

**INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – 25  
JUNE 2019**

**PART I -DELEGATED**

**6. THREE RIVERS CROXLEY GREEN PARKING REVIEW – STAGE 2  
CONSULTATION OUTCOMES  
(DCES)**

**1 Summary**

- 1.1 This report asks the Committee to determine which streets will be included in the final scheme area for this review, following the stage 2 consultation in late 2018. It is brought at the Committee's express request following the receipt of petitions in January this year relating to the roads to be included.

**2 Details**

**Role and scope of the District Council in managing on-street parking**

- 2.1 On-street and off-street parking controls apply within the main settlements in Three Rivers District and on other roads where they are needed to balance parking demand, ensure highway safety and promote the free flow of traffic. Three Rivers District is designated as a Civil Enforcement Area for parking controls and the Council provides the statutory parking enforcement service.
- 2.2 The Council acts as agent for the Highway and Traffic Authority, Hertfordshire County Council, to promote and introduce schemes (called "Controlled Parking Zones") to manage competing demands for parking provision on public roads in the District. The County Council also introduces parking controls through its own programmes to develop and improve the road network and these controls are also enforced by the Council. These powers are set out in a Parking Agency Agreement between the two Local Authorities which enables the District to introduce "*Controlled Parking Zones and Ancillary Measures.*"
- 2.3 The basis for the agreement is that the District is best placed to address competing local demands for on-street parking. It does not confer powers or duties to specifically address traffic flow or road safety issues, although both are often improved by District Council parking schemes.

**Croxley Green Parking Review**

- 2.4 This Committee resolved on the 20 November 2018 to continue with a scheme initiated in 2016 to address reported parking problems across Croxley Green. This scheme was initiated because of the large number of reports about different parking issues from different roads in the area.
- 2.5 The initial consultation area was expanded to include most roads in Croxley Green, on the basis that this would give people at more addresses the opportunity to provide comment on their perceptions of parking. The Parish Council for Croxley Green also proactively submitted letters and reports asking for new parking controls in some central locations.
- 2.6 Over 5,000 properties were consulted in Croxley Green in 2017 as part of the Stage 1 informal public consultation, to establish the area in which a scheme would be taken forward. This resulted in the creation of an initial scheme area that included around

1,500 properties in central Croxley Green which were consulted (Stage 2) on initial design plans from October to December 2018.

- 2.7 That consultation involved a letter and consultation document being sent to every address in the streets within the 'stage 2 proposed scheme area' that had been identified by Officers and agreed by local Ward Councillors and the Lead Member to be further consulted. Appendix B shows the response rates and support for a scheme, in each street, as well as a copy of the letter (which explains some of the possible details of any scheme) The full details can be found in Appendix A, which is the report produced by HBC Traffic Engineers.
- 2.8 The outcome of this second stage of public consultation can be seen in Appendices A and B (which is the summary). It indicates that there are several streets where lack of support or opposition was expressed, with a core area where there is clear support.
- 2.9 The Committee should note that Appendix B includes a map showing, for each of the areas defined by HBC Engineers, the percentage of addresses responding in support of the proposed scheme (published as a preliminary design plan) against the percentage of addresses in each street that responded.
- 2.10 The percentage response rate is included to inform the Committee of how representative the overall response is, but it is important that the Committee notes that usual practice presumes that if people do not respond, they are considered not to oppose the scheme.
- 2.11 Every address is consulted by letter sent by post and the consultation process is carefully managed to ensure that this can be evidenced. Any people who do not respond are considered neutral, and do not form part of the figure provided to show the numbers or percentage of people in support. This practice is usually adopted because it is not feasible to force people to respond, but they have the option not to respond.

### ***Inclusion of streets at stage 2***

- 2.12 That 'stage 2 proposed scheme area' comprised the streets that had indicated through the stage 1 consultation that they experienced parking problems and would support parking controls as a solution.
- 2.13 The consultation area also included some streets that the retained Traffic Engineer recommended to be included despite lack of support for parking controls at the stage 1 consultation. This is common practice where streets are not included but are considered particularly at risk from potential displaced parking due to their character or location. For example, Frankland Close was included because it is the natural location for displacement from Frankland Road and Harvey Road, which expressed support for new controls at the stage 1 consultation.
- 2.14 Due to the central location of Dickinson Square and Dickinson Avenue, which at stage 1 were strongly opposed to any parking controls, local Ward Councillors asked that these streets were notified by letter to each address before being definitively excluded from the stage 2 consultation. The outcome of this was a petition signed by a majority of residents from both streets asking to be included in that consultation, to which the Council responded by including these streets. All other streets adjoining or near to the consultation area were also sent this notification letter, with little response.

### ***Streets no longer proposed to be included following stage 2***

- 2.15 As shown in Appendix B, some streets that were included in the stage 2 consultation are no longer proposed to be included. These are Frankland Close, Harvey Road and the east end of Frankland Road along with Fuller Way and adjoining roads (Repton Way and Dulwich Way), Yorke Road and Oakleigh Drive. Each of these roads was included in the second stage consultation area because (other than in Frankland Close and Repton Way), the majority of people responding from to the stage 1 consultation had expressed support for new parking controls. None of these streets are now proposed to be included, but they will receive a notification letter as explained in section 2.23 below.
- 2.16 The majority of respondents in these streets expressed a lack of support for any new parking controls at the stage 2 consultation and are therefore not proposed to be included in any final scheme. Frankland Road has been split based on the strong support at the eastern end.

#### **Street selection based on consultation response data**

- 2.17 The consultation was designed by officers of both Local Authorities, carried out by TRDC and the results collated and reported by HBC Traffic Engineers, whose report recommends, at section 9.3, that: *Following a review of the comments received throughout the informal consultation process. It is recommended to proceed to the formal consultation stage of the roads that show 50% or more support for the proposals (Appendix 1) and implement various junction protection measures as reported.*
- 2.18 If this recommendation is followed, the final scheme area would include streets where the response indicated a balance of opinions in favour of and opposed to the scheme. It would also include streets where a small majority (considered by TRDC Officers to comprise between 50% and 60% of responses) support proposals.
- 2.19 TRDC has committed not to force permit parking into streets where there is no clear majority support expressed in response to the informal consultation, without some overriding rationale. The Committee should note that while there is no definitive policy for the way in which consultation results are assessed (because historically consultation on each proposal has been tailored to the local circumstances, as directed by the relevant Committee), TRDC has historically considered that a clear majority of responses is represented by a majority of 60% of respondents in support. This figure obviously differs from that proposed by HBC Engineers.
- 2.20 The Committee must note that any figure derived from consultation response data does not represent a threshold by which a vote is evidenced, but is intended to inform the Committee's decision. Equally, this (or any) figure is not an absolute figure used to determine whether streets are included or not; it is indicative and is intended to inform Committee decisions.

#### **Local Ward Councillor views**

- 2.21 Local Ward Councillors were apprised of the outcome of the stage 2 consultation earlier this year. They expressed several views including:
- One Member considered that consultation results should be interpreted using higher percentage figures for responses by street.
  - Some streets were clearly recommended not to be included but some of these are likely to suffer particularly from displaced parking – these should receive a

further letter notifying people in these streets that a scheme was being progressed.

- Local people must be clearly informed that the Council does not intend to continue to repeatedly consult in the area once a scheme is delivered (the 3-year criterion).
- Specific locations should be treated as part of this scheme, including:
  - Watford Road (west) section – while little support is shown for controls, the situation with the footway is urgent and dangerous. Officers note that this section is likely to be subject of requirements by other statutory bodies for introduction of controls as part of any traffic order associated with this scheme. Permit bays were proposed and could be introduced, or the bays could (not recommended) be uncontrolled except to enable ‘at any time’ restrictions or a clearway to be introduced on the carriageway, which would also control the dangerous parking on footway.
  - Winton Drive – Proposed change to timing on one section of bays, to assist local school.
  - Baldwins Lane – Bus stop clearways near Two Bridges roundabout.

2.22 It is intended that every address in the agreed scheme area, or considered likely to be affected by the final scheme, will be notified (but not consulted) by letter that the scheme is intended to proceed. This will give people the opportunity, if they wish, to proactively demonstrate support for their street to be included in the final scheme area.

### **3 Options and Reasons for Recommendations**

3.1 The selection of one of the proposals set out in the recommendations will enable the effective control and progression of the Parking Management Programme, through which the Council delivers new parking control schemes in response to public requests, acting as agent to Hertfordshire County Council, which is the local Highway Authority.

### **4 Policy/Budget Reference and Implications**

4.1 The recommendations in this report are within the Council’s agreed policy and budgets, developed to contribute towards the corporate objectives included in:

- Three Rivers Community Strategy 2018 to 2021
- Three Rivers District Council Strategic Plan 2018 to 2021

### **5 Financial Implications**

5.1 The 2019/20 Controlled Parking Budget is £155,000. The overall cost of implementing this scheme cannot be evaluated until a decision has been made (essentially at the making of the traffic order) confirming the scope and extent of the scheme. However, it is anticipated that this scheme will cost around £40,000 and can be contained within the overall budget provision.

### **6 Legal Implications**

6.1 This schemes will be progressed in line with the Council’s powers conferred by the Road Traffic Regulation Act and as detailed by 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 Council to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the County Council, to enable works on the highway to proceed.

## **7 Equal Opportunities Implications**

### **7.1 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. |

## **8 Staffing Implications**

8.1 The Parking Management Programme sets out the core annual work of the Traffic Engineer, overseen by the Head of Regulatory Services.

## **9 Environmental Implications**

9.1 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 and specifically in the local design guide, Roads in Hertfordshire (2011).

## **10 Community Safety Implications**

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

## **11 Public Health implications**

11.1 None specific.

## **12 Customer Services Centre Implications**

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

## **13 Communications and Website Implications**

13.1 Information about the progress of schemes, and the Council's general approach to parking schemes, will be made available online and at key local public locations (such as libraries and Parish Council offices) as appropriate.

## **14 Risk and Health & Safety Implications**

14.1 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.

14.2 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).

| <b>Nature of Risk</b>  | <b>Consequence</b>  | <b>Suggested Control Measures</b>  | <b>Response</b><br><i>(tolerate, treat, terminate, transfer)</i>   | <b>Risk Rating</b><br><i>(combination of likelihood and impact)</i> |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Traffic Order advertisement attracts unresolvable objections | Potential withdrawal of whole scheme; more likely modification of proposed design in response to issues raised. | The standard process involving 2 or 3 stages of informal public consultation is specifically intended to enable the public to inform and contribute to the development of all Traffic Order proposals to avoid objections to the formal Notice of Proposals. | Tolerate: this is a standard risk in any Traffic Order-making process; it cannot be prevented nor mitigated for. | 4   |

14.3 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.

|   |            |               |                  |                  |
|---|------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Very Likely</b><br>-----<br>▲<br><b>Remote</b><br>-----<br><b>Likelihood</b> | <b>Low</b> | <b>High</b>   | <b>Very High</b> | <b>Very High</b> |
|   | 4          | 8             | 12               | 16               |
|   | <b>Low</b> | <b>Medium</b> | <b>High</b>      | <b>Very High</b> |
|   | 3          | 6             | 9                | 12               |
|   | <b>Low</b> | <b>Low</b>    | <b>Medium</b>    | <b>High</b>      |
|   | 2          | 4             | 6                | 8                |

|  |                           |          |          |          |
|--|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | Low<br>1                  | Low<br>2 | Low<br>3 | Low<br>4 |
|  | Impact<br>Low -----> High |          |          |          |

**Impact Score**

4 (Catastrophic)

3 (Critical)

2 (Significant)

1 (Marginal)

**Likelihood Score**

4 (Very Likely (≥80%))

3 (Likely (21-79%))

2 (Unlikely (6-20%))

1 (Remote (≤5%))

14.4 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.

**15 Recommendation**

15.1 That the Committee agrees that on the basis of the results from both stages of the consultation, a final scheme is progressed to the detailed design stage, in line with the details of the proposal published for the stage 2 consultation including the preliminary design proposing permit parking areas (but modified by the public feedback received through that consultation), taking account of the evidenced public preference for a scheme operating for one hour; and with a suggested limit of two resident permits per address consistent with the current Parking Zone; designating the final scheme area to include the streets either:

a. Where over 50% of respondents to the recent consultation on the initial design are in support of the introduction of a scheme (in line with the recommendations of the contracted engineer, as shown in green on the plan at Appendix B);

Or;

b. To include only the streets where a clear majority of respondents (set at 60% of respondents to the recent consultation on the initial design) are in support of the introduction of a permit parking area (subject to any further consultation carried out in relation to the recommendation at 15.2 below)

15.2 That if recommendation 15.1(b) is selected, Committee agrees that any streets where there is a small majority (between 60% and 50% of respondents) in support of a scheme will be treated with a short, targeted further stage of consultation to determine whether these streets should be included in the final scheme area. This recommendation takes into account that, regardless of whether this recommendation is accepted, these and other streets nearby will be notified that a final scheme area has been agreed (as detailed in section 2.22 above).

- 15.3 That the Committee agrees that as part of the final scheme area Officers take forward the specific issues prioritised by local Ward Councillors set out in section 2.21 along with any other minor improvements identified to urgently require attention, progressing these to implementation as part of this final scheme.
- 15.4 That the Committee agrees specifically to re-consult and include in the scheme area the section 'M' called 'Watford Road East' which will involve significant re-consultation (as detailed in section 2.21 above).
- 15.5 That authority is delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member and relevant Ward Councillors to consider responses to any further consultation under the above recommendations; and to include or exclude further streets from the scheme area before detailed design is published as a result of these responses; as well as to address or set aside any formal objections to any Notice of Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders in connection with this final scheme.

Report prepared by: P. Simons, Senior Transport Planner, Regulatory Services

#### **Data Quality**

Data sources: None external.

#### **Background Papers**

None.

#### **APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A – Consultation Outcomes Report (by HBC Traffic Engineers) – to follow

Appendix B – Table and Plan showing percentage support and response rates by area defined by HBC; Stage 2 consultation letter.