

---

# INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Tuesday 25 June 2019 between 7.30pm and 9.16pm.

Councillors present:

Stephen Giles-Medhurst (Lead Member for Transport and Economic Development)	
Andrew Scarth (Lead Member for Housing)	
Phil Williams (Lead Member for Infrastructure and Planning Policy)	
Margaret Hofman	Reena Ranger
Tony Humphreys	David Raw
Joan King	David Sansom for (Cllr Hayward)
Stephanie Singer	Dominic Sokalski for (Cllr Getkahn)

Officers Present: Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services  
Peter Simons, Senior Transport Planner  
Sarah Haythorpe, Principal Committee Manager

Also In attendance: Geof Muggeridge, Director of Community & Environmental Services  
Croxley Green Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher

**Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst in the Chair**

### **IHED 01/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Getkahn (Cllr Dominic Sokalski substituted) and Councillor Alex Hayward (Cllr David Sansom substituted).

### **IHED 02/19 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Infrastructure, Housing and Economic Development Committee meeting held on 19 March were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

As part of the consideration of these Minutes, Members were asked amend one of the minutes from the 8 January 2019 meeting with regard to Minute IHED39/18 – Verge Parking Management ) in order that it concurred with the Chairman's motion as unanimously passed by the Committee.

The Minute to be amended to read as follows:

As set out in section 2.17-2.24, only areas clearly defined as verge, where parallel parking or echelon parking can take place, are included in the programme; and

As set out in section 2.17-2.24, the criteria are enhanced to exclude any grassed amenity green over 5 metres (one car-length) from the kerb-edge of the nearest public road (adopted highway maintainable at public expense); or

As set out in section 2.17-2.24, should Members prefer to continue to replace significant areas of grassed amenity green with car parking facilities, that any relevant proposals are made the subject of a work stream that is separate to this verge hardening programme.

As set out in section 2.33, all such bays and informal parking areas on TRDC land are required to be treated with relevant Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act to control parking and other activities at these locations.

As set out in section 2.36 to 2.37, parking areas on TRDC estate will not be designated for the benefit of private persons or bodies.

This amendment to the Minutes was agreed by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

#### **IHED 03/19 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chairman ruled that the following item of business had not been available 5 clear working days before the meeting but was of sufficient urgency for the following reasons:

Appendix to the Three Rivers Croxley Green Parking Review – Stage 2 Consultation Outcomes

To enable the Council to progress the work with the parking review.

#### **IHED 04/19 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **IHED 05/19 TO RECEIVE A PETITION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 18**

The Committee received a petition, comprising 61 signatures, which stated:

“We are deeply concerned about drivers parking their vehicle on Astons Road, causing danger to public safety and obstructing the passage of other vehicles, particularly those of public services.

We support Moor Park (1958) Ltd, which represents all residents of the estate, in requesting the statutory local authorities to urgently consider measures to prevent parking in Astons Road.”

In accordance with Council Procedural Rule 18, the Lead petitioner, Mr Jamieson from Moor Park (1958) Ltd, presented the petition to the Committee.

The Chairman thanked Mr Jamieson, and informed him that the points raised in the petition would be considered by Officers as part of the Parking Management Programme. With regard to the access by refuse vehicles, he advised that this had been checked with Officers and there had been no reports of problems raised

with regard to access. The restrictions on parking around the station had been put back in place by the County Council.

RESOLVED;

That the petitions be accepted and that Officers consider the points raised in petition.

That the Lead Petitioners be written to in acknowledgement of their submission of the petition as part of the Parking Programme process.

## **IHED 06/19 THREE RIVERS CROXLEY GREEN PARKING REVIEW – STAGE 2 CONSULTATION OUTCOMES**

The report asked the Committee to determine which streets would be included in the final scheme for this review, following the stage 2 consultation in late 2018. It was brought at the Committee's express request following the receipt of petitions in January this year relating to the roads to be included.

The Chairman moved, duly seconded, some revised recommendations as detailed below for consideration by the Committee. These had been circulated to all Members before the meeting.

1. That the Committee agrees that on the basis of the results from 2 consultations in Croxley, a final scheme is progressed to the detailed design stage (Stage 3), 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;
2. That the detailed design be undertaken for roads where over 50% of respondents on the initial design are in support of the introduction of a scheme as shown in green on the plan at Appendix B;
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;
4. That the detailed design once available be discussed with Croxley Councillors and the Lead Member after which residents in the proposed parking zone be informed of the detailed design with an opportunity to comment. *Note: It is expected that a letter will be issued to this effect during July allowing for comments to be received by early September.*
5. That the detailed design be amended, if required, subject to public comments and then progressed to the Traffic Regulation Order stage (Stage 4) as soon as possible after that.
6. The Committee agrees specifically to re-consult and include in the scheme area the section 'M' called 'Watford Road East' (as detailed in section 2.21 above) seeking residents views regarding on pavement parking bays and likely displacement.
7. That those streets not shown in green on the plan at Appendix B (apart from M as above) be informed via letter that will not be included in the proposed Croxley Parking Scheme at the same time as the detailed design is made public and thus

be given the opportunity to comment and make representations to be included before 1 September.

8. That authority is delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member (who will consult Ward Members) 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 progressed to Traffic Regulation Order stage 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 of the final scheme.

The Senior Transport Planner advised that households in all the streets in the proposed parking scheme area had been consulted on whether they would support some sort of parking controls and what sort of features they would like included. The Council had circulated a plan and some indications of what the permits would cost with possible operating times. Residents were asked to indicate what sort of operating times would be preferred if a scheme was introduced. The Council intended to produce a detailed design but needed to determine which streets it would cover. The plan at Appendix C of the report showed the streets that were consulted in the autumn. The colours showed the percentage of support, with the streets with over 50% support highlighted in green. The plan was labelled to show the percentage of people who supported permit parking controls over the percentage of respondents in the street and was derived from more detailed plans to show where there was clusters of support.

In Frankland Road (eastern part being area 'R' and the western half being area 'Q') and showed that the road was split as there was a lack of support at one end of the road but support at the end nearest the station.

In Area 'M', in Watford Road (East), there was a very wide footway which was used for parking. There was a cycle lane on the north side which it was expected would have to be double yellow lined. Local Councillors had suggested to put parking bays on the footway on the southern side (for which there was little resident support). This was because parking on this footway was considered dangerous and obstructive to pedestrians despite the very wide footway width. The Council acts as agent in respect of parking management and expected it likely that it would be required by the County Council and the Police. It was considered likely they would come back and require double yellow lines on the carriageway here, which would also ban all parking on the footway, so introducing parking bays would retain some parking for residents.

The Chairman clarified the revised recommendation (1) was for the preference that the scheme be operated for one hour probably around midday with a suggested limit of two residents permits per address and to be consistent with the current parking zone and therefore not an all-day CPZ.

With regard to Appendix B a Member said the green areas showed the percentage of support being between 50-100% but the percentage of people who had responded was very low. In the report it said the Council did not wish to force changes on residents but there was concern they would be applied where residents did not want them.

The low response rates in some areas were observed by Members but in other areas the response rate was in line with the election turnout.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Mr Grant from the Croxley Green Residents Association spoke against the proposals.

The Senior Transport Planner replied that the Council had consulted with all households and that the data was put together to show where there were clusters of people generally in a particular street or area which supported

parking restrictions. Splitting up Frankland Road was usual practice and could be compared to other restriction zones in Rickmansworth. The road was split following the resident responses on where they felt the problems were. There was evidence to show clear support for some parking controls in Croxley Green but it was difficult to see where the boundaries were going to be if you only included the roads where there was 80-90% in favour. There had to be a continuous area for parking restrictions to work. In terms of consultation responses a figure which was used nationally as a standard was 14% but the response rates which the Council had was 25%.

Usual practice used by the Civil Service and many Local Authorities is that consultation analysis considers only the responses of people who responded and people who did not respond were considered to have neutral views. With regard to the level of detail which had been given in the Stage 2 consultation a preliminary design plan had been provided showing what residents could expect and Officers felt that the level of detail was adequate for that consultation stage.

The Chairman said that what was built in to the recommendations was that the areas not included in the detailed design would receive a further letter saying they were not to be included. If they now wished to be included that would give the residents the opportunity to say. The Council would not force a scheme on the roads where residents said no. The only exception being zone 'M' Watford Road east where there were other considerations with regard to commuter parking.

A Member asked when the Stage 2 consultation was sent out was it made clear to residents that if they did not respond it would be deemed they were in agreement. A number of residents had said they never got the consultation papers. The Senior Transport Planner advised that in terms of the first consultation the papers were all individually addressed and sent by Royal Mail any returned mail outs were recorded to ensure all addresses had received them. In addition exhibitions were held with deposits areas at the library and Parish Council offices as well as Three Rivers House. Information was also provided on site notices.

The Chairman said it was for the Committee to agree to the revised recommendations or not to progress them. In 2017 the residents were consulted and they wanted a scheme.

Consultation on the detailed design would be held with the Local Croxley Councillors and the Parish Council. If residents responded saying they did not want the parking scheme having looked at the detailed design then the road would be removed. That was the purpose of the next stage consultation.

The Senior Transport Planner advised that with any parking scheme a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would need to be completed which was a costly and difficult legal process. To make the TRO the Council would use the detailed design but would only do so if there was resident support. If there was significant opposition it would not be progressed.

A Member said in Dickinson Square the solution to the problem was not what the Council were proposing. The Chairman said a petition had been presented to the Committee in favour of a residents parking scheme there. It was noted that once a TRO was in place there was the ability to amend it and change its operation.

Croxley Green Parish Council said if the consultation went ahead Officers should consult them and that the information to residents should clearly state the solutions to the problems of each specific proposal with the benefits and dis-benefits.

The Chairman moved a further amendment to recommendation 4 to include that the Parish Council be consulted.

A Member reiterated that with regard to the consultation it should clearly state that if you do not respond it would be assumed that you are in agreement. Legal advice would need to be provided on the legal implications of doing that.

On being put to the Committee the revised recommendations were declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being 6 For, 1 Against and 4 Abstentions.

POST MEETING NOTE:

*The question on consultation responses was specifically raised in relation to a recent parking consultation in Croxley Green. When the District Council consults informally ahead of a traffic order proposal, it must consult every directly affected address and must consider every response. Where a response is not received from any directly affected address, the lack of that specific response is not given any weight in the assessment of consultation outcomes. However, the overall response rate in each street is provided to the decision-maker to provide context for the number of responses that are received.*

*This exercise is simply not the same as the voting arrangements for the transfer of the housing stock. This is not a binding vote to determine a particular outcome.*

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee agrees that on the basis of the results from 2 consultations in Croxley, a final scheme is progressed to the detailed design stage (Stage 3), 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;
2. That the detailed design be undertaken for roads where over 50% of respondents on the initial design are in support of the introduction of a scheme as shown in green on the plan at Appendix B;
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;
4. That the detailed design once available be discussed with Croxley Councillors, Parish Council and the Lead Member after which residents in the proposed parking zone be informed of the detailed design with an opportunity to comment.  
*Note: It is expected that a letter will be issued to this effect during July allowing for comments to be received by early September.*
5. That the detailed design be amended, if required, subject to public comments and then progressed to the Traffic Regulation Order stage (Stage 4) as soon as possible after that.
6. The Committee agrees specifically to re-consult and include in the scheme area the section 'M' called 'Watford Road East' (as detailed in section 2.21 above) seeking residents views regarding on pavement parking bays and likely displacement.
7. That those streets not shown in green on the plan at Appendix B (apart from M as above) be informed via letter that will not be included in the proposed Croxley Parking Scheme at the same time as the detailed design is made public and thus

be given the opportunity to comment and make representations to be included before 1 September.

8. That authority is delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member (who will consult Ward Members) 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 progressed to Traffic Regulation Order stage 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 of the final scheme.

## **IHED 07/19    INSTALLATION OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS TO ENHANCE RETAIL CENTRES IN THREE RIVERS DISTRICT**

This report recommended that the Council introduces publicly accessible 'rapid' electric vehicle charging points in car parks around the District. These would be delivered under the Retail Parades Enhancement programme to improve the attractiveness of local retail centres for business users and visitors, as well as providing an opportunity for local residents (and potentially taxi firms) who have no private opportunity to charge their cars. Vehicle charging would be provided at a cost to the user and would be located at the main retail centres in the District. This proposal does not interfere or overlap with other proposals to introduce electric car charging points for purposes other than retail parade enhancement.

The Chairman advised that the funding was within the existing budget in terms of the capital commitment and was in line with the aspirations of the recently passed Council motion on the climate emergency. The charging points were to be located at two locations in the District to see if they could then be rolled out to other parts.

The Senior Transport Planner advised that the way the parking spaces would be monitored to ensure the vehicle was not parked in the bay all day was via negotiation with the electricity feeder in that if the vehicle was parked there longer than it should it would incur an additional fee. The Committee were considering rapid charging points where you could charge a car in 20-30 minutes. There was demand for these chargers in town centres. The County Council had advised that they would not be installing any on the highway. The main reason for them was to improve the retail parades and to provide the opportunity for drivers to charge their car quickly. There were currently very few rapid chargers around. The drivers and passengers would have time to spend in the town centres while the car was charging. The costs that would be incurred would be met by those who use them.

The Committee were reminded that the decision in principal on the electric chargers was taken in 2015. At that time there was potential for having Government funding in relation to low emission vehicles but this offer had not been renewed by the Government since that time.

A Member asked if there would be a downloadable app and a map to show where the chargers were located. Also what would be the parking arrangements? The Senior Transport Planner said all electric vehicles had built in Satellite Navigation which would showed the closest charging point. With regard to the parking bays at Causeway House they were free. In Rickmansworth we would be using 3 bays in one of the short stay car parks. The rapid 150 kw chargers being proposed could be viable for the next 10 years based on current findings. With regard to the app apparently it would be able to advise if the charger was in use as well as its location. On the electric charging points in the Barton Way they were heavily

used which Officers think was by residents as they tended to be used in the evening. They did not produce any revenue as they were slower 'fast chargers' put in place as part of the scheme called "Plugged in Places" and was EU funded to offer free charging points.

Members raised concern with regard to enforcement. The Senior Transport Planner advised that the Council had an enforcement service which would deal with this to ensure that people not charging their vehicles did not park there. If a vehicle overstayed the charging time an extra charge would be added.

The Chairman moved the Officer recommendation in report, duly seconded.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

The installation of charging points as part of the Retail Parade enhancements programme is agreed at two trial locations, in Rickmansworth and Abbots Langley, all details being delegated to the Director (CES) in consultation with the relevant Lead Members for Economic Development, Transport and Parking.

The introduction of further points to locate one in each District settlement is agreed in principle, with all details for specific installations being delegated to the Director (CES) in consultation with the relevant Lead Member for Economic Development.

#### **IHED 08/19 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO PARKING OPTIONS FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES**

This report detailed the outcomes of investigations that were required by this Committee to support a proposed scheme intended to address the parking needs of local businesses and employees who require regular, cost-effective parking near their workplace, while safeguarding the parking needs of local residents and other existing permit holders. This proposal was agreed in outline by the August 2018 meeting of this Committee, to address the required review of business permits and to introduce a solution that will make better use of unused parking capacity in Rickmansworth and Chorleywood.

The proposal creates new permits available to people who are not residents but are working at local addresses, to enable them to park in on-street permit bays and in designated permit bays in off-street car parks. This option would make available only a limited number of permits which would be allocated on a strict quota-based system to ensure that permits can only be used in specific streets or parking places where spare, unused parking capacity has been evidenced.

This will ensure that parking pressures are kept at a sustainable level and to ensure this, a proportion of parking bays (set here as 20%) in each street would be excluded from the scheme, to ensure that legitimate eligible permit holders (other than resident permit holders, who have already been accounted for) find it easy to park.

The Senior Transport Planner advised that what was being proposed was to create a new type of permit for people who worked locally. The reason for this was that there was demand for permits for people who worked locally and there was capacity in the resident parking zones. Surveys had been carried out and studies into the number of permits issued. In Rickmansworth the surveys showed

that around 71% of all of the parking bays were not used on a regular basis during the day and around 68% in Chorleywood. The table in Appendix A set out each street and how much capacity there was. Currently local workers parked in the long stay car parks and for the whole year it cost just over a £1,000. The new permits would allow people to park at a reduced rate.

A Member said that workers would always park nearest the town so if you lived near to the town particularly in Talbot Road/Norfolk Road there may be a space to park but not near to your house and this could be a daily problem. It stated that 4 permits would be available to each business but what controls were in place to stop the scheme from being abused. The Senior Transport Planner referred Members to Paragraph 3.16 in the report which stated the total capacity required by all resident permit holders and how it was protected. On the issuing of permits, at the moment the permit applicant signs a form which included certain terms and conditions which if breached would be given to the Fraud team to investigate. When a member of staff of a local business applied for a permit they would have to provide their car registration so that it can be checked and both the applicant and the business would sign the application for a permit.

In response to a question with regard to lower rates/sliding scale for part time workers, work experience people and voluntary workers and if they could share a permit, the Senior Transport Planner advised that one of the constraints and legal requirements with a TRO was that the Council were not able to discriminate between the different types of road users. The Chairman said that Officers could see if it was feasible.

The Chairman moved the motion to approve the Officer recommendations, duly seconded.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being 8 For, 2 Against and 1 Abstention.

#### RESOLVED:

That informal public consultation on the proposals is undertaken to propose new 'Local Employee permits' in the locations indicated by the final columns (labelled 'Recommended') of the tables at Appendix A, with limited numbers of permits in each street, subject to quotas based on evidenced spare capacity in each street,

That authority to determine these quotas annually is delegated to the Director (DCES) in consultation with the Lead Member for Transport and Economic Development

That (subject to the outcomes of informal public consultation being reported back to the Lead Member for Transport and Economic Development), authority is delegated to the Director (CES) in consultation with that Lead Member to determine details of the scheme in line with those in this report; to authorise advertisement of the relevant traffic orders and to either return a report to this Committee or to set aside objections and proceed to make the traffic orders, to:

- a) increase capacity for permit holders in the locations identified in section 3.17 above;
- b) reallocate off-street car park capacity in:

- i. Talbot Road South Car Park (currently residents permits/business permits/long-stay) to long-stay and resident permits only, reducing by 3 or 10 business permit bays)
  - ii. Talbot Road Car Park (currently residents permits/business permits) to long-stay, reducing by 12 business permits and 12 resident permits)
  - iii. Bury Lane Car Park (currently business permits/long-stay/short-stay) to new permits (reducing provision by 10 short stay bays, 20 long-stay bays; and transferring provision for at least 30 new Local Employee/Business permits from Talbot Road South and Talbot Road car parks)
  - iv. Nursery Car Park (currently residents permits) to residents permits/new permits
  - v. Park Road Car Park (currently 12 bays, to be changed to private parking for Three Rivers House);
- c) prevent the unauthorised use of permits by charging an additional fee where permits are misused;
  - d) in exceptional circumstances and following consultation with the Lead Member for Transport and Economic Development, to issue 'Local Employee' permits at no cost (recording the resulting cost to the Council through Budget Monitoring)
  - e) amend traffic orders to update the eligibility of both businesses and residential addresses for the issue of residents and other permits, in line with the August 2018 report to this Committee to regularise the issue of business permits and following planning decisions that have occurred since the making of the current permit parking traffic orders;

To authorise officers to promote new permits and changes to the business permit scheme.

#### **IHED 09/19 WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee reviewed the work programme. The Chairman advised that there was only one report scheduled for the August meeting on the Housing Allocations Policy. The Principal Committee Manager was asked to check this report was still coming forward to the Committee and if it was not to look to cancel the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the Work Programme be noted and consideration be given to cancelling the August meeting if the Housing Allocations policy was not coming forward to the meeting.

#### **IHED 10/19 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The Chairman moved, duly seconded, the following resolution:

“that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined under paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act. It has been decided by the Council that in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.”

**IHED 11/19    INSTALLATION OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS TO ENHANCE  
RETAIL CENTRES IN THE THREE RIVERS DISTRICT – APPENDIX C**

The Committee consider Appendix C to the report.

**RESOLVED:**

That public access to Appendix C be denied as it contained commercially sensitive data provided by an external firm).

**CHAIRMAN**