

INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

PART I -

8. Three Rivers Parking Management Programme: 16-2 Rickmansworth West Stage 2B (Detailed design) consultation outcomes report, November 2022 (DCES)

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report asks the Committee to determine which streets to include in the Rickmansworth West parking scheme area before the detailed design is progressed to the statutory notice of a Traffic Regulation Order, taking account of the response to public consultation and the detailed discussion of the issues as set out below.
- 1.2 The Committee is asked to delegate decisions on any further scheme details to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member and relevant Ward Councillors. It is envisaged that this would include any final design improvements in any roads that are included in the future scheme, in response to comments received during consultation.
- 1.3 Three Rivers District Council, acting under agency from Hertfordshire County Council and as a statutory Local Parking Authority, published a draft detailed design for this scheme from February to March 2022.
- 1.4 This followed a decision by the IHED Committee (January 2021) to delegate authority for further actions on this scheme (up to and including decisions on making any Traffic Order) to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member and relevant Ward Councillors.
- 1.5 Following the publication of draft detailed design plans, a report of the outcomes was circulated to local Ward Councillors for their views to inform a delegated decision that would determine the streets within the final scheme area before the statutory Order is proposed.
- 1.6 A further meeting was held with Local Ward Councillors to explain any aspects of the report where clarification was required and their views were provided in early October. As their views requested an alternative option to those proposed, further investigation into the survey results was required and is reported below (section 5).
- 1.7 Lead Members indicated a preference for Option B (which is designed to include the Uxbridge Road as well as streets in which respondents generally supported the proposals) but with the addition of Elm Way (for the reasons set out in sections 4.14 onward, below).
- 1.8 A further delegated report was presented to the Head of Regulatory Services before it was determined to return this decision to the Committee, taking account of the divergence of views returned by the Members whose views were required to support the delegated decision.
- 1.9 This report details the process to date, reiterating the details provided in the September 2022 report and seeking a decision on the option to be taken forward to determine which streets should be included in the final scheme area. More detailed information is provided in the Appendices, importantly Appendix A which gives the survey response figures (along with Appendix B which shows mapped responses and

Appendix C listing the comments received). The Committee may also wish to refer to Appendix F which outlines the area covered by the different options.

2. Details

- 2.1 In February 2022 people at 471 properties in the Rickmansworth West scheme area were invited along with the general public to comment on a proposed detailed design for a permit parking scheme.
- 2.2 The background and approach are set out in earlier reports; the scheme overall aimed to consult in and around numerous streets from which requests had been received for new parking controls (and largely for permit parking schemes).
- 2.3 The initial stages of consultation shaped a more focussed scheme area around Moneyhill Parade and led to the production of a proposed draft detailed design plan in streets where respondents confirmed that there was a parking problem and told us that they would support new parking controls.
- 2.4 People in some streets (such as Church Lane) told us that they did not want to be included in future proposals, so these streets were removed from the scheme. The response to the previous stage of consultation is published online here: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/download?id=51476>.
- 2.5 For the spring 2022 consultation, the scheme area was split into smaller areas which received specific letters, tailored to the specific circumstances of each street, as shown at **Appendix B**. This was necessary due to the inclusion of streets that had returned very varying responses at an earlier stage of consultation.
- 2.6 A majority of people at addresses in two streets West Way and Park Way had not wanted to be included in the scheme but had been surveyed to ensure they had a good opportunity to reconsider; while addresses on Uxbridge Road (A412) near Field Way were presented with a different proposal to that proposed at the previous stage.

3. Responses

- 3.1 212 valid responses were received from addresses in the area, giving a good overall response rate of 47%. The table in the Appendices below show an analysis of the responses. This first considers the response rates, looking at streets with response rates over 25% and categorising responses from these by rate, with progression typically considered for streets where a significant response (over 33%) was received.
- 3.2 In total 423 responses were received. 150 were duplicated (typically a paper and online survey were completed), 40 were from respondents at addresses outside the area and 21 were invalid (anonymous or defaced). The high level of duplication is considered to indicate the level of interest in this scheme.
- 3.3 One petition was received, from residents of Park Way.

Key Stakeholder responses

- 3.4 The District Council consulted key local bodies with a strategic outlook, in this case the Batchworth Community Council and the Rickmansworth and District Residents' Association.
- 3.5 Both organisations acknowledged receipt did not respond to the consultation.

4. Analysis of responses

- 4.1 **Appendix A** gives the figures and a written summary of the response in each street along with a brief overview of the proposal. Sections from 4.6 onward below give a detailed analysis and discussion of the outcomes for selected streets.
- 4.2 Overall, 26% of respondents said that there are parking problems in their road. Only in Mount View is there clear support for the scheme as proposed (73%).
- 4.3 There continues to be some minority support in surrounding streets for a permit zone, as shown at **Appendix A**. The streets in which there is some significant minority support for a scheme include:
- Elm Way (with 40% support for a scheme that differs to the proposal; and which is not feasible, while a further 30% do not support a scheme, comments indicating that this is on the single ground that they do not believe it will be effective due to weak enforcement)
 - Field Way (with stronger support south of Mount View)
 - Uxbridge Road (with stronger support at the eastern end)
 - Dellwood (100% but only 1 response)
- 4.4 Streets in which there is little support for a scheme and which are proposed to be withdrawn from any future proposals include:
- Field Way (North of Mount View)
 - West Way
 - The Highlands
- 4.5 Local Ward Councillors met with representatives of Elm Way and Field Way who advised that their positions have not changed since the previous survey (report appended).

Response analysis by street

Mount View

- 4.6 While 73% of respondents supported the scheme, only 18% supported the design of this scheme. This is confirmed by the comments; out of 62 individual comments, 32 cited design issues such as the extent of yellow lines, the fact that bays run across crossovers or the accuracy of the plans.
- 4.7 The most common general theme and source of disagreement was the proposed timing which many felt should not be all-day (which was proposed in line with the all-day restrictions on Uxbridge Road, the expected implications of which this scheme seeks to address). Fifteen comments requested a one- or two-hour operational Zone with others suggesting morning only (as in the adjacent Zone D) and some supporting the proposed all-day timing.
- 4.8 Enforcement was also a key issue with concern that proposed restrictions would not be adequately enforced (a common theme in this area).

Field Way

- 4.9 Responses can be seen at **Appendix C**; it is clear that there is a support cluster around Mount View with little support further north (consistent with West Way) but also a low response rate with two not in support on the southern arm (which does not have so many frontages).

Elm Way and Park Way

- 4.10 The responses of people at local addresses in Elm Way and Park Way are similar in that these have been clearly expressed, both in that they do not support the proposals, and in their reasons for their position.
- 4.11 Each road is primarily residential in character (Elm Way less so), they are parallel and both join Uxbridge Road where its character is primarily commercial.
- 4.12 Local Ward Members were advised throughout the scheme development (in 2020 and 2021 and at a recent meeting to discuss the emerging outcomes of this scheme), that:
- *Elm Way is at the centre of the current parking pressures (but the petition from the majority of residents effectively asks for their road to be made private, an option we have no powers to offer) or to exclude nearby residents, which would be outside the intended scope of any proposed permit parking scheme.*
 - *Park Way has existing daytime controls (SYL 0630-1830) and is on the edge of the existing Zone D. The residents via a petition asked that the current situation remains unchanged. Engineers have identified significant opportunity for parking provision.*
 - *The District Council has options to include or exclude the road from the scheme in the context of its responsibilities and the implications of either option.*
 - *It is usual District Council policy to introduce new parking controls only where there is general support for a scheme.*
 - *It is considered unacceptable to exclude Park Way for these reasons:*
 - *Impact on local residents - no daytime on-street parking on their street (where it is demonstrably feasible)*
 - *If the District Council does not provide any permit parking bays on this road, neither current nor future residents would have the opportunity to park on-street, either on this street or on surrounding streets.*
 - *Impact on the public (in whose interests' public roads must be managed), due failure to maximise parking in the area of the permit zone.*
 - *The daytime prohibition of parking has been the historic situation, but a failure to provide parking where it is safe and feasible is not an acceptable outcome in the context of the District Councils' role to manage parking demand for current and future needs.*
- 4.13 A meeting was held in late 2021 with local Ward Members and residents of Park Way at which this was explained to the residents. They understand the situation and have also been apprised (through the letter sent to invite survey responses in February 2022) of the issues facing the District Council in determining the outcome here.

Elm Way

- 4.14 Of 14 addresses consulted, 10 responded with 70% (7) suggesting in comments that some form of parking restriction was required. Only 40% (4) responded that permit parking was needed (but did not support this specific scheme), with the clear majority of 60% (6) responding that they would not support permit parking.
- 4.15 However, 40% do support a parking scheme that differs to the proposal (and which is not feasible, while having very similar aims to the proposed scheme), while a further 30% state that they do not support a scheme solely because they do not believe it

will be effective due to existing weak enforcement (which is not considered a reasonable concern, as the Council has already reassured respondents).

- 4.16 Comments are set out in **Appendix C**, largely in full, from 13 people at 10 addresses; several of these included a repeat of the form letter request (despite it having been addressed in the survey letter).
- 4.17 Respondents generally expressed support for a scheme but continued to make this conditional on largely irrelevant considerations including unfeasible modifications, concerns about enforcement and expectations that a parking scheme should address other problems.
- 4.18 The response received is similar to the response at the last stage of consultation (where 100% of people at all addresses supported a scheme with a different design, which was expressed through a form letter requesting measures that the District Council is unable to provide, for legal and practical reasons set out below).
- 4.19 The letter inviting survey responses that was sent in February 2022 incorporated a clear explanation of the reasons why the District Council could not provide the measures requested. Key requests were:
- *Permit parking outside the residential properties within Elm Way road for only those residents of Elm Way*
 - *Closure of Elm Way road to through traffic*
- 4.20 The reasons given in the letter were respectively:
- *A Local Authority could not justify prioritising parking for some residents over others on a public road. A permit zone like that proposed is the lawful method to prioritise parking for local residents, of all streets within the Zone, but allocating space on public roads is unlawful and although permits can prioritise different user groups, it would be unreasonable for a local Authority to discriminate between groups of residents.*
 - *The effective stopping up of a highway is outside the legal powers of the Local Authority and is therefore beyond the scope of this proposed Permit Parking Zone.*
- 4.21 The apparent intent of the responses provided (at both the preliminary and detailed design) is to prevent people with a legitimate parking need in this area (such as residents of other adjacent streets) from parking on this street, in addition to preventing others parking who have a less legitimate reason to park locally.
- 4.22 It is suggested that this perhaps stems from an inaccurate perception of the status of this public road, which the responses received suggest should be considered to be a private road.
- 4.23 Support in Elm Way for any parking scheme was only 40% (or 4 of 10 responses from 14 addresses), with 6 of 10 addresses not in support of any scheme. There was also no support from these 4 respondents for the proposed scheme as shown on the published plans.
- 4.24 It is apparent from the thirteen unique comments (**see Appendix C**) received from people at 10 addresses in Elm Way that a significant number of respondents do support a scheme, but want it designed differently.
- 4.25 Comments from 7 addresses state that the proposals do not go far enough. Comments from 5 addresses stated that they “believe a permit parking plan is required for Elm Way”. Comments from 5 still supported the ‘counter proposal’ that

was explicitly refused at the last stage of consultation (with the reasons why this could not be supported explained in detail in the letter that was sent to each Elm Way address inviting a survey response in early 2022).

- 4.26 Looking at the 6 respondents stating that they do not support a scheme, 3 respondents returned comments. Each of these comments stated or clearly indicated that the reason these 3 respondents did not support a scheme, was due to lack of confidence in enforcement.
- 4.27 These 3 respondents not in support of a scheme returned the following comments (this includes all comments but is summarised to focus on every specific concern reported):
- *...severe parking problem cannot be resolved until the illegal and dangerous parking of all types of vehicles in this area is addressed. There is virtually no policing in this area.*
 - *I don't believe a permit parking scheme would work on Elm Way as... The majority of unsafe parking is happening at the end of the road on yellow lines, introducing parking permits would not discourage people from parking somewhere where they already should not be parking.*
 - *No parking permits will fix the issues that really need addressing... double yellows are rarely policed and besides, the most problems with the parking are caused after 6.30pm i.e. after most parking permits zones end.*
- 4.28 It is therefore considered that while it is clear that people in Elm Way do not support the published scheme, it is not clear that they do not support any scheme at all, with the survey responses to some extent conflicting with comments provided.
- 4.29 It is also clear that a substantial number of respondents from Elm Way (5, or half of all respondents) have not read or have ignored the letter explaining that their preferred option is not viable and cannot be delivered by the District Council.
- 4.30 In the context of the overall number of responses, it is considered that not only is Elm Way very likely to suffer significantly if either no scheme is introduced or (perhaps worse) if a scheme is introduced on Mount Way, but also that respondents from Elm Way are aware of this but have not properly considered the implications of their negative survey response, on which the preference of Local Ward Councillors appears to be based, while expressing concern over those implications either by asserting the counter proposal or by stating in comments that they require a scheme.
- 4.31 The concerns of Elm Way respondents were addressed in the reports for stages 2A and 2B in some detail and can be seen in those reports.
- 4.32 It is therefore considered in summary that the response data for Elm Way should be carefully considered against the context and the District Council's careful consideration and demonstrable efforts to advise people in Elm Way over their aspirations. It is considered that the reasons given by people at addresses in Elm Way to support their responses cannot reasonably be accorded significant weight (as discussed at section 4.14 onwards, above).

Park Way

- 4.33 The petition received stated that the signatories do not support the scheme, asking for it to be removed from Park Way and that the current parking restrictions be retained, signed by 48 people at 21 addresses of 23 total in that street (in addition to

the survey responses from that street). Responses to the survey showed that the clear majority (100% of respondents) prefer not to be included in a scheme, consistent with previous survey outcomes.

- 4.34 The reasons for this vary but from the comments at **Appendix C** can be seen to include the view that residents do not need on-street parking, that there are other permit bays in roads in the area where residents can park (several cited Money Hill Road) and that people in Park Way do not want residents from nearby streets parking in their road.
- 4.35 The letter inviting survey responses that was sent in February 2022 included a detailed explanation of the reasons why the District Council had determined to re-consult Park Way taking account of the previous survey outcome showing that people in this street did not support a scheme:

“Your street has been included at this stage following careful consideration of a petition submitted in 2019, in response to the publication of the preliminary design. The District Council does not believe that its proposal could reasonably meet the aspirations of the petition, which asked that “the current arrangement (single yellow line parking restrictions 8.30am to 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday) remain unchanged”.

Having carefully considered the implications of this proposal, which would retain Park Way as a street without daytime parking, isolated within permit parking zones, we consider that this would not be in the public interest, with no parking provision for its residents (current or future) should they or their visitors require it during the controlled hours; reduced opportunity for residents of nearby roads to be able to park in roads near their home; and reduced on-street parking opportunity for the public (where shared-use bays are proposed).

This consideration is not affected by the design of the proposed parking layout, which we understand itself causes concern to residents of Park Way. Parking bays would be located only where it is safe and does not obstruct vehicles; and the design can be easily modified, subject to technical and legal requirements.

- 4.36 The clear intent of the responses provided (at both the preliminary and detailed design) is to prevent any daytime parking by anyone with a legitimate parking need (whether residents of other adjacent streets, future residents of Park Way or even residents or visitors to addresses on Park Way) from parking on this street.
- 4.37 It is considered that the reasons given by people at addresses in Park Way to support their responses cannot reasonably be accorded significant weight (as discussed at section 4.33).

Uxbridge Road

- 4.38 The low response rate and low level of support for a scheme does not reflect the stronger level of support at the eastern end for a form of restrictions. Earlier stages of consultation involved detailed engagement with nearly every local firm on this primarily commercial section of this classified road, indicating that businesses have mixed views but that most recognise the parking issues and many are concerned about the impact on their customers, but also where their staff would park. Various solutions have been suggested to address these. The scheme as a whole aims to improve customer parking and is intended to address the impacts on this street, so it is not considered that the Uxbridge Road can be reasonably omitted from any scheme.

5. Options and Reasons for Recommendations

5.1 Several options have been developed, based on the consultation response and technical and legal requirements, as set out below and on plans in **Appendix F**:

Option A: An effective technical solution (preferred option)

Option B: approach incorporating streets with significant support for a scheme

Option C: a minimal approach (Uxbridge Road only, with Dellwood)

Option D: no further action (do nothing option)

Option E: Suggested by Members: Option B excluding Field Way and Uxbridge Road (Include Mount View and only existing bays on Uxbridge Road)

Option F: Suggested by Members: Option B with addition of Elm Way.

5.2 As the District Council investigated a scheme here in 2014 that was withdrawn (following opposition from Elm Way residents for similar reasons) and this current scheme was programmed as soon as the criteria would allow (in 2017), the next time a scheme could be investigated in this area would be after 2026 (unless resources are increased to enable an investigation earlier than the agreed 3 years minimum period).

Option A: An effective technical solution.

5.3 This option takes into account the results of the three stages of consultation so far, recognising that there is significant divergence in the views of people at addresses in adjacent streets.

5.4 It also recognises the requirement, expressed clearly by people within and visiting the area, that parking on the Uxbridge Road (A412) be better managed to enable traffic flow; to improve safety of all road users (both those using the roads and people walking and crossing from the footways); and to reduce parking congestion particularly in the services roads and nearby residential roads arising from the many visitors to the shops and services at this busy shopping area.

Option A implications

5.5 This option would:

- extend / create a new permit zone on Mount View and on Field Way, in response to the clear and consistent preference expressed by people at addresses in these streets, as well as in Dellwood (to enable the District Council to manage parking on its own land).
- introduce the restrictions proposed on the Uxbridge Road as set out in the consultation. This proposal recognises that parking management is essential on this busy street that is primarily characterised as a local retail centre, with largely commercial land uses, with a minor residential function largely attached to the commercial uses; but also recognising that there is no strong support for these restrictions from the residents of this primarily commercial street.
- extend / introduce a new permit zone on Elm Way, The Close and Park Way, accepting that people in these streets do not support the proposed permit zone (as discussed at section 4.14 onward), but recognising that these streets are within the core area, so would become isolated within the proposed permit zone.

- Provide limited waiting bays on flank walls as shown on the plans (to contribute to the longer-stay parking needed by, for example, the various Medical services sited nearby).
 - withdraw proposals from streets to the edge of the proposed Zone that did not support proposals, specifically West Way and The Highlands).
- 5.6 The general effect of Option A, relative to the parking context, is shown at **Appendix F**.
- 5.7 This option is recommended as the best solution in technical terms that would address the current parking context, problems and challenges most effectively across the whole area currently evidenced as affected by parking for Moneyhill Parade and the existing commercial land uses. It would:
- Provide managed short-stay options for shoppers and visitors, close to the shops and services
 - Safeguard footways and crossings to keep walking easy, attractive and simple for people who currently have to manoeuvre around parked vehicles that obstruct lines of sight, footways and roads contributing to unpredictable vehicle movements that create anxiety for people who need to cross roads.
 - Protect prioritised parking for residents of streets in the core area and their visitors
 - Keep this important through-road clear for through traffic, relieving pressure on traffic joining from local roads
 - Clarify where the various parking demands are met and help drivers to find suitable parking.
- 5.8 This option would require a departure from the usual preferred policy to introduce new parking controls where support is evidenced from a majority of people at local addresses.
- 5.9 Departures from this policy are sometimes recommended, but usually only where the beneficial outcomes to the public and local people are considered to be clear and to outweigh the benefit of the policy (which is intended to steer the installation of parking improvements towards sites where the most directly affected people, typically the frontagers) consider that they are necessary.
- 5.10 In this case, it is considered that
- Option A: Inclusion of Elm Way and Park Way in a proposed scheme
- 5.11 In considering this aspect of Option A, three factors are considered most significant:
- 5.12 It is considered in both cases that the clearly stated reasons given by respondents for their views cannot be supported by a Local Authority because they are not reasonable, and therefore could not justify the District Council in withdrawing its proposed scheme (although elements could be modified to address some minor concerns; but this would not address the core demands or expectations of respondents in both streets.
- 5.13 The local context is significant in considering parking in both these streets.

- 5.14 Elm Way is not wholly a residential street as it is functionally very much a part of the Moneyhill Parade local shopping area, with only 58% of kerb space on Elm Way being fronted by residential land uses (with 42% fronted by commercial land uses).
- 5.15 Park Way is functionally characterised as a residential street, with only 25% kerb space fronted by commercial land users (petrol filling station and former Care Home) but it is much nearer to the larger Medical services at the eastern end of the study area.
- 5.16 The likely outcome of leaving these roads as proposed by these respondents would be harmful both to their own parking needs and to provision for the general public (as discussed at section 4.33).
- 5.17 Where people at local addresses do not support proposals that are considered necessary to improve parking for strong technical reasons, the District Council acting as agent for the Local Highway, Traffic and Transport Authority must consider carefully what action it will take to withdraw or progress any scheme. Its specific remit is to manage parking demand, for the public as a whole on public roads. This role is interpreted to prioritise parking for specific demands (such as in residential streets, for residents) over parking for other needs (some of which may however be identified to be legitimate, so are provided for, to some extent).

Option B: approach incorporating streets with significant support for a scheme

- 5.18 The general effect of Option B, relative to the parking context, is shown at **Appendix F**. This would:
- extend / create a new permit zone on Mount View, Dellwood and on Field Way, in response to the preference expressed by people at addresses in these streets, as well as in Dellwood (to enable the District Council to manage parking on its own land).
 - introduce the restrictions proposed on the Uxbridge Road as set out in the consultation, recognising that parking management is essential on this busy street that is primarily characterised as a local retail centre, with largely commercial land uses, with a minor residential function largely attached to the commercial uses; but also recognising that there is no strong support for these restrictions from the residents of this primarily commercial street.
 - not introduce new restrictions on Elm Way, The Close or Park Way (except for limited waiting bays on flank walls as shown on the plans, to contribute to the longer-stay parking needed, for example, by the various Medical services sited nearby).
 - withdraw proposals from streets to the edge of the proposed Zone that did not support proposals, specifically West Way and The Highlands).
- 5.19 This approach responds to the preference of people in streets where a majority does not support the proposed permit zone (as discussed at section 4.33 onwards).
- 5.20 At the same time this approach recognises the continued negative impact of parking on these streets (as discussed at section 4.33 onwards); but gives greater weight to the clearly-expressed preference of people currently at local addresses for their street to remain isolated within the proposed permit zone.
- 5.21 This option is not recommended because it would:

- Enable displaced parking pressure to increase on Elm Way to the detriment of all road users seeking parking opportunities here and particularly to residents (whose continued objections to the proposals do not appear to be reasonable or to consider the facts as set out before them, as explained above).
- Affect current and future residents and visitors to Park Way by providing no on-street parking opportunities nearby except short-stay visitor parking, incurring the risks discussed in section 3 above.
- Create a Permit Parking Zone that while contiguous is not easily legible to drivers, or easily enforceable. This is contrary to good practice and usual District Council practice, as it would leave a 'gap' in the Zone requiring drivers to enter and leave the Zone (with increased signage) more frequently (for example, simply driving from Uxbridge Road to Mount View would cause entry to the Zone twice). This could be confusing and likely to distract drivers who are likely in this context to be non-local and seeking parking.

Option C: a minimal approach

5.22 This option would:

- introduce the restrictions proposed on the Uxbridge Road as set out in the consultation, recognising that parking management is essential on this busy street that is primarily characterised as a local retail centre, with largely commercial land uses, with a minor residential function largely attached to the commercial uses; but also recognising that there is no strong support for these restrictions from the residents of this primarily commercial street.
- Not introduce new restrictions on any residential streets (except for limited waiting bays on flank walls as shown on the plans, to contribute to the longer-stay parking needed, for example, by the various Medical services sited nearby); and except in Dellwood (to enable the District Council to manage parking on its own land).

5.23 The general effect of Option B, relative to the parking context, is shown at **Appendix F**.

5.24 This option is not recommended as it would have the negative effects described above but would additionally not protect residents of streets in support of a Permit Zone at the current time (in current conditions) from the additional parking displacement likely due to the necessary treatment of the Uxbridge Road.

Option D: no further action

5.25 There is an option is to do nothing, withdrawing all proposals.

5.26 This option is strongly not recommended as it would not address any of the problems this scheme was programmed to address, leaving the Moneyhill Parade area (currently a busy area with many parking issues) unimproved despite the significant public support for some form of solution here, to address footway parking, lack of accessible parking for shops, obstructive parking and the need for priority parking for residents. The current situation can be expected to worsen as car ownership and residential density increase with national trends.

6 Responses of Lead Members and Local Ward Councillors to delegated report

6.1 Following the publication of draft detailed design plans in February to March 2022, with a survey, a report analysing various aspects of the survey response was

circulated to Local Ward Councillors in September 2022 (having been deferred awaiting legal advice). A further meeting was held with Local Ward Councillors to explain any aspects of the report where clarification was required and their views were provided in early October.

- 6.2 As the response requested an alternative option to those proposed, further investigation into the survey results was required and a further short report assessing the alternative option was discussed with Lead Members and the Head of Regulatory Services.
- 6.3 In summary, Local Ward Councillors considered that none of the proposed options should be progressed. Instead they propose a new option (that is apparently intended to be based solely on resident responses), proposing no further action except on:
- Mount View to be included in a PPZ (with no view as to whether this would be preferred as a Zone for only this street, or extension of existing Zone D from Moneyhill Road eastwards).
 - Controlling parking in the existing **limited waiting/uncontrolled** bays on the service road to the south side of Uxbridge Road **to provide 2 hour free parking with further paid parking.**
- 6.4 Local Ward Councillor feedback is summarised below (non-relevant comments are included but represented in grey).
- 6.5 The provision of new off-street parking is outside the scope of this scheme and the assertion on enforcement is not relevant to this decision.
- 6.6 The recommendation for 2-hour free stay in limited waiting bays is consistent with on-street bays at in some but not all retail centres; there is generally a mix of one-hour and two-hours in Rickmansworth, with 2 hours in Chorleywood and just 1 hour in Croxley Green and Abbots Langley. The rationale is not however considered robust as the proposed charge for 2 hours in this scheme would be £1, which would not (it is considered) *be likely to reduce the time people spend in restaurants.*
- a) *Whilst the B option would be the most preferable.. This does not reflect what our Uxbridge Road residents' responses were...."there is no strong support for these restrictions from the residents of this primarily commercial street."*
 - b) *it is essential for the parking on the left-hand side of the Uxbridge Road to be re-organised with a preferable two hour free parking system, plus paid options to extend, to give better churn and prevent pavement parking.*
 - c) *The addition of a public carpark, as all other shopping parades have, would also help solve the lower Cedars Estate parking.*
 - d) *We ... recommend that we have a 2 hour free parking so that people can actually spend time in the restaurants as this reflects what is seen in Chorleywood, Croxley and Abbots Langley.*
 - e) *These roads would not be constantly monitored even with an extra traffic warden making five for all of TRDC.*
 - f) *Finally, we are aware that the residents of Mount View are in favour of this scheme to mainly prevent commuter parking and we would therefore recommend this road does have a CPZ zone.*

- 6.7 Officers consulted the District Council's retained Traffic Engineers and prepared the following advice in response to these suggestions?:

Outline issues

- 6.8 The options presented in the Stage 2B Outcomes report (September 2022) were considered by Officers to be the only justifiable options, based on the evidence collated from surveys and site observations. A recommended option with justification was set out in some detail.
- 6.9 The new option suggested by local Ward Councillors could not, in the view of Officers, be justified because it does not take account of the likely negative outcomes or provide any reasonable justification or mitigation to address these. The reasons below explain our views.

Officer response to Member feedback on delegated report

- 6.10 The proposed option (hereon referred to as option E) is not considered viable in support of the objectives of the parking management programme.
- 6.11 It is considered that there is no reasonable justification to withdraw the principle of controlling parking on the currently uncontrolled carriageway and footways on the Uxbridge Road (A412).
- 6.12 It is considered highly probable that any option that does not propose controls on nearby residential roads will lead to increased parking pressure on those roads (this consideration is slightly different for Park Way).
- 6.13 The Uxbridge Road is a classified Principal road, because this would fail to deliver parking management (to direct drivers to suitably designated and managed parking places) and would not reduce the collateral risks to traffic flow and safety of all road users, including pedestrians, on this street. This area is defined as a "Place e.g. High Street" (P3/M2) by the Local Highway Authority, within the context of the A412 as a classified Principal road, by the Place and Movement Network. In both highways and planning terms this area is primarily commercial and a through-route, rather than a primarily residential road.
- 6.14 The scheme has been developed partly to reduce parking pressure on residential streets from demands for parking in the retail and commercial area of Moneyhill Parade, so it is considered that the District Council cannot support the risk of increased parking pressure on two residential street sections (Uxbridge Road o/s no.111; and Field Way south section) where there is not only strong likelihood of displacement, but also evidenced support for restrictions. It is considered that this also applies to Elm Way, as set out below.

Elm Way

- 6.15 It is specifically considered that if Mount View becomes controlled, Elm Way would be even worse affected than at present, if left uncontrolled, as parking pressure would not be dissipated onto Mount View.

6.16 Uxbridge Road A412

- 6.17 The key driver for any parking scheme in this locality is of course the character of Moneyhill Parade and nearby streets with its wide range of over 40 active businesses from medical, health and personal services to restaurants, takeaways and convenience shops, with several well-established specialist firms.

- 6.18 Parking for visitors to these firms is largely uncontrolled at present and there is significant public pressure for both controls to enable traffic flow and for priority parking for residents in some nearby streets that are already badly affected by visitor parking.
- 6.19 It is expected that any new scheme will involve parking displacement (of visitors, shop workers and residents) from the Uxbridge Road. The current scheme has involved extensive consultation over three years to ensure that the views of people in the affected streets, and in streets that are likely to be affect by any new scheme, have been thoroughly canvassed and carefully considered in shaping the proposed scheme.
- 6.20 Any option not proposing controls on the carriageway of Uxbridge Road is considered likely to cause severe congestion of both parking, footway parking and traffic flow on the classified road, which are all well-evidenced current issues.

7. Policy/Budget Reference and Implications

- 7.1 The recommendations in this relate to the Council's agreed policy. The District Council operates as Local Parking Authority in a context of local and national policy and sets its policies with regard to those published by Hertfordshire County Council (primarily the *Local Transport Plan 4* and its child document, *Roads in Hertfordshire* (2011). It also considers relevant policies including the Local Plan and the Corporate Plan.
- 7.2 It is anticipated that the 2023/24 budgets will include an allocation specifically for these types of schemes and the programme will be managed within the agreed allocation.

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 All schemes are progressed in line with the District Council's powers under its relevant Agency Agreement with Hertfordshire County Council. In some cases, where any physical changes to the layout of highway are proposed, it may be necessary for the District Council to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the County Council, to enable works on the highway to proceed.
- 8.2 Three Rivers District Council is the Local Parking Authority for the District, designated by the Traffic Management Act 2004 (and associated legislation). It is responsible for enforcing and introducing controlled parking zones and other measures, acting under agency from the Local Highway Authority, Hertfordshire County Council. It is directly answerable to the Government for the way it manages parking finances.

9. Equal Opportunities Implications

9.1 Relevance Test

Has a relevance test been completed for Equality Impact?	No – there is no change to service provision
Did the relevance test conclude a full impact assessment was required?	No – matter will be reviewed through on-going consultation.

10. Staffing Implications

- 10.1 The Parking Management Programme sets out the core annual work of the Transport & Parking Policy team, supported by the retained Hertsmere Borough Council Traffic Engineer, overseen by the Head of Regulatory Services.

11. Environmental Implications

- 11.1 Permit parking schemes help to improve local environments by controlling and managing the impact of on-street parking, by improving access and safety for people walking and cycling and by promoting responsible driving.
- 11.2 The impact of schemes on the local built environment and street scheme will be considered as part of individual schemes, but the design and use of any proposed parking control measures are controlled by legislation and Government guidance as well as by local policy set out in the Hertfordshire County Council policy documents forming part of the Local Transport Plan 4 and specifically in the local design guide, Roads in Hertfordshire (2011).

12. Community Safety Implications

- 12.1 All schemes are designed to take account of safety implications. Where appropriate the police are consulted and safety audits are where necessary carried out as part of the scheme design.

13. Public Health implications

- 13.1 None specific

14. Customer Services Centre Implications

- 14.1 Parking consultation is particularly likely to attract unusual levels of contact. Where required, the Customer Services Manager will be briefed as appropriate.

15. Communications and Website Implications

- 15.1 Information about individual schemes, and the Council's general approach to parking schemes, is published online at www.threerivers.gov.uk/betterparking and at key accessible locations such as libraries and parish offices as appropriate.

16. Risk and Health & Safety Implications

- 16.1 The Council has agreed its risk management strategy which can be found on the website at <http://www.threerivers.gov.uk>. In addition, the risks of the proposals in the report have also been assessed against the Council's duties under Health and Safety legislation relating to employees, visitors and persons affected by our operations. The risk management implications of this report are detailed below.
- 16.2 The subject of this report is covered by the Regulatory service plan. Any risks resulting from this report will be included in the risk register and, if necessary, managed within this/these plan(s).

Nature of Risk	Consequence	Suggested Control Measures	Response <i>(tolerate, treat, terminate, transfer)</i>	Risk Rating <i>(combination of likelihood and impact)</i>
The scheme may not be full, due to the consultative and iterative nature of the	Threats to local quality of life, environmental quality reduction,	Relevant and appropriate project management	Tolerate.	3

legal process for introducing parking restrictions, and limited resources.	negative publicity.	processes used.		
Failure to deliver the programme would leave the Council unable to provide an adequate level of service in addressing parking management issues within the district.	Threats to local quality of life, environmental quality reduction, negative publicity.	Relevant and appropriate project management processes used.	Tolerate.	3

16.3 The above risks are scored using the matrix below. The Council has determined its aversion to risk and is prepared to tolerate risks where the combination of impact and likelihood scores 6 or less.

Very Likely ----- Likelihood ----- ▼ Remote	Low	High	Very High	Very High
	4	8	12	16
	Low	Medium	High	Very High
	3	6	9	12
	Low	Low	Medium	High
	2	4	6	8
	Low	Low	Low	Low
	1	2	3	4
	Impact			
	Low -----▶ Unacceptable			

Impact Score

4 (Catastrophic)

3 (Critical)

2 (Significant)

Likelihood Score

4 (Very Likely (≥80%))

3 (Likely (21-79%))

2 (Unlikely (6-20%))

1 (Marginal)

1 (Remote (≤5%))

16.4 In the officers' opinion none of the new risks above, were they to come about, would seriously prejudice the achievement of the Strategic Plan and are therefore operational risks. The effectiveness of the management of operational risks is reviewed by the Audit Committee annually.

17. Recommendation

This report requests that the Committee determines which streets to include in the scheme area before the detailed design is progressed to the Traffic Regulation Order stage.

i) The committee is recommended to select Option A, preferred for the reasons set out in section 5;

or, if it determines not to select Option A, it is recommended to

ii) select one of the alternative options set out in section 5

The committee is also recommended to:

iii) to delegate decisions on further scheme details and programme in line with all relevant current practice, policy and standards, including the consideration and treatment of objections to Traffic Regulation Orders, to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member and relevant Ward Councillors.

Data Quality

Data sources: Internal data collated through consultation

Data checked by: Peter Simons, Senior Transport Planner, Regulatory Services

Data rating:

1	Poor	
2	Sufficient	
3	High	y

Background Papers

APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS

- Appendix A – Survey results table and summarised outcomes by street
- Appendix B – Support for a Permit Parking Zone by street, March 2022
- Appendix C – Comments (summary by street)
- Appendix D – Consultation pack (Areas consulted, Survey, Letter templates)
- Appendix E – Published Detailed Design plans (Jan 2022)
- Appendix F – Options plans

Appendix A - Results and street summary

				Q1 Do you think a permit parking scheme is needed in your road?			Q2 Do you support the layout of parking bays and yellow lines on the published plans?		
Street	Addresses consulted	Responses	Response rate (%)	Yes (number)	Yes (%)	No (number)	Yes (number)	Yes (%)	No (number)
The Close	7	7	100	1	14	6	0	0	1
The Highlands	30	27	90	4	15	23	0	0	4
West Way	70	60	86	10	17	50	2	3	5
Park Way	23	18	78	0	0	18	0	0	
Mount View	58	44	76	33	75	11	8	18	24
Elm Way	14	10	71	4	40	6	0	0	4
Field Way	41	17	41	6	35	11	3	18	4
Uxbridge Road	171	28	16	13	46	15	6	21	11
Dellwood	56	1	2	1	100	0	1	100	
Total	470	212	45	72		140	20		53
Dark blue = majority responded >51%				Green = Clear majority of responses >60%					
Light blue = significant number responded >33%				Amber = No majority/small majority >50%					
Pale blue = fewer than a third responded <33%				Orange = One third to one half (33%-50%)					

Summary of responses by street

Street	Street summary	Initial Officer response
The Close	Clear majority (86%) prefer not to be included in scheme	Propose this street is removed from the scheme but included in 'excluded streets' notification.
The Highlands	Clear majority (85%) prefer not to be included in scheme	Propose this street is removed from the scheme but included in 'excluded streets' notification.
West Way	Clear majority (83%) prefer not to be included in scheme	Propose this street is removed from the scheme but included in 'excluded streets' notification.
Park Way	Clear majority (100%) prefer not to be included in scheme	Proposed to include street in some form (see optional proposals).
Mount View	Clear majority (73%) prefer to be included in scheme with comments to be assessed on design changes and timings	Proposed to include street in some form (either new Zone or extension to existing).
Elm Way	Clear majority (60%, 6 of 10 respondents) prefer not to be included in scheme	Proposed to include street in some form (see optional proposals).
Field Way	Clear majority (67%) prefer not to be included in scheme. Clear majority of responses from people north of Mount View with cluster of support for scheme around that junction, only two responses from south of this point.	Propose include street south of Mount View to a point north of this junction (See optional proposals).
Uxbridge Road	Clear majority (64%) prefer not to be included in scheme	Include in scheme due to character of this classified road and longstanding wide variety of problems caused by visitor and other parking here with identified urgent need to address uncontrolled parking. Note cottages opposite Field Way.
Dellwood	Clear majority (100%) prefer not to be included in scheme (but note only 1 response).	Include in scheme (land privately owned by the District Council).

Appendix C – Comments summary by street

Comments from Elm Way and Uxbridge Road (residents and separately businesses) are given more fully as these two streets have more complex issues.

Comments from other streets are split into themes and summarised, including comments that provide information or views that are relevant to the consideration of this report.

Comments that do not contain relevant information (those that are purely positive, negative or neutral with no unique feedback) are summarised at the head of each street section.

Comments relating to design issues (e.g. placement of bays, lines or the way the plans are shown) are not reported here but have been collated for use by design engineers.

Recorded comments included all comments from addresses where more than one person submitted a response, to ensure individual information and views are collated; so the numbers of comments does not always match the number of valid submissions.

Responses to selected specific issues are set out [in blue](#).

Dellwood (1)

- Since all residents here are elderly and in most cases disabled we need to be able to park close to our residences...suggest parking adjacent to flats be clearly marked as Residents Parking and even Permit Required.

Elm Way (13)

- Enforcement: Current proposal will not do enough to alleviate the parking pressure and issues for Elm Way; scheme does not address the problems of elm way's [existing] illegal parking... currently dangerous parking despite yellow lines and no parking control or enforcement (7)
- The proposals for the changes are welcome though need a number of issues to be addressed... believe a permit parking plan is required for Elm Way. (5)
- We provide our counter proposal [*similar proposal to stage 2A*]: Permit parking outside the residential properties within Elm Way road for only those residents located within Elm Way road itself / Closure of Elm Way road to through traffic, possibly via our preferred solution of the use of retractable bollards (5)
- Current double yellow lines on Elm Way and surrounding are not providing the desired effect, these should be replaced with red lines.
- The proposal does not address other local safety issues
- A number of vehicles are parked for weeks and do not move or are approached by owners.
- "I have no issue with residents of Moneyhill Parade and the owners and employees of those businesses parking on Elm Way but making Moneyhill Parade short stay parking only, with no residents parking will only exacerbate the current problems on Elm Way"
- Large lorries also use this small residential road for deliveries but do not have enough room to manoeuvre or exit safely... access to Elm Way restricted to avoid dangerously large delivery vehicles using Elm Way
- Encourage drivers to use the provided parking on Money Hill parade
- Parking spaces opposite the shops 8 to 15 would be better utilised as loading bay (2)

- Parking bays that are on the surrounding roads need to be restricted to at least until 8:30pm as the majority of shops on Money Hill Parade provide convenience food. The evening being the busiest time period for collection of food

Uxbridge Road – Businesses (20)

- Parking bays need to be free for **shop owners and staff** who work at Moneyhill parade... would be detrimental all my staff who drive/park all day...., this will effect these vital staff getting to work at time, and home at a reasonable hour... extremely limited/impossible access to with limited and unreliable transport public transport to get to work on time... Strongly object to the proposal to turn both sides of the service road on the south side of Uxbridge Road at Moneyhill Parade into short-term parking bays only... (12)

Form of local employee permit envisaged, not yet agreed by Committee.

- Concerns over **loss of trade if customers** are unable to find somewhere to park... there will not be sufficient parking for non-permit holders during enforcement hours. Trading 50 years and I fear this will be the end... plans need to be reviewed to get the right balance... if there is land close by to develop into car parking for Parade customers otherwise the fear is the local businesses will lose significant trade. (9)

Not supported - Proposals increase availability of parking on Uxbridge Road by reallocating long-stay to short-stay, better managed parking (easier to find and less likely to be obstructed by vehicles parked all day).

- Local businesses will suffer if they are unable to get **deliveries**... risk to life to expect loading bay users to deliver across a main carriageway to shops opposite, there needs to be loading bays both sides (5)

Supported but in practice deliveries currently rely on crossing main carriageway due to historic development of businesses whose accesses are often are no longer fit to be used for deliveries; Loading bays were specifically considered in detail by engineers; carriageway width generally too narrow to permit loading bays except where proposed; expectation that deliveries will make use of extended waiting restrictions at junctions as at present.

- There are no **designated car parks** in this area (3)
- **Timing of parking for businesses:** Parking will be needed from 8.30 till 6.00 Mondays till Fridays, and 8.30 till 1.00 on Saturdays... Parking permits for staff to local businesses... The limited waiting bays are for limited time and not all day parking... No other long term parking options... Removal of proposed single yellow line and parking where there are no houses would help (3)
- There are no **disabled parking provisions** in this area (2)
- **enforce** parking on double yellow lines (2)
- Surgeries and pharmacies... rely heavily on parking availability for vulnerable and elderly patients at zero cost.... especially to our elderly patients, on small pension wages... and most of my patients ... rely on free parking in the surrounding area (2).
- Have the council considered restricted parking time in bays in the residential roads.

Yes, some dual use bays proposed, but proposal is intended to promote parking for residents primarily in residential streets, and for customers primarily on main road.

- Left side of the Uxbridge road is **always full of unused car, car for sale, waiting for repair** etc. One hour or 2 hours' free car park with number plate registered parking ticket

Uxbridge Road Residents (23)

- **Enforcement...** rarely see a PARKING OFFICER in the Moneyhill Area ... Current parking restrictions are poorly enforced (7)
- notice there are only limited parking bays proposed along the one side of Money Hill Parade where are the residents in that section of shops will park?... permit parking bays are introduced along that stretch of shops ... permit parking is not necessary... need all the double yellow lines you have proposed along with the presence of a traffic warden to make sure people get the message they can't park in these areas
- do agree that changes are required around the mill end parade but very concerned about losing on street parking outside my house (the stretch of uxbridge road opposite the end of field way) ... If we lost this parking, we'd have to cross a busy road with 2 children and it'd be impossible to do this and unload shopping etc
- Agree with the yellow lines 100% outside properties 101-111 Uxbridge road as supported by the residents.
- Introducing short stay bays in the money hill parade would result in cars parking on Uxbridge Road (opposite field way) instead.
- Very difficult to park outside our house because of non-residents parking while going to the local shops, going to the Aquadrome or even commuters
- Do not restrict parking on elm way or Moneyhill parade more than it is. It will kill the parade
- Restrictions/zone would only need to be in place Mon - Fri and should not include Saturdays
- Parking permits for staff to local businesses...The limited waiting bays are for limited time and not all day parking...No other long-term parking options...Removal of proposed single yellow line parking and parking where there are no houses would help.
- Very difficult to park due to non-residents and Commercial vans.
- Inconvenience to everybody who lives in these roads and very detrimental to the shops. Sort out the unlawful parking along the parade and the ends of the roads leading into the parade. It would make it much safer for pedestrians and traffic.
- Agree with the DOUBLE YELLOW LINES and the PARKING PERMITS. Park Way is a narrow road suggest (with the introduction of permits) should be changed to ONE WAY, towards Uxbridge Road (so that petrol tankers can leave the Esso garage) ... if Elm Way was ONE WAY towards Uxbridge Road it would reduce the congestion on the corner of Elm Way/Uxbridge Road... double yellow lines outside 113 to 119 need to be repainted as they are worn out by people parking on them.
- Proposal is likely to make the situation worse... not be enough Permit Bays for everyone who would require them... redesign current layout on Moneyhill Parade to maximise the use of space available. Remove westbound pavement between the main road and slip road and make diagonal parking bays...Erect barrier between road and diagonal parking to prevent the parking on the road/pavement that currently happens. Move west bound bus stop as its current position is dangerous for people trying to exit central slip road exit.

- Happy with the way the parking works on money hill parade. We don't want parking permits.
- Do not think it is fair to have to pay for permit holders.
- Double yellow lines outside my property. These are completely ignored on an hourly basis... if the permit parking is introduced will it be enforced. (2)
- Don't feel the parking in this area is an issue... strongly oppose these plans. (2)
- Would like to object to the whole proposal... Especially the removal of parking on Uxbridge Road from 189 onwards... proposal is provide more parking in the area but this proposal provides the opposite... It will only reduce parking for residence... Moneyhill Parade is at its busiest in the evening when the residents permit would not come into effect. It will only reduce parking for residence... currently not enough parking for the residents between the spaces available outside the homes on the Uxbridge road and Field Way... avoid parking on Field way, it's a dark road with a long stretch of bushes and occasional has individuals waiting around. feel unsafe and uncomfortable having to park further and further down the road... proposal to not allow parking outside the houses 189 has not considered the safety of residents and their visitors.
- No designated car parks or disabled parking provisions in this area
- Sort out the unlawful parking along the parade and the ends of the roads leading into the parade.

Field Way (19)

4 solely negative, 3 solely positive, 1 solely neutral, 2 design issues. Other specific matters raised:

- Wait and see if commuter parking does push into Field Way. At present it does not. (2)
- Bays should be cut in level with road and then kerbed to stop driving on path
- Cost: Proposed charges astronomical. I agree with a permit scheme but would like at least one free permit per household for residents to use.
- Timing: Having such a long restriction (Monday - Saturday) doesn't make sense - it is not close enough to the train station to make it somewhere people park before getting the train.
- Parking should be restricted to one side of road
- Scheme should address the need for more parking for Moneyhill Parade shops, restaurants and takeaways.

Mount View (62)

9 solely negative, 5 solely positive, 1 solely neutral, 32 design issues. Other specific matters raised:

- Timing: Operational hours too long (8.30am-6.30pm). It only needs to be 1 hour in the middle of the day, to deter daily commuters and Heathrow holiday bus passengers. (15)
- The parking restriction is only needed couple of hours a day from Monday to Friday. I don't think Saturday restrictions are needed (3)
- I humbly suggest an active permit Zone between 08.30 until 13.30 (2)
- Parking restrictions should be 8.30am - 6.30pm (2 - but note this is as provided on plan)"

- **Enforcement:** Whilst we welcome the creation of the CPZ for our area, it is most important that the parking regulations are properly and regularly enforced (5)
- **Parking by nearby residents:** Some neighbours are concerned that residents displaced from nearby streets will take up permits meaning the parking situation will not improve (4)
- Any scheme that is agreed [should be] one for the Whole of Mount View not just one section / The scheme must include the Close (3)
- Dentist will struggle. The dentist serves parents with children and i am unsure where they would park whilst their child is receiving treatment (2)
- What has been provided is the best you can achieve in view of the demands for change expressed by local residents
- The scheme would be more accurate if you show the area where It is not allowed to park to keep my access free (design plan request)
- There does not appear to be any provision or guarantee that I will have enough parking space to suit my needs.

Park Way (30)

All comments express negative views on support (with none clearly giving a direct response to rationale explained in survey letter). On the need for parking for residents:

- No demand/we do not need onstreet parking (23)
- Residents should park in other streets/plenty of space nearby to park that should be used first (generally citing Moneyhill Road) (9)
- Do not want nearby residents to clutter up our road (3)
- We are a close knit community and support each other when friends and family visit and require additional parking.