide further recommendations and comments if needed.

I sympathise with the difficulty that residents have with street parking south of St Johns Road, Boxmoor.

Over the last year or so the volume of commuter parking in Boxmoor has increased significantly and a weekday walk around the area shows commuter parking now extends north of St John's Road to Green End Road (causing problems for buses), Alston Road, Grosvenor Terrace, Sebright Road, Puller Road and Cowper Road. Particular problems occur when parents drop off and collect children from St Rose's school and Boxmoor School, when parking frequently blocks pavements and is over double yellow lines. My concern is that the introduction of the RPZ will exacerbate the problems that already exist in the above roads.

My particular concern relates to the two service roads and parking bay on The Poplars estate off Cowper Road. Ownership of those roads was passed from the Commission for the New Towns to Dacorum Council by deed dated July 1978. The original deeds for the estate, together with regulations and restrictions established under those deeds, make it clear that only the residents of the Poplars have a right of way on those roads and that we are also liable for the costs of maintenance. Indeed, some years ago we paid for the road to be resurfaced (which is now beginning to show signs of wear).

| Concern about displaced non-residential parking to areas beyond Zone X is understood. The Council will continue to monitor the situation should it decide to implement the Zone X CPZ. |
| Comments are noted. Consider whether to extend future parking management consultation to The Poplars area. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
We already suffer significant inconvenience as parents of children who attend Boxmoor School use our service roads as a car park. If you wish I will send some pictures to illustrate. As commuters already park nearby, my fear is that the introduction of the Residents Parking Zone will mean our estate will also become a car park for commuters. I would appreciate advice as to the measures that might be introduced to ensure that parking on The Poplars is reserved for residents only.

You cannot call this a consultation, if you completely ignore previous comments, and will not offer an explanation to legitimate questions. The proposal has not changed one iota from the original proposal, which was, and still is, flawed.

Please respond to this e-Mail!

As previously stated:

We are not in favour of the proposed scheme because it will not work!

Although parking by train station customers is a contributory factor, the primary cause is the high density of terraced houses (with multiple car ownership) with no off road parking. This scheme will not solve this problem.

AS ALSO PREVIOUSLY STATED:- Should the scheme be introduced anyway. We would need the curb space immediately in front of our driveway marked no waiting at designated times. We do NOT want the space in front of our drive designated a parking space. This would be ridiculous!

The Council's priority in this area is to prioritise parking for residents and their visitors. Whilst it is understood that resident parking demand in some locations is likely to put pressure on available on-street supply, it is the Council's experience that removing non-resident long stay parking helps relieve this pressure and, consequently, reduces the need for parking across private driveways.

By proposing a marked bay in this location greater flexibility is provided for residents of No 22 and their visitors. If a yellow line restriction was proposed nobody would be permitted to park across the driveway during the restricted times.

Comments are noted.
Consider marking courtesy line across dropped kerb within marked bay.
No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
The minimum solution would be a single yellow line with additional white marking to indicate it is a driveway. This should encompass our driveway plus a Metre either side, to allow me to manoeuvre in and out of our drive.

I am writing regarding your letter of September 2013 regarding the proposed controlled parking zone in Boxmoor.

This is to advise you that I object to the proposed scheme and believe that it is unnecessary and too expensive.

Previous consultation in the proposed Zone indicated an overall level of support for the proposed Controlled Parking Zone. In the proposed CPZ 65% of those who responded to the scheme design consultation were in favour of proceeding. A further 23% were in favour of proceeding with changes to the proposals 11% were not in favour of proceeding.

The cost of permits and vouchers is set to be affordable and solely to help cover the costs of running the scheme. At 48p per week for a £25 permit and 77p per week for a £40 permit residents’ permits are considered to be good value when compared with other parking charges and vehicle running costs.

Comments are noted.

| I object to the proposed “no waiting at anytime”, to the upper part of Fishery Passage from St Johns Road junction down to the road bollards adjacent to Earls Court. I live at XX St Johns Rd, and park in the above Fishery Passage area as do the other residence (XX) as this is outside our block. Removal of this will have a negative effect on our quality of life as we will have to search for parking spaces that are at best hard to come by in St Johns Rd and will become harder if these proposals go through. I therefore object on the grounds of safety for the residence of flat XX and personally have safety/unreasonable inconvenience concerns for my children and myself having to carry shopping etc distances and across roads to my residence. I propose that the permit parking holder area cover this No changes are proposed to the existing restriction at the top end of Fishery Passage. An existing ‘motor vehicles prohibited’ restriction exists in Fishery Passage meaning that motor vehicles should not be using Fishery Passage. In light of the above the proposed ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions between the existing restriction and bollards can be removed. Comments are noted. Remove proposals for top of Fishery Passage from St Johns Road to bollards. Remove Earls Court from eligible properties list No other changes to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
I refer to the ‘No Waiting at any time’ (CPZ) proposal to prevent parking at the upper part of Fishery Passage from St Johns Road to the bollards adjacent to Earls Court.

I live at XX St Johns Road and park in the Fishery Passage area, as do the other residents of the block. This is both convenient to ourselves and practical as it enables us to park away from the main St Johns Road or on one of the narrow side streets where parking is always at a premium. The Fishery Passage is a cul de sac with no through traffic and would therefore seem to be an ideal site for a limited number of cars. Removal of this facility would have a detrimental effect on our quality of life as we have to search for parking spaces further afield and thus increase the congestion in Boxmoor’s streets.

I therefore object most strongly to this proposal on the grounds that it is a) Unnecessary in that the present parking situation is both practical and unobtrusive and b) The proposal would seriously inconvenience the householders and add to the already critical congestion in Boxmoor.

We have previously raised our objection to the introduction of a CPZ. It seems that the CPZ is to go ahead and I will therefore not repeat our objections to it. I would however be interested to know how many responses were received and what proportion of residents were in favour and against the CPZ.

However, to the extent that it is to go ahead, it is unclear why it is necessary to implement controls for 2 separate hours of the day. My understanding is that the aim is, predominantly, to control commuter parking. That aim will be well achieved by restricting parking for one hour.

An existing ‘motor vehicles prohibited’ restriction exists in Fishery Passage meaning that motor vehicles should not be using Fishery Passage.

The proposals seek to protect the narrow alleyway to allow access to the rear of properties accessed off of it and access along it via non-motorised vehicles.

The alleyway is not wide enough to allow vehicles to pass safely and turn. Parked vehicles may also serve to obstruct waste and emergency vehicles seeking to access properties in this area.

The results of this consultation are summarised in the main report.

The Council is keen to ensure that priority for residents remains throughout the day. By implementing a 1 hour restriction only this may not discourage shift or off-peak rail commuters from parking on-street rather than at the station.

The scheme has been designed so as to balance the priority of residents whilst at the same time enable visitor parking via not having all day controls, providing residents with visitor vouchers and allowing some short stay, limited waiting.

Comments are noted.

Remove proposals for top of Fishery Passage from St Johns Road to bollards.

Remove Earles Court from eligible properties list.

No other changes to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.

Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.
alone, say between 10am and 11am.

To control parking for two hours may discourage people from visiting residents, some of whom are disabled and cannot get out, and will force residents to incur disproportionate and unnecessary costs in providing vouchers for visitors for 2 hours rather than 1. It seems, at the very least to be worth seeing if one controlled hour is sufficient. If it proves to be insufficient, an additional hour could be added. Experience shows that controls are rarely, if ever, reduced and so I do not think it appropriate to begin with two controlled hours.

It would also be helpful for there to be clarification regarding bank holidays which should, of course, be periods that are NOT controlled.

My only concern with the proposed scheme is the restriction on the number of hours of vouchers that residents will be able to obtain per year. 100 hours of vouchers per year is effectively 50 days, which equates to less than 1 full day per week. As someone planning to have a family in the coming years and likely to rely on parental support for childcare I feel that a limit of 100 days or 200 hours per year would be a fairer limit and mean that family would be able to park outside the house for up to 2 days per week at times when my car is unlikely to require a space.

I hope the above will be taken into account in your deliberations and decision making.

Thank you for inviting comments upon the proposed controlled parking zone in Boxmoor.

Please read this note in conjunction with my earlier comments which are noted below.

Comments will be taken into account when residents of Green End Road are consulted on potential future parking controls.

Comments are noted.

Consult residents of Green End Road on
submission. Thank you too for your reply and acknowledgement in this new paper that concerns about parking in Green End Road and its environs need to be addressed.

As previously stated, we are not opposed to the introduction of a controlled parking zone in Boxmoor. Indeed, it is necessary, as recent years has seen increased traffic, commuter parking and school "runs". However, the introduction of restrictions to the south of St John's Road will inevitably increase the pressure on parking in unrestricted roads to the north of it, causing even further congestion, disruption and the risk of serious accidents. Traffic now in Green End Road, which is a bus route, is ever on the increase - it is seen as a short cut from Boxmoor to Warners End without roundabouts or sleeping policemen!

It is inevitable that with commuters seeking parking elsewhere as a result of what is initially proposed, unacceptable congestion and disruption will occur in Green End Road. Therefore, I would urge the Council to introduce the extended controlled parking zone to include the roads referred to in the second paragraph of your consultation document as a matter of urgency.

I have received the information about the controlled parking zone in Boxmoor and was seeking your advice. XX is part business and part residential. We would have a maximum of XX staff at one time and also a maximum of XX XX. Our appointments tend to last 30 minutes, occasionally 60 minutes.

Therefore I was looking to see what you suggest as being a XX some of our XX are disabled or have difficulty walking and parking away from the XX would not be ideal.

The operational hours of the proposals are such that there are only 2 hours per day, Monday to Friday, when most controls will operate. Outside these days/hours parking is mainly unrestricted.

The use of the off-street area used for parking Fishery Passage is unaffected by the proposals.

Elsewhere in the proposed zone a number of shared use parking bays are proposed that allow waiting for up to 30 minutes.

Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

viable parking management options.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
I look forward to hearing from you with your suggestions.

Please refer to the email I sent yesterday (Tuesday 8th October) and I have thought of some further questions for the Controlled Parking Zone in Boxmoor.

1. We are part residential and part commercial so can we apply for both a business and residential parking permit?

2. Opposite the XX there is a large parking bay. I assume we can still park here as it is set back from the 'no waiting at any time' allocation zone?

3. Is there any scope for leniency on the 30 minute rule?

4. Some of our XX are disabled or have difficulty walking and parking away from the practice would not be ideal.

These points are really important and could affect our business significantly. Please take into consideration all of the above points and also please see my email from yesterday too.

| My attention has been drawn to the consultation in progress on the CPZ south of St Johns Road and the fact that only after it is implemented will the Council start consulting on an extension north of St Johns Road to cover, inter alia, Alston Road. We have not received a consultation pamphlet through the door!

I must say this will simply subject us to a long period of chaos as the displaced commuter parking tries to find refuge in our road, where it will inevitably clash with | Businesses in the zone will be entitled to apply for an annual permit for a vehicle essential for the running of the business.

The property occupier will be entitled to apply for either a business or resident permit. The terms and conditions of eligibility will vary depending on which permit is applied for.

Yes, this space will be available for parking as it is not under the Council's control.

Only disabled badge holders are permitted to park for longer than the 30 minutes that will be available.

Disabled Badge Holders are permitted to wait for up to 3 hours on yellow line restrictions (subject to considering safety and other highway code concerns).

Comments will be taken into account when residents of Alston Road are consulted on potential future parking controls. | Comments are noted.
Consult residents of Alston Road on viable parking management options.
No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
Residents' parking and the twice-daily school run. Already we have a situation in which normal traffic let alone emergency vehicles and public service vehicles cannot venture down our road for long periods of the day and cannot get out of the road due to double parking – the road sweeper has to perform his duties at 0630 for instance, and the local bus service down Green End Road is hazardous – and now we are asked effectively to be patient and await a fresh consultation whilst the situation is greatly exacerbated by the displaced commuter parking. Life will become intolerable and dangerous for us local residents, and our personal situation is made worse by the fact that we live XX to the XX (built some ten years after we moved in) with its own car parking problems already impacting on residents in Alston Road, particularly in the evening. The police readily tell you that no notice is taken of the present minimal yellow line on the corner of our road and Green End Road and at times has led to the abandonment of some cars (photos sent to the Police in the past) whilst parents collect their children.

You may well deduce from the above that to implement the proposed scheme without taking into consideration the impact it will have on our area may well result in serious accidents as well as serious personal inconvenience.

| The parking problem in the main is a result of commuter 'Station Parking'. Therefore, why not work with the landowners that own the parking sites and agree an affordable parking fee for commuters. It would save commuters time and effort cruising round the residential roads at dawn. | Permit parking is not proposed for Bargrove Avenue. All comments are noted and will be considered when residents in area to north of St Johns Road are consulted on need for parking management. | Comments are noted. Consult residents of Bargrove Avenue on viable parking management options. |
| Implementing CPZ does not solve the parking problems. | The cost of implementing the CPZ is considerably less than the cost of acquiring land and providing additional station | No change to proposed |
It just pushes the problems into the roads further up from the station. In the Boxmoor scenario, it clashes with the village area and St Roses School parking in Green End Road. (Also, forward thinking! What/when Pouchen End is developed? How many people will be rail commuters? Will they be looking for street parking?)

As a Bargrove Avenue resident, I moved here over 20 years ago aware of a school and its parking issues. However, the school has expanded in the last 20 years but they have not increased their parking to reflect more staff. And they have also started to use the side roads for parking. The school has wide grass verges the length of its long drive, therefore, part of their ‘planning’ agreement should have been extra parking by having these grass verges concreted into parking bays. School parking for drop off and pick up is temporary and unavoidable but it would make a huge difference if they parked with consideration.

As in my communication last year, Green End Road parking causes poor visibility to traffic from side roads. Therefore, effective, less disruptive and not incurring cost possibilities are:

- Extend yellow lines on the corners to increases visibility. (Although, school parents park on the existing yellow lines on the corner of Bargrove Ave and Alston road, they have their own rules! They should be educated to park correctly and safely.)

- No waiting Mon- Fri between (e.g. middle of day for an hour e.g.11.30a.m-12.30p.m)........to stop commuters.

Dacorum Council prefers to see the needs of rail users met by the railway industry. This should ensure parking at stations is managed in such a way that rail users aren’t forced to park in residential streets.

Traffic Regulation Orders
- Speed humps up Green End Road ........to reduce speed of traffic.

I totally object to ‘Permit Parking’, I have already paid a premium to live close to the station. So I strongly object to paying annually for my and visitors parking outside my home.

This is not a long-term solution.

Homeowners start to pave their front gardens and the residential areas start to look like concrete land. Then there will be a new excuse for a project how to make our towns and residential areas green, environmentally friendly and encourage wildlife. (Hemel Hempstead Town Evolution project rings a bell)

High ‘Parking Fees’ cause these problems, they kill off towns and cause problems and resentment. Especially when it is plain to see that, plenty of affordable parking could be constructed by the station for commuters. It may not be the cheapest option but it is the best option for everyone concerned.

Again, I strongly object to any form of permit parking. The money spent on this project should have been put towards a Station Car Park project

With reference to your proposals, as detailed in your leaflet dated September 2013.

One question, once you’ve displaced (not solved) the problem of railway commuter parking to the area to the north of the CPZ (as this is, in reality, the most likely place it will go, it being geographically next closest to the railway station), where are the residents of this area then supposed to park?

Comments regarding potential displacement of parking to roads north of St Johns Road are noted and will be taken into account should the Council wish to consult residents of that area on potential parking management.

The Council is committed to providing residents of the proposed Zone X with priority with regard to parking for them and their visitors. Previous consultations have confirmed support of residents in Zone X for proposed permit parking. Permit parking charges are set to help cover the costs of

Comments are noted.

Consult residents of St Johns Road on viable parking management options.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
I live on St. Johns Road, between the junction of Cowper Road and the roundabout where St. Johns Road meets Fishery Road. This stretch of St. Johns Road is already subject to parking restrictions, in the form of yellow lines and suffers from a severe lack of parking, forcing local residents to park on side streets, such as Cowper Road, Puller Road and Sebright Road. In addition, these roads are also used for parking by local business owners, their customers, parents dropping off and collecting their children from local schools and railway commuters. As I am sure you are aware, these streets also suffer from a severe lack of parking, so much so, that in the case of Puller Road, additional parking provision has had to be provided at the entrance of Hanover Green, as no alternative exists.

From my own personal observations, the poor parking provision suffered by the aforementioned streets are at least equal to, if not worse than any parking issues I have witnessed on any of the streets within the proposed CPZ, and are without doubt worse than that experienced on parts of Moorland Road and Cangels Close. Indeed, your own proposals map identifies Moorland Road and Cangels Close as having much lower residential densities than Cowper Road, Puller Road, Sebright Road, Alston Road, Grosvenor Terrace, etc. and, from a cursory glance at Google Earth, I would estimate at least 70% of the residents who live along these two roads have access to garages and/or private driveways, many of which are capable of accommodating multiple cars. The same cannot be said for much of Boxmoor.

Whilst I appreciate your scheme is based upon a survey of residents opinions on permit parking within their own streets, it appears highly contradictory that in trying to solve a problem of a lack of parking provision that, residential streets that enjoy very good private off street parking, we have the nerve to impose a charging zone on Boxmoor.

| Managing the scheme. Residents and businesses in the proposed Zone are fully aware of the permit costs throughout the consultation process and the levels of support received are deemed to take permit price into account as part of the overall package. At 48p per week for a £25 permit and 77p per week for a £40 permit the Council considers this to offer good value when compared to other parking charges elsewhere. The Council makes no positive revenue from its on-street parking income. This is not expected to change should the current proposals be implemented. |
parking have been included within the CPZ, whilst residential streets that have little or no off street parking, and that will probably suffer as a consequence of the implementation of the CPZ, have not.

In this respect, it is my belief, the proposal lacks insight, is crude and is poorly thought out. It fails to address the problem of parking provision that is common to large parts of Boxmoor in a fair and democratic way, and ignores the effect the impact the CPZ will have on neighbouring areas when implemented. Apart from benefiting the few, it will not resolve the problem of parking provision within the area, simply move it on. Unfortunately (but not unsurprisingly), the proposal appears to be more about generating a revenue stream for the council than addressing parking issues, and on this basis, I would like to register my objection to the implementation of the proposed CPZ in its current form.

I believe a mistake has been made on your Controlled Parking Zone map, as you have indicated that double yellow lines are to be painted across my garage driveway opposite XX. This leaves me in the position of being the only resident who is not permitted to park across their driveway to load or unload 24/7. I concur with the placement of double yellow lines beginning after my driveway and continuing along Moorland Road toward Cangels Close.

I attended the drop-in session at St John's Church and met with a Planning Officer who assured me that it was an oversight on her part that the double yellow line had been drawn across my drive as she thought that the garage belonged to the next property on the left side along Moorland Road, going towards Cangels Close and she had just continued the line outside that property on the drawing. She did promise me confirmation by

| Loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow lines
  and that is the case in front of the garage referred to. |
| Comments are noted. |
| No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |

Loading in front of the garage in this location is not considered desirable at any time due to the proximity to both the bend and the junction of Grove Road as well as the proposed permit holder bay on the north side of Moorland Road. In addition the proposals as a whole will reduce the amount of non-resident long stay parking in this area, freeing up more space on street. This should reduce the need for parking in inappropriate locations albeit without removing the ability to load/unload on yellow lines.
email but this has, regrettably, not materialised.

I have lived in Moorland Road for 30 years and there has never been a traffic problem in front of my garage. Without any parking control measures, fire engines, refuse trucks and removal lorries have had no problems navigating this corner and there have been no accidents or collisions. Placing the double yellow lines across the road from my garage on the entrance to XX will, however, serve to improve the clearance on this corner further.

If, contrary to the information given to me by the Planning Officer, the decision to paint double yellow lines across the driveway to my garage was made on the grounds of safety, I would like to point out that the very next bend along Moorland Road towards Cangels Close is identical to the bend by my garage and I would have thought, if there were safety grounds for the decision, that the road markings there would also have to reflect this. In addition to this, further along Moorland Road there is a right-angled bend with Cangels Close where the parking control measures you propose place vehicles moving towards each other head on (pictures 3, 4 and 5). Continuing along Cangels Close towards Northridge Way there is a sweeping bend where your proposed parking measures would result in poor visibility and again force vehicles into head-on positions (pictures 6 and 7).

The Highways Department have never had an issue with my garage before, supporting my ability to park in front of my garage by painting a white line on the road across my driveway, even though there were no double yellow lines across the road opposite my garage.

I seek confirmation that the proposed double yellow lines across my driveway will be replaced by a single yellow
I would like to object to the proposed CPZ @ Boxmoor. I live in Grovehill West and commute to London for work. I use the on street parking at the following locations: Kingsland Road, Horsecroft Road, Wharf Road and Foster Road (wherever I can find a space.) I do so only because the parking @ the station is not affordable @ £6 per day minimum. There is no alternative and by implementing this CPZ it will only mean that commuters like myself will only have to park further away and walk to the station.

I buy an annual pass for the trains/underground and this is in excess of £4100. For this amount we don’t even get a ‘free’ space to park at the station. The bus service that does service the station is not often enough and neither is it direct enough. It takes roughly an hour to get from the station from Grovehill West. The same journey by car takes less than 15mins. If there was a frequent and fast service to the station I’d gladly take this. Also the bus services do not seem to be in sync with the train services. If a train arrives @ Hemel @ 6pm, the bus leaves the bus stop @ 6:05pm. Unless you are superman/woman, there is on way to alight from the train, race down the stairs, clear the barriers, clear the taxi rank, run down to the road, cross the road and then board the bus. (Which you then have to pay for!)

A more comprehensive approach needs to be adopted by all the parties concerned: the train companies, the local bus services and indeed

| The Council’s priority is to enable residents and their visitors to park close to their homes. This is the main theme that underpins the proposals and in this location this continues to be the priority. The Council prefers to see the needs of rail users met by the railway industry. This should ensure parking at stations is managed in such a way that rail users aren’t forced to park in residential streets. In addition the Council considers that it is the role of local bus operators to work with the rail industry to help ensure rail users are able to take advantage of bus services and not be forced to drive to the station. | Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
the local councils. Until this is addressed there will always be issues parking in and around areas close to the stations.

Maybe most of what I’ve said is beyond your control, but making the area a CPZ does not help anyone.

Thank you for your recent letter dated September 2013. We wish to object on the following grounds:

We are opposed to the limit of three permits per household. Each driver residing in a property should be entitled to a permit for a vehicle. This would ensure that properties with little or no parking requirement do not have wasted, unused entitlement which they are not permitted to pass on to others, whilst adequately accommodating the needs of residents with greater parking requirements.

The sizes of the properties in the zone will naturally govern the necessity for permits; each property will have a physical limit as to the maximum number of potential drivers it can house and in many cases will have less. The provision of off road parking at some properties will also reduce the requirement for permit allocation in some cases.

If extra permits are not allowed there would need to be provision, within the zone, for areas of completely unrestricted parking to allow residents to park, locally, any vehicles for which they are not allowed to have a permit under the proposed limit of three.

We are opposed to a scheme which effectively dictates how many vehicles a resident may have by making additional parking unavailable (limit of three permits per household).

We are opposed to any scheme which would force the DYL at the junction of Fishery Passage and Horsecroft Road is proposed in order to protect visibility at that junction and restrict parking in a location that is not wide enough to allow on street parking with space for passing by other

The Council considers that having had two rounds of consultation so far the proposed scheme has received sufficient support for its main purpose – to provide residents with priority for parking over long-stay non-residents Monday to Friday.

The scheme is only proposed to operate for 2 hours in the day, Monday to Friday. This limits the effect of restrictions on residents but will remove long stay non-residential parking. The Council considers that, on balance, this flexibility is the best way forward in this area.

Comments on extended days and hours of controls are noted and will be taken into consideration in any future review of Zone X.

The limit on numbers of permits properties are eligible for is a balanced judgement by the Council having taken into account limited parking capacity on street and current car ownership levels.

Individual circumstances can be considered. This should negate the need for inconvenience to residents and, therefore, requirement to park vehicles in other locations outside the zone.

The DYL at the junction of Fishery Passage and Horsecroft Road is proposed in order to protect visibility at that junction and restrict parking in a location that is not wide enough to allow on street parking with space for passing by other
residents to permanently park vehicles in surrounding streets outside the zone (limit of three permits per household). We are opposed to any scheme which forces residents to park in other streets and use up other people's parking provision.

We are opposed to any scheme which puts residents to the inconvenience of having to walk significantly greater distances to reach their properties from wherever they may be able to locate parking outside the zone. We are opposed to any scheme which results in greater inconvenience to us as residents. We can presently park all our vehicles with little difficulty and the proposals will cause us great difficulties. We are opposed to the introduction of double yellow lines at the point where Fishery Passage joins Horsecroft Road (opposite Foster Road) resulting in the loss of approximately ten spaces as currently used. We are opposed to the unnecessary and permanent reduction of the area's parking capacity, by approximately ten spaces, operational at all times by the introduction of double yellow lines at the abovementioned site. We are opposed to any scheme which will reduce the number of parking spaces that we currently have use of, in an area where there is great demand (proposed double yellow line provision will remove approximately ten spaces where Fishery Passage joins Horsecroft Road). In addition to any daytime parking difficulties to be addressed for residents, there is substantial pressure on parking space in this area in the evenings and weekends when there is a large influx of non residents to the area. Under the existing arrangements there is rarely any spare parking capacity in the evenings and the permanent removal of any existing parking spaces would be unacceptable. Such a loss of spaces will result in a vehicles. The proposals do not affect the off-street parking on the south east side of Fishery Passage as this is not highway so remains available to use at the discretion of the land owner.

An additional parking space is created on Horsecroft Road opposite the junction with Fishery Passage.

Other junctions or narrow roads in the zone are protected or proposed to be protected in the same way.
positive shortage available for residents in the evenings. We are opposed to the scheme's operational hours. In order to make acceptable the loss of approximately ten, very necessary, parking spaces in this area, by the provision of double yellow lines at the point where Fishery Passage joins Horsecroft Road, the operational hours of the scheme would need to be extended to encompass the hours of 8-10pm and weekends. This would remove the need for the ten spaces to be preserved. We are opposed to any scheme which would cause greater inconvenience to residents. The short hours of the scheme would not afford any assistance in the evenings when there is great demand for parking in the area and, under the current proposals, the additional threat of the removal of ten existing parking spaces. The short hours do not preserve any spaces for residents in the evenings. We are vehemently opposed to the proposals as they currently stand. We are opposed to a scheme which would be detrimental to our lives and result in poorer resident satisfaction. We were under the impression that this scheme was designed to 'ease parking' for the residents. The current proposals will do the exact opposite in our area. As it stands currently, the proposals would significantly increase inconvenience and would cause greater parking congestion for the residents of our area of the scheme and inconvenience in not being able to park all of one's vehicles locally. To avoid *increasing inconvenience* to the residents in our area the scheme would have to offer: A flexible approach to the number of permits allowed per household - to suit individual households' needs. and, either a) drop the plan for double yellow lines at the Horsecroft Road/Fishery Passage area and allow the residents and visitors to the area to continue to make use of the ten
spaces currently available there
or
b) increase the effective hours of the scheme to encompass 8-10pm and run 7 days a week at least in Horsecroft Road where there is greater pressure on parking in the evenings and at weekends. This would mean there would no longer be a need for the ten spaces being threatened by the proposed yellow lines as the residents will have protected access to all the available parking at all peak times of day including the evenings and weekends.
Do please contact me if you have any queries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In response to your invitation to comment or object to the proposals. We would like to offer our considered response.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In principle, we object to the controlled parking scheme on the basis of additional costs that will be incurred (a) to the taxpayer for implementation and on-going administration and compliance management and of the scheme (I have no recollection of seeing these costs) and.... (b) due to the personal expense that we will incur as a result of having to purchase permits and vouchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am also annoyed that the primary beneficiary of the scheme will be Network Rail - or whoever manages the car park at the railway station, who no doubt will derive increased revenue (I hope they will send Dacorum Borough Council a thank you card!).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As this household is likely to be in a minority to disagree with the proposals and if the scheme does proceed; we would like to reiterate that we still have strong concerns (previously registered) that the double parking at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council has carefully considered the costs associated with implementing and administering the scheme against the need to prioritise residents parking against that of long stay non-residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of parking permits is considered to be reasonable when compared to other parking charges (a £25 permit equates to less than 50p per week and a £40 permit equates to 77p per week).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income received from sale of permits and vouchers as well as enforcement will help fund the cost of running and administering the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No objection has been received from either the highway authority or Police to the proposals. The scheme design retains the junction protection at this location and provides some yellow line restrictions between the shared use bays and permit bays to help avoid long lengths of parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will remove long stay non-resident parking which will also help reduce demand for parking generally in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposals have been designed so as to provide a balance between resident permit only bays (the majority of space) and some shared use bays (for short stay visits and to assist local businesses but also allow residents to use these bays if necessary). The shared use bays have been located so as to provide a range of locations in the area rather than cluster together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junction of Fishery Road and Kingsland Road permitted under the scheme, will lead to dangerous congestion and the risk of an accident when vehicles are attempting to pull into Kingsland road when vehicles are approaching West along Kingsland Road. This danger is presently avoided by the existing &quot;no waiting&quot; line which we believe should be retained. If you have not already done so, we suggest that this concern be addressed with Highways Dept. If the above is not adopted we advocate that the proposed shared use bays in Kingsland Road be changed to permit only. We fail to see any logical reason why this specific area of road has been nominated as shared use which is a disadvantage to residents. Thank you for the opportunity to register our views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The results of previous consultations are available on the Council's website. Based on the responses received to previous consultations, the Council considers that there is sufficient support for a permit parking scheme. The Council has carefully considered the costs associated with implementing and administering the scheme against the need to prioritise residents parking against that of long stay non-residents. The cost of parking permits is considered to be reasonable when compared to other parking charges (a £25 permit equates to 48p per week and a £40 permit equates to 77p per week).

The proposals have been designed so as to provide a balance between resident permit only bays (the majority of space) and some shared use bays (for short stay visits and to assist local businesses but also allow residents to use these bays if necessary). The shared use bays have been located so as to provide a range of locations in the area rather than cluster together. |

I am writing in reply to the letter received by the council in relation to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) proposed in Boxmoor.

I strongly object to the CPZ for the following reasons:

1) I live as a resident on Horsecroft Road; I have never had any issue with parking.
2) Having spoken to my neighbours they have had no issue with parking either. It also disturbs that the exact findings from the original questionnaire have not been published.

It seems ludicrous that one has to pay road tax to keep a vehicle on the road, now you are proposing we have to pay to park it each year? |

The results of previous consultations are available on the Council's website.

Based on the responses received to previous consultations, the Council considers that there is sufficient support for a permit parking scheme.

The Council has carefully considered the costs associated with implementing and administering the scheme against the need to prioritise residents parking against that of long stay non-residents.

The cost of parking permits is considered to be reasonable when compared to other parking charges (a £25 permit equates to 48p per week and a £40 permit equates to 77p per week). Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |

| I am writing in reply to the letter received by the council in relation to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) proposed in Boxmoor. I strongly object to the CPZ for the following reasons; 1) I live as a resident on Horsecroft Road; I have never had any issue with parking. 2) Having spoken to my neighbours they have had no issue with parking either. It also disturbs that the exact findings from the original questionnaire have not been published. It seems ludicrous that one has to pay road tax to keep a vehicle on the road, now you are proposing we have to pay to park it each year? | The results of previous consultations are available on the Council's website. Based on the responses received to previous consultations, the Council considers that there is sufficient support for a permit parking scheme. The Council has carefully considered the costs associated with implementing and administering the scheme against the need to prioritise residents parking against that of long stay non-residents. The cost of parking permits is considered to be reasonable when compared to other parking charges (a £25 permit equates to 48p per week and a £40 permit equates to 77p per week). | Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
This seems nothing more than a way of increasing revenue for the Council. If this was not the case and really is just to make it better for residents in the area, why would you not issue free permits for current residents? I also think local businesses in the already struggling High Street will be damaged by this proposed scheme having to pay an elevated cost for the permit.

The Council makes no positive revenue from its on-street parking income. This is not expected to change should the current proposals be implemented.

Boxmoor was quite a successful little village. With many shops, butchers, a bank etc etc.

At the same time Hemel Hempstead town centre was full of individual shops and was quite interesting to visit.

At that time both Boxmoor and HH town centre had largely unrestricted access for cars and free parking for longer stays.

HH town has been pedestrianised and parking is paid for. It is not possible to simply drive up close to the shop you require nip in and buy something. As a direct result of this the town has become run down. Many shops have shut – whereas their equivalents in non pedestrianised towns nearby continue to succeed.

Some time back Boxmoor was narrowed and much of the street parking was removed or reduced. Horsecroft road was cut off at the Three Blackbirds and a paid car park was added.

Result less successful shops in Boxmoor.

This latest scheme is simply following the same pattern. The problem is railway parking and you plan to restrict the village to solve the problem. People park here because the station car park is so expensive. So why not fix the

The Council’s priority is to enable residents and their visitors to park close to their homes. This is the main theme that underpins the proposals and in this location this continues to be the priority.

The previous consultation identified demand and support for a controlled parking zone within Boxmoor.

65% of those who responded to the scheme design consultation were in favour of proceeding. A further 23% were in favour of proceeding with changes to the proposals. 11% were not in favour of proceeding.

The Council prefers to see the needs of rail users met by the railway industry. This should ensure parking at stations is managed in such a way that rail users aren’t forced to park in residential streets.

Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.
problem with a free car park for station parking.

Your CPZ Boxmoor scheme will simply move the problem outside the area. You are not solving the problem at all simply moving it. The side effect is likely to be that shops will close in Boxmoor for the reasons above.

Hemel Hempstead was recently voted the ugliest town in England. It is thinking like this that has earned the town that reputation.

If there is a problem it should be fixed rather than side stepping the issue.

Other examples might be.
- Pavilion knocked down and never rebuilt.
- River gade not maintained so the park floods.
- Free parking removed near town shops close.
- Traffic lights added at the swan A41 traffic worst it has ever been
- Traffic lights at two waters should be a roundabout save money energy etc and less traffic.
- One way system in old town WHY WHY WHY!!!!!

We are a XX XX based in St Johns Road and whilst this is strictly not in the Controlled Parking Zone area there will be an obvious movement of the parking problem from this area to the areas just outside the zone.

There is mention of businesses being able to get 1 parking permit but there is no mention if this needs to include a registration number as it does for residential permits. I assume that this is to allow the permit to be used by any of the different staff who might be working and need to park by the surgery. If this is not the case then I would recommend that any linking of a permit to a car registration should be removed.

Properties in St Johns Road are not proposed to be eligible for permits in the proposed CPZ.

The Council will consult St Johns Road on potential future parking management options once a decision has been made on the proposed CPZ.

Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.
1. The major problem of all day (Mon-Fri) commuter parking has been addressed and should have a beneficial impact for all locals.

2. The introduction of shared parking bays will cause some inconvenience.

3. The time restrictions - particularly the 9am -10am slot - will clash with several of our regular weekday services and also daytime Funerals and Weddings. Please consider changing the AM timing to 8.30AM - 9.30AM as our services begin from 9.30AM onwards.

4. At the FRONT of the church i.e. along St Johns Rd no recommendations have been made. This short section of road immediately opposite the Three Blackbirds pub and immediately adjacent to a traffic calming road restriction will inevitably be used even more often than at present. A suitable time restriction on weekdays (ex Sat/Sun) will benefit our usage as it is the only safe dropping off spot for disabled parishioners, funeral corteges and wedding cars. We put cones out at present but these are ignored.

As far as I am aware the nearby shops would also benefit from this restriction as their passing trade has been severely damaged by ‘commuter parking’ already.

General

There will no doubt be some adverse impact on streets to the north of St Johns Rd as commuters seek alternatives but I understand that additional restrictions are not supported by residents. The stretch of road from St Johns C of E church to our own looks to be the most likely alternative with further adverse impact on residents, our parishioners and regular users of our community

Thank you for copying me into your email to the Consultation. I am sorry that this consultation letter was not properly delivered - seems my email last February to the organisation that runs the consultation was overlooked.

You raise very valid points and they will be considered. I will make enquiries for you about obtaining a permit.

There is proposed to be shared use bays in Wharf Road (2), in Foster Road and, as you point out there is both a church parking area and a surface car park in Cowper Road which is free for one hour.

St Johns Road was not considered for inclusion in the scheme after the feedback from initial consultation. With respect to funerals a hearse would not attract a Penalty Charge Notice during a service and discretion is used for an official funeral car (black limousine). Other mourners would need to park outside the zone or take advantage of the 30 minutes available in the shared use bays during enforcement hours. The needs of the local businesses and other organisations have been taken into consideration as the scheme is proposed to run for just two hours per day rather than full days as in our existing CPZ areas.

A church is not eligible for a permit.

Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
centre which can only accommodate 15-20 cars safely.

My earlier submission (see Email dated 14/2/13 below) continues to represent our views.

We received no acknowledgement or contact to discuss our particular concerns in relation to our church community who are regular users of the street parking adjacent to the church (which is on the opposite side of a busy road to our main carpark which is already used by parishioners and locals thus helping to reduce on street parking.

We notice that on the latest plan that no limited parking has been introduced along the section of St Johns rd itself - immediately outside the front entrance to our church. This will be used even more by commuters once the CPZ is operative with a resultant increase in existing problems for funeral and wedding cars UNLESS we can be assured that parking wardens will be told to exercise discretion/common sense for these events.

Lastly, do we as a church qualify for a residential or business permit and at what cost?

| Should Dacorum Borough Council decide to proceed with the CPZ proposals for the area south of St John's Road, Boxmoor, residents of Bargrove Avenue, Sebright Road, Green End Road and Alston Road will be adversely affected by 'displacement parking'. This term covers the effect of shifting the problem of commuter car parking from the south of St John's Road to roads further north, rather than solving the problem via constructive dialogue with railway authorities. There is also a problem with parking congestion/illegal and obstructive car parking in Bargrove Avenue, Sebright Road, Green End Road and Alston Road. | Permit parking is not proposed for of St John's Road, Boxmoor, residents of Bargrove Avenue, Sebright Road, Green End Road and Alston Road. All comments are noted and will be considered when residents in area to north of St John's Road are consulted on need for parking management. Dacorum Council prefers to see the needs of rail users met by the railway industry. This should ensure parking at stations is managed in such a way that rail users aren't forced to park in residential streets. | Comments are noted. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders |
Road, Green End Road and Alston Road in the area around St Rose's School, particularly at morning and afternoon drop-off and pick-up times. Again, there has been no constructive dialogue with the school authorities aimed at easing this problem for local residents.

In view of the parking issues and the council proposals, I comment as follows:

1. **I do not support a permit parking system in Bargrove Avenue.** This imposes an unwelcome financial penalty on households. While I sympathise with residents of roads south of St John's Road and welcome any parking restrictions that will be to their benefit, it is wrong that residents north of St John's Road should pay the price of solving their parking problems - either financially or in enduring ‘displacement parking’.

2. **I welcome 'no waiting zones' throughout the entire length of Bargrove Avenue, and suggest the hours of 9-10am and 2-3pm.**

3. **I suggest 'no waiting at any time' stretches in Green End Road.** This would create valuable ‘passing places’ for through traffic, including buses and emergency vehicles. Currently, bumper-to-bumper parking along both sides of the road - mostly at school ‘bottle neck’ times - results in head-on road blocks for through traffic.

I trust that residents north of St John's Road will be treated with consideration and fairness by Dacorum Borough Councillors in adopting any CPZ proposals for Boxmoor.

I am more anxious now about the safety of these proposals because I have tried leaving various widths to get in and out and am surprised myself how often it is impossible to manoeuvre in or out of the drive. How are the general public going to know? It is worse when the

Thank you for your reminder email and further e-mail concerning the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone in your area. Apologies for the slight delay responding. Currently the council has consulted on an outline scheme only. Should I decide to move forward with the proposals a

Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
vehicles are lorries and vans and when a lorry or van is parked opposite.

I have also tested the visibility of my car to on-coming traffic as I reverse out.

I have written to XX. I want to know what assessment the council have done and to see a copy of that.

Leaving it until a consultation seems foolhardy as they need the assessment there for me to see. Last time the spokesman just walked out of the room.

I would be glad if you could let me have the information I asked for in my last email (below) so that I have the it for the consultation.

If you do not have the information can you let me know?

I have waited for the detailed plans that you asked me to wait for. I see nothing has changed. Has anybody been and looked? Following the inadequacy of the previous consultation I need reassurance about the process at this next stage or it will all be signed and sealed.

I am very concerned that the visibility issues surrounding getting on and off my drive have not been properly considered. The drive in a dip. Visibility is blocked by a high fence and is now to be blocked by parked cars.

Secondly how do you get on and off the drive when cars are parked so close?

Can you answer these two issues and confirm somebody has driven on and off the drive?

There hasn't been any consultation for this house yet. What should be my next step to ensure there is some?

detailed scheme will be produced for a formal consultation. At that stage both Hertfordshire County Council (the Highway Authority for Dacorum) and the Police would be consulted. If either of these agencies objects to the scheme on safety grounds the scheme would be modified or discontinued.

If I decide to move forward with the proposals you will have a further opportunity to respond to a consultation based on detailed plans, as previously advised to you.

I hope this explanation has been of assistance to you at this stage in the consultation process.

The revised plans have been drawn up taking into account comments from the last consultation with requests included where the purpose of the scheme is not compromised and if practical. Site visits would not include driving vehicles onto private property.

It is likely that parking in the roads will be reduced should the scheme go ahead and therefore result in some improvement to your current situation. Marking bays across driveways does not imply that it is acceptable for anyone to park there, but it does give the property permit holder the opportunity to use the space should they wish, allowing a visitor to park in your driveway without the need to use visitor vouchers.

During this consultation the plans will be reviewed by Hertfordshire county council for safety and compliance. To oppose or support the scheme please follow the guidelines on your consultation leaflet.

Thank you for your supplementary e-mail. The proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), if introduced, will not make any difference to the elevations of your drive and will not make exiting your drive any more difficult than you currently find it. The proposed CPZ is intended to improve the
| I have asked over and over again in letters, emails and at the consultation for somebody to look at the situation of getting on and off my drive. Can you please say to yourself I must go and do this today? That is - send me an email with a time when you can sit as a passenger and see what the situation is. The dips and other geography are not shown on the map but nobody has looked at it and definitely not looked at it sitting in a vehicle.

Secondly, from my measurements, driving on and off the drive is not possible when cars park too near. Nobody has checked it out.

It is nothing to do with permit holders blocking across the whole drive.

If nobody is prepared to look at this now please tell me so I can get further advice. |
| --- |
| opportunities for residents to find parking near their homes through reducing commuter parking in the area and it does not include making alterations to private drives. The geography of the area is unlikely to have changed since you chose to make the property your home however the number of cars that park in the road may have increased and this is something that we are trying to address through our proposals for a CPZ. If you wish to improve visibility, the height of your boundary fence, the elevation or construction of your drive way, I respectfully suggest, that you seek advice from a reputable tradesman.

Thank you once again for your e-mail, unfortunately there is nothing further I can suggest therefore I now consider this matter closed. |
APPENDIX E – BOXMOOR CONSULTATION SUPPORT
**Appendix E - Boxmoor support**

**General comments:**

- All the following are in support of the scheme so comments are in this context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the proposed scheme but would prefer it to operate six days a week. I live at XX Moorland Road and the commuter parking during the week is replaced by people using the station for shopping and social trips to almost the same level on Saturdays. The car park at the station is open on a Saturday.</td>
<td>The primary objective of the scheme is to provide residents with priority over weekday long stay non-resident parking. Informal consultation on the proposals in September 2012 identified support for a Monday to Friday scheme.</td>
<td>Comments are noted No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in full support of the parking control options. I would, however, like the weekends to be considered, as although the number of commuters to the road will be greatly reduced during the week, my experience is that people will still use the road as a means to avoid paying the station parking fees. This further reduces the opportunity for residents or their visitors to be able to park within some reasonable distance of their property. I have resided at XX Kingsland Road for almost 8 years now and have witnessed an increasing frustration of many households being unable to park near their homes due to the flurry of commuters. Most households have more than one vehicle and this further adds to the problem. I have observed residents with off road parking not using their drive ways and parking on the road side more recently. One assumes this is to stop people parking irresponsibly and blocking their drives. I would be grateful if weekend restrictions could also be considered as part of the exercise.</td>
<td>The primary objective of the scheme is to provide residents with priority over weekday long stay non-resident parking. Informal consultation on the proposals in September 2012 identified support for a Monday to Friday scheme.</td>
<td>Comments are noted No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My wife and I support the proposals for the controlled parking zone in Boxmoor. However, I would strongly recommend that the proposed ‘no waiting Mon-Fri 9-10am and 2-3pm’ restrictions outside of XX, XX and XX Moorland Road be implemented as ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions. This would prevent potential blockage of these properties’ driveways by parked vehicles not belonging to these properties and would also allow greater visibility of the road for cars leaving these driveways thus improving road safety (cars are regularly parked on the road outside of XX Moorland Road, which severely restrict visibility of oncoming traffic for vehicles leaving neighbouring driveways).

I am just writing to confirm that I am strongly in favour of the proposals for a Controlled Parking Zone in the Boxmoor area.

I have already provided several reasons why I think it would be a good idea to implement these proposals and believe that some of the proposals should be made stronger than those cited in the proposals document.

For example, I think that the scheme should operate for a longer time period during the day e.g. from 8am to 11am in the mornings and from 2pm to 6pm in the afternoons/evening. This would then prevent the maximum number of commuters parking here in the mornings and people who don’t even live in the area from parking in this area in the afternoon.

I think there should be special areas allocated for delivery vans to park in. In a recent incident, I witnessed a supermarket delivery van’s wing mirror being clipped by a very impatient driver, who was not prepared to wait a few minutes for the delivery driver to unload his produce and deliver it to one of the houses over the road. (I live in Horsecroft Road, opposite the Boxmoor Social Club).

The proposed CPZ will remove long stay non-resident parking and, therefore, overall demand for parking in this area.

The Council is keen to ensure that residents have as much flexibility as possible with regard to their own parking needs at their own properties which is why only single yellow line restrictions are proposed in the location referred to.

If it is considered that removing long stay non-residential parking will significantly reduce the likelihood of parking across private driveways.

The Council’s experience is that the proposed hours and days of operation provide a balance between removing long stay non-resident parking and providing priority and flexibility for residents and their visitors. Removing long-stay non-residential parking should allow more space for deliveries to take place without causing undue delay.

Delivery vans will be exempt from permit controls whilst loading and unloading.

Speed restrictions and traffic calming are matters for Hertfordshire County Council to address and these comments will be passed to them.

The Council has carefully considered the need for and amount of visitor vouchers that will be available to properties within the CPZ. This includes allowance for the fact that only two hours per day are controlled and there will be some short stay limited waiting available within need for permits or vouchers. On balance, the current proposals are considered robust but applicants for permits/vouchers will be considered on their merits.
As well as a Controlled Parking Zone, I think **more speed restrictions** should be put in place on our road. I think some sort of **traffic calming measures** should be put in place e.g. speed bumps or 30 mile an hour signs put up. A lot of drivers driving down our road, do so at great speed, and I am surprised that more children haven’t been injured or killed as a result of this. Putting in speed bumps at various points along Horsecroft Road will at least make drivers think twice about the speed that they are driving at and perhaps at least make them think about other road users and pedestrians, for at least a few seconds.

In general, I am very supportive of the idea of a Controlled Parking Zone in the Boxmoor area and I hope that a lot of other residents take the time to respond to this important consultation document. It would be a shame if this scheme could not be implemented because of a lack of response to the consultation proposals.

I think far too many people use the Horsecroft Road/Kingsland Road area as a **substitute station car park**, where they currently don’t have to pay any parking fees to use the car parking spaces in this area. Because of this, some of my neighbours who have cars cannot park in front of their own houses at present. Also, it is very difficult for friends and family to park in these areas when they come to visit people both during the week and at weekends. Perhaps the scheme should be extended into the weekend period as well somehow.

Or at least, Dacorum Borough Council should make sure that each resident living in the area is allocated with enough visitor vouchers, to enable their friends and family to be able to park safely in front of their own houses. The idea of visitor vouchers seems like a good idea to me for people who don’t have cars themselves and don’t need to apply for a resident’s parking permit but would still like people they know with cars
Whether any changes can be made to the scheme or not, at this late stage, I and my partner, Peter Gorman are strongly in favour of the proposals for a Controlled Parking Zone in Boxmoor.

Hi as a resident of XX Kingsland road I support the resident parking in Boxmoor But I think it should be all day ! And what happens on weekends??

The primary objective of the scheme is to provide residents with priority over weekday long stay non-resident parking.

The Council’s experience is that the proposed hours and days of operation provide a balance between removing long stay non-resident parking and providing priority and flexibility for residents and their visitors.

Comments are noted.
No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

First of all can I make it clear that it is a massive **YES** to the restricted parking proposal!

Secondly, I am a bit concerned that the letter which was sent out to South Boxmoor residents wasn’t clear as to whether you need everyone to respond or not? Some residents may read the letter and see it as a confirmation rather than something they need to respond to.

Can you let me know if this is the case? If a majority response is still needed then I will go out door-to-door and make sure that residents are clear that they need to confirm their willingness. At this stage, and because we have all mostly agreed with the policy, it may be that the ‘no’s will be more vocal than the ‘yes’s. Which would be disastrous!

The level of response received clearly indicates that the need to comment in support of the scheme was understood by properties that wished to do so.

Comments are noted.
No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

We write in support of the proposed RPZ, on condition that it includes the whole of Grove Road.

The proposed scheme includes all of Grove Road.

Comments are noted.
No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would like to register my opinion on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone.</th>
<th>The primary objective of the scheme is to provide residents with priority over weekday long stay non-resident parking.</th>
<th>Traffic Regulation Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking in the area is extremely difficult to numerous train users parking in our streets.</td>
<td>Informal consultation on the proposals in September 2012 identified support for a Monday to Friday scheme.</td>
<td>Comments are noted, Monitor the situation and review after a minimum of six months of the CPZ being operational. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am definitely in favour of controlled parking in Boxmoor, and would much prefer the CPZ as proposed than nothing at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the proposed scheme to be improved by extending it to Saturdays as parking on Saturdays can be extremely difficult due to commuters parking in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I wish to add further comments with reference to the recent consultation document. I have examined your report dated April 2013. I now realise that I was not consulted on the second phase. Although my address is XX, my property has access to and flanks Grove Road. Like the residents of Grove Road, I own part of the road. My understanding of your document states all owners of the road must be consulted. I have not been consulted and my agreement has not been sought or given. |
| FYI |

“Grove Road
5.6 Nine of the eleven properties submitted written representations requesting that the road be included within the proposed scheme.
5.7 The current proposals exclude Grove Road as it was believed to be private and not public highway. It has since become apparent from paperwork provided by residents that the actual status of Grove Road is unclear. |
| At the time of publishing proposals it was not known that the property in question had access onto Grove Road. The request is considered reasonable insofar as the property user may need to park in Grove Road. Since the April 2013 report further investigation has concluded that a Traffic Order can be made on a road not maintainable at public expense. This can be done without the need to ask for landowners’ consent. Consequently the proposals now include Grove Road following demand to do so from some residents within the road who expressed concerns about non-resident parking. At the time of preparing the draft Traffic Orders it was not known that XX had an access onto Grove Road. It is suggested that XX could be added to the properties eligible for permits in Zone X as the property residents and their visitors may need to park in Grove Road. |
| Amend Traffic Order to include properties which access into the proposed Zone No other changes to proposed Traffic Regulation Order |
5.8 When introducing a CPZ a road does not have to necessarily be maintained by the Council. However, an Order can only be made if the road falls into the description of “a highway or any other road to which the public has access”. The road does not have to be public highway.

5.9 If a road comes under this description then it could be included in an Order and be subject to parking controls, provided the owners of the road all agree to this. Such an agreement would need to be obtained from all householders/residents/landowners in the road to confirm that they wanted controls to be introduced.

5.10 It is likely that a further legal agreement would be required to be signed by both Dacorum Borough Council, who would operate the CPZ and Herts County Council as the Highways Authority [n.b. It should be noted that such an agreement could have repercussions as it could be made in perpetuity i.e. any subsequent owner might have to be bound by the agreement].

PCL Comment: Investigation into the extent of public highway will need to be undertaken with Herts County Council. Once confirmed, informal consultation should be undertaken with residents on the outcome with a view, if possible, for inclusion of Grove Road within the proposed CPZ.

| Thank you for the consultation document of September 2013. I am very much in favour of the scheme implementation but have one comment/objection regarding the proposed | The position of the bay in question has been carefully considered. It's proximity to the Post Office has been a key factor in deciding its location. In order to ensure residents are not unduly inconvenienced the bay has | Comments are noted, No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Order |
shared use/limited bay on the south side of Horsecroft Road to the east of the Foster Road junction.

This proposed bay is outside the properties XX Horsecroft Road and being the only 'free' bay available will be much used by non-residents calling at the post office, nursery and/or St Johns Road shops. Can this bay, please be positioned immediately opposite on the north side of the road so as not to be outside of any of the houses.

been made 'shared use' to allow permit holders to park there and the bay has not been made too long. As limited waiting is only short stay it is considered that the turnover of the bays should ensure access for residents.

There are also free bays on the other side of the Foster Road junction and along one side of Foster Road itself which will help disperse the demand for short stay non-resident parking.

Yes yes yes, most of us residents have been talking about this for 10 years now and it will not come soon enough. Just two things: One, Some of the previous correspondence stated that just 68% of us agreed to this scheme. Is there a direct correlation between that number and those with driveways? Two, Is there any chance of getting the roads resurfaced?

The level of support for the scheme in relation to properties with driveways is not recorded. The Council prefers to consult on the scheme as a whole and assess the results across the whole area.

Comments are noted.

Road maintenance issues are for Hertfordshire County Council to consider and comments on this issue will be passed to them.

Comments are noted.

Re your letter which we received today: yes we do agree with the having permits for our road hopefully as soon as possible. The only thing that is a concern is the solid lines down the road could it not be marked parking spaces only being solid lines we feel as we have had to put up with over the year that people don't have any respect for peoples driveways. They only have to park a couple of feet over the drive and if the neighbours car is parked in the driveway it can make it very difficult to get out sometimes unable to get out.

The proposed CPZ will remove long stay non-resident parking and, therefore, overall demand for parking in this area.

The Council is keen to ensure that residents have as much flexibility as possible with regard to their own parking needs at their own properties which is why parking bays are proposed in some locations, across driveways. This allows residents to park across their own driveways or other drivers by agreement with the owner.

It is considered that removing long stay non-residential parking will significantly reduce the likelihood of parking across private driveways.

Comments are noted.

Consider marking courtesy line.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

I am in favour of the CPZ in Kingsland Road and look forward to the scheme commencing.

My only concern is that some 20 odd homes (including mine) have drives that allow off road parking but although you write

The proposed CPZ will remove long stay non-resident parking and, therefore, overall demand for parking in this area.

The Council is keen to ensure that residents have as

Comments are noted.

Consider marking courtesy line.
about ‘bays’, are you going to make it clear to parkers that they must not park across the drives? It appears that just two lines will be painted the length of Kingsland Road and I feel that something more instructive should be done such as ‘a break in the line allowing parking’ as it crosses all drives.

It is considered that removing long stay non-residential parking will significantly reduce the likelihood of parking across private driveways.

| Is the maximum of 100 hours visitors vouchers (single and weekly) per annum? If so, do they have to be used within the year? This is not really clear from the document. | A maximum of 100 hours of visitor vouchers may be purchased per annum. Vouchers purchased may be carried over to subsequent years without affecting annual entitlements. More detailed information on applying for and use of vouchers will be sent out to properties should a decision be made on proceeding with the proposal. Permission can be sought from the Council for special arrangements regarding use of skips in CPZs. The Council makes a charge for allowing consent to leave a skip in a CPZ. |
| We live at XX Horsecroft Road, Boxmoor and I just wanted to e-mail to say we are happy with the proposal regarding the parking. I do think that residents in the area should be issued one permit free of charge and then have to pay for any other permits though. | The Council has carefully considered the cost of implementing and running the proposed CPZ and concluded that it is reasonable to expect properties that benefit to contribute towards the cost of running the CPZ. This is also to help avoid imposing the cost of running the CPZ on properties that do not benefit. In this context charges for permits are necessary but it is considered that the cost of a single permit (£25 per annum/55p per week) is good value when compared with other parking charges elsewhere. |
| We wish to make the following comments in response to the consultation on the controlled parking zone in Boxmoor: | Comments will be taken into account when residents of Green End Road are consulted on potential future parking controls. |
1. We broadly support the proposed parking zone 2. The Council is right to consider restrictions in the Green End Road area, given that this new scheme has the potential to displace problems onto roads to the north of the controlled area. In fact, there is an argument for introducing both schemes at the same time. The Green End Road proposals should be brought forward urgently.

2. Whilst considering parking controls on Green End Road, speed restrictions should also be investigated. Some people use Green End Road as a “cut through”, and their speed is often excessive for a quiet residential road. The presence of an infant school is a risk factor, and a 20 mile per hour zone may be beneficial.

3. Nothing in this plan addresses the fundamental problem of the lack of affordable parking for London commuters. There would probably be little need for parking restrictions if all commuters parked in the station car park. The Council should investigate all powers available to tackle the excess prices charged for parking at the train station. It is wrong that those who work long hours in London, generating the taxes on which public services rely, are penalised in this way.

4. Comments relating to speed restrictions are matters for Hertfordshire County Council as highway authority. They will be referred to HCC but the proposed scheme has been designed so as to locate parking so that it will help keep vehicle speeds down.

   Parking for rail users is a matter for the private rail companies and the Council has no influence over how their parking is managed or priced.

   The existence of a parking bay across a dropped kerb does not allow anybody to park and cause obstruction without the consent of the property occupiers.

   The Council has carefully considered the need to balance restricting parking (via yellow lines) versus providing flexibility of allowing residents and their visitors to park across their own accesses.

   For this reason in this location it was considered appropriate to propose a bay in order that adjoining property occupiers and their guests had the flexibility to park in front of the dropped kerb.

   Comments are noted.

   No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

---

I own XX Horsecroft Road which is occupied by my elderly mother and we both support this proposal.

However we do not see that there is sufficient space to accommodate parking bays in front of the garages outside this property or that belonging to our neighbour and parking bays would restrict access to the garages. They are therefore not appropriate for this location and instead I suggest you extend the proposed no waiting line.

Thank you for your letter dated September 2013 concerning All bays in Cangels Close are proposed to be on the

Comments are noted.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
the “Controlled Parking Zone” in Boxmoor.

Whilst we absolutely approve of the need for a controlled parking zone, our comments relate to the particular area of Cangels Close and the proposals therein. Please find attached a diagram with the specific areas we are concerned about highlighted.

Our concerns remain as follows:

• Cangels Close is a very thin road with a number of curves and parking on the road means cars struggle to get past whilst parking on the pavement impacts pedestrians many of whom are elderly/disabled.
• It is not clear to us whether the proposed bays are in the road or part on the pavement – it would be very helpful if this is clarified.
• Currently everyone who parks on the street parks half on the pavement and half off, meaning a compromise for both drivers and pedestrians, albeit an unacceptable compromise.
• If the proposed bays are on the road then this will actually worsen the current situation as the road will have less space for passing and cars will be unable to turn round or indeed get off drives easily.
• It would seem to make sense from a safety perspective to have both marked sections changed to “no waiting at any time” from permit holder bays. This would mean that cars could pass each other in the road on the bends without any more accidents. It would also mean pedestrians could utilise the full width of the pavements.
• The section nearer to the top of Cangels Close will by our estimations fit a maximum of 2 cars only. None of the residents in this part of of Cangels Close need to park in this area as all have sufficient drive space for any visitors. So giving up these 2 bays would not have any impact on the provision of parking spaces for residents/visitors.

road.

The proposals will remove long stay non-resident parking which should ease the demand for parking on street and reduce the need for parking in Cangels Close and adjoining roads. This should also reduce the instances of footway parking.

For the above reason, it is not considered necessary to have ‘no waiting at any time’ where bays are proposed. This would also remove the flexibility of allowing residents and their visitors to park.

Consideration has been given to passing vehicles in the proposed design and the likely removal of long stay non-resident parking. The current layout reflects this design work and neither the highway authority or Police have objected to the design. The scheme has been designed so as to balance the need for parking and also help keep vehicle speeds down.

These comments are noted but the Council considers that allowing parking in as many places as possible provides flexibility for residents in order that demand can be met on days where it is needed. Yellow line waiting restrictions do not offer the same level of flexibility.

No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders
Overall, as this is out to consultation it seems a shame that the current proposals do not currently take into account the opportunity to not only control the parking but to make the road a safer pace for residents and people that use the road as a thoroughfare, be they in cars or on foot.

Please can you confirm receipt of this e-mail. Please also feel free to contact us by e-mail should you wish to discuss this matter further.

I live at XX Kingsland Road and am supportive of the introduction of the parking control zones. I have a couple of comments.

- I am one of the few houses at the Fishery Road end of Kingsland Road with off street parking and a dropped kerb. One of the reasons for wanting the control zone is that due to the parking congestion one the rest of the road cars are left (albeit for short periods of time only) outside my house causing an obstruction (the same is true for other houses with off street parking. The concern I have is that if the area outside my house is marked as a parking bay it might imply that parking outside my house is available resulting in an obstruction. Is there a way of not marking the areas outside the houses with dropped kerb (and therefore designated as not parking) be left outside the scheme?

- You are passing on the costs of running the scheme onto the residence, which is not unreasonable and the costs are, in my opinion, appropriate. Another beneficiary of this scheme would be the train station as it would force more people into using the car park at the station. Should the station (or whoever receives the revenue from the car park) be asked to contribute?

The Council has carefully considered whether to mark bays across dropped kerbs or, alternatively, yellow line restrictions. On balance and based on experience of similar schemes elsewhere, the provision of bays across driveways allows flexibility for residents to park across their own driveways (should they need to) and, with their consent, other non-residents (i.e. visitors/neighbours) during permit controlled hours.

The existence of a bay does not mean accesses can be blocked and experience suggests that this is unlikely to be the case.

If a bay were not marked a yellow line would be required instead which would not offer residents any flexibility.

Comments are noted and welcomed. Unfortunately the Council has no powers to seek a contribution from the rail industry and considers that if the scheme delivers improvements for residents and that encourages non-residents to park in the station then the desired outcome has been achieved.

Comments are noted. Consider marking courtesy line. No change to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.