
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Tuesday 24 September 2019 between 7.30pm and 8.35pm.

Councillors present:

Stephen Giles-Medhurst (Lead Member for Transport and Economic Development)	
Andrew Scarth (Lead Member for Housing)	
Steve Drury (Lead Member for Infrastructure and Planning Policy)	
Margaret Hofman	Reena Ranger
Tony Humphreys	David Raw
Sara Bedford (for Cllr Getkahn)	Alex Hayward
Stephanie Singer	

Officers Present: Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services
Nigel Pollard, Section Head Financial Planning and Analysis
Sarah Haythorpe, Principal Committee Manager

Also In attendance: Councillors Marilyn Butler, Paula Hiscocks, David Sansom and Croxley Green Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst in the Chair

IHED 12/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Getkahn (Cllr Sara Bedford substituted) and Councillor Joan King.

IHED 13/19 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Infrastructure, Housing and Economic Development Committee meeting held on 25 June 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

IHED 14/19 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:

REPORT FOLLOWING INTRODUCTION OF DEDICATED ON-STREET 'LONG-STAY VISITOR PARKING BAYS' AT KINGS LANGLEY AND CROXLEY GREEN (REF: 17-3)

To enable the revocation of the TRO for the parking bays.

IHED 15/19 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

IHED 16/19 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 18

The Chairman said normally under the Council's Constitution a maximum of three petitions could be presented at any one meeting to enable normal business to be conducted. The matter had been discussed with the Council's Monitoring Officer and it was agreed that given we had a number of petitions, some of which were on the same subject, we should take all of them tonight rather than delay them to the November meeting. It was important that the public see the Council taking account of their views and comments at this appropriate time as all the petitions related to public consultations carried out by the Council rather than delay them until the November meeting.

The Committee received the following petitions:

Petition 1 - To receive a petition signed by 55 residents which states:

Remove Talbot Road from any proposed plan to allow local businesses to grant permits to their employees to park in Talbot Road between 8.30 and 18.30.

Why is this important?

Because Talbot Road is so central, inevitably anyone granted a permit will gravitate to this road, particularly the western end at the junction with Church Street, which is already lacking in enough road parking for residents and particularly in the day, their visitors.

Petition 2 – To receive a petition signed by 111 residents which states:

We as local residents of Cedars Avenue, Nightingale Road and Uxbridge Road, Rickmansworth are submitting this petition to **stop** the introduction of the parking proposal. We believe the proposal is based on a flawed survey, is unclear on where the demand has arisen, lacks detail on how it will be managed and implemented and does not consider the impact on local residents.

Petition 3 – To receive a petition signed by 60 residents which states:

We the residents of Money Hill Road are submitting this petition to object to the Permit Parking proposal for Local Employees in our road. We believe the proposal is based on incorrect data in the number of permit parking spaces, does not take into account safety concerns for this road which is a 'Rat Run' and does not consider the effect on the residents of the road. We are also greatly concerned that the Council Officials are aware that the 46 car parking spaces in the report include the parking across dropped kerbs preventing access to resident's driveways.

Petition 4 – To receive a petition signed by 53 residents which states:

We the undersigned residents of Park Way wish to formally record our objection to the parking management proposals for Park Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire WD3 7AT. This includes objecting to the parking management

proposals for West Rickmansworth and the proposals for parking bays for local workers.

We ask that the current arrangement (single yellow line parking restrictions 8.30am to 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday) remain unchanged.

Petition 5 – To receive a petition signed by 69 residents which states:

We the undersigned, wish to be removed from any proposal for a permit parking scheme in Dickinson Square for the following key reasons:

The introduction of yellow lines would dramatically reduce the available space for residents to park and would significantly speed up the flow of traffic through the Square making it more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists,

Markings on the road would be detrimental to the appearance of Dickinson Square which is a Conservation Area.

Petition 6 – To receive a petition signed by 122 residents which states:

In the Stage 2 consultation over Nov/ Dec 2018, the majority of Frankland Road residents who responded said that they DID NOT WANT a CPZ in Frankland Road.

We, the undersigned, reiterate that we DO NOT WANT a CPZ as currently proposed, and we DO NOT WANT our road split 'East/ West' with CPZ at one end.

In accordance with Council Procedural Rule 18, the Lead petitioners or a resident who signed the petition presented it to the Committee.

The Chairman thanked all the petitioners and the members of the public for attending the meeting and for the presentation of the petitions. All six petitions related to parking consultations undertaken by the Council and they would now be considered alongside and analysed with the other comments received on the consultations. Once consideration of the consultation responses had occurred and Officer reports were received he would be liaising with the appropriate Ward Councillors and discussing the next steps in terms of what if any decisions need to be taken on removing roads, including roads or re-consulting residents. Delegated authority had been given to the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with him (as the Lead Member) to discuss these matters with Ward Councillors and agree the next steps. The Officer reports were unlikely to be received until sometime in mid to late October.

A Member asked once the reports were received from Officers and discussed with the relevant Ward Councillors would a report come back to the Committee. The Chairman advised that the delegation was with the Director in consultation with the Lead Member but he would discuss with the Ward Councillors the next processes and would not make a commitment at this time.

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 consultations.

Attached to the report was the comprehensive period 4 budget monitoring report for the all the Council's committees.

This report has already been presented to the Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting on 2 September 2019 which sought approval to a change in the Council's 2019 - 2023 medium-term financial plan.

The Section Head Financial Planning and Analysis brought the following points to the Committees attention:

Paragraph 1.2 of the Annex showed a favourable variance of £26k at the end of Period 4. There was an explanation in Paragraph 1.4 relating to parking and further details were provided in Appendix 2 of the annex on how the variances had arisen in terms of revenue. In terms of capital this Committee was not reporting any variances in July.

A Member asked about the figure of £510,000 for Asset Management/Property and what it represented. The Chairman advised that this budget was under the remit of the Policy and Resources Committee. The Member wished to know if any of the money related to this Committee. The Section Head Financial Planning and Analysis said that if there was any property that was within the remit of this Committee then some of the costs would be included. The figure of £510,000 was the total cost for the whole Council.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

IHED 18/19 WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee reviewed the work programme. The Head of Regulatory Services advised that the annual Parking Management Programme report and an update on the Cycling Strategy would be presented at the November meeting.

A Member asked about reports on the Conservation Area Appraisals and if Officers could provide an update on whether the Council had a Conservation Officer and what time commitment they gave. The Head of Regulatory Services advised that the Council buy in this resource. It was understood there was limited involvement in the Conservation Area appraisals due to the team having other priorities. With regard to the time commitment of this resource the Head of Regulatory Services would need to provide a written reply. The Conservation Officer came into the offices one day a week to make contact with Development Management staff on sites. She would check with the Head of Planning Policy and Projects details regarding Conservation Area Appraisals.

POST MEETING NOTE: At the moment they spend all their time on Development Management but we have the capacity to ask them to do additional work (subject to budgets) like Conservation Area Appraisals.

The Local Plan does take priority but we should be in a position next year to commission the Rickmansworth Conservation Area Appraisal.

A Member asked for clarification on the report on the "policy review on creation of car parks on TRDC owned land." The Head of Regulatory Services advised that this item had arisen from a report with regard to issues around verge hardening on TRDC owned land. Some requests had been made for the Council to look at informal parking on privately owned TRDC land, disabled parking bays and how we look at those areas where informal parking was taking place. There was

obviously a maintenance liability on the Council as a result of this and Members had asked that this be looked at in more detail.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be noted.

IHED 19/19 REPORT FOLLOWING INTRODUCTION OF DEDICATED ON-STREET 'LONG-STAY VISITOR PARKING BAYS' AT KINGS LANGLEY AND CROXLEY GREEN (REF: 17-3)

The Chairman said the report was being presented due to failure to fully take into account the dynamics of the local road conditions and existing traffic calming features in Kings Langley and as such would lead to additional congestion and impede the free flow of traffic.

The Chairman moved, duly seconded, that the recommendation be amended to "that the Committee determines to initiate procedures to revoke the long term visitor parking bay Traffic Order covering Kings Langley and to suspend the existing bays." The reason behind the amendment was to allow the legal process as detailed in Paragraph 3.2 of the report. This statutory process was a 21 day consultation process with a six week challenge period. If the current suspension was not included in the recommendation it would mean that anyone could park in these bays for the 21 day statutory period and six weeks challenge period and there would be nothing the Council could do about it.

The Parking Working Group had received a proposal which was consulted on with the public and following the consideration of the consultation responses some of the proposals for parking bays along Home Park Mill Link Road and some in Station Road were removed. This followed a meeting with the Lead Member and Ward Councillors. At this time there were no comments, complaints or objections to the proposals in Station Road south of the M25. Both the Police and the HCC Highways Authority were consulted on the proposals and neither raised any objections and indeed the consultants the Council employed raised no issues. Since the installation concerns had been raised by the public and others and the Chairman himself had also visited the site to look at the traffic conditions. In relation to existing traffic calming features installed by the County Council outside No.48 and No.50 Station Road this had not been picked up. This issue had been raised with the County Council who agreed that they should have objected. The TRO for the bays was legally correct and had been legally implemented. The only way to take them out was to revoke the order and revert back to what was there previously.

The Head of Regulatory Services reported that if the Committee were minded to revoke the order in Kings Langley they needed to revoke the dual use of the bays as well. From an Officer perspective we would not be looking to sell any permits in Kings Langley. Anything that was changed in Kings Langley as a result of this recommendation would be revoked and enforcement would start.

Members made the following comments:

The bays were looked at by a lot of people (staff, professional consultants, the Highways Authority and the Police Traffic Management Unit). Everyone thought they were okay and no objections had been made against them. When they were implemented it was obvious they were not right and it was right the Council revoke the situation, learn from it and speak to the other authorities involved about how we had come to this decision

With regard to the responses to the original consultation, the Chairman advised that there were no comments raised both for or against in relation to the bays towards the M25 on Station Road and at the traffic lights. On paper the bays looked feasible and it was not until the lines went down that it showed they were not going to work.

How strong was the local concern? Local concern had arisen since the lines had gone down. A Member noted the number of concerns that they were aware of was three figures.

When would Members see the total cost for installing the bays and removing them? The Chairman said the cost were absorbed within the parking budget and there was no separate figure for this scheme.

What lessons had the Council taken away from this experience especially with regard to future consultations, how people were consulted, and the use of social media as that was where the bulk of the objections came from. The Chairman advised that details were placed on the Council's Facebook page, the public were formally consulted, notices had been put up, letters sent, plans were available on the website and public notices. With any TROs there was a statutory consultation process to go through. All the consultees signed off the TRO so there was a learning curve for everyone.

If people did not respond how can the Council assume whether they were either for or against? The Council need to look at how we do consultations and also consider the implications on houses who do not have residential frontages.

The Council must always consider highways safety and act on this and there was clearly a highways issue here.

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

RESOLVED:

that the Committee determines to initiate procedures to revoke the long term visitor parking bay Traffic Order covering Kings Langley and to suspend the existing bays.

CHAIRMAN