DECISION RECORD

Subject: Tring TRO
Staff Contact: Ian Thompson
Tel: 01992 658175 (58175)

Executive Member: Terry Douris
Portfolio: Highways

1. Decision
To proceed with the implementation of no waiting at any time restrictions as advertised and/or amended in Wick Road/Chesham Road, Wigginton and Miswell Lane, Tring. Plus partial footway parking bays in Wingrave Road, Tring.

2. Reasons for the decision
At the informal consultation stage (29/1/16 to 12/2/16) the Police responded they had no objection to any of the proposals. The other responses received were:

- Wick Road/Chesham Road – three responses of support Including Wigginton Parish Council.
- Miswell Lane – no responses.
- Wingrave Road – two responses; one in support and one happy to see some improvements, but querying the actual benefit they will bring.

The responses were considered and it was decided to progress to the formal stage with the proposals unchanged.

At the formal consultation stage (5/10/16 to 26/10/16) the Police again responded they had no objection to any of the proposals. The other responses received were:

- Wick Road/Chesham Road – one response of support.
- Miswell Lane – four responses; one of support and three objecting. The main reasons for the objections was the reduced availability of on street parking as the location consists of residential and commercial properties, so demand is high for residents and customers. Also, one objection requested that restrictions are placed in the service road to deter all day parking.
- Wingrave Road – three responses; two with objections and one query. The query was regarding how an application for a VXO may affect the proposals as it would be within the extents and the objections were that:
  - Majority of vehicles are parked in a nearby road so that should have capacity improved.
  - The footway is too narrow to allow partial parking and would affect pedestrians.
  - If vehicles park wholly on the carriageway there is room for two buses to pass.
  - Proposals do not create additional parking.
  - Questions the justification behind the scheme and the funds could be better spent.

The responses were considered and the following recommendations reached:
• Wick Road/Chesham Road – progress to sealing unchanged.
• Miswell Lane – the service road is a private road so we cannot place restriction on this. There have been some limited waiting bays recently installed which will allow a turnover for customers to park. There is parking to the rear of the premises for residents and workers, plus there is a new development of housing reached via the northern service road access. Therefore, it is felt the proposals are required and should progress to sealing unaltered.
• Wingrave Road – progress to sealing unchanged based on the following considerations:
  o Improving parking capacity in another road is not part of this scheme.
  o Measurements have been taken and a minimum footway width determined and bays can be marked bearing this in mind.
  o There is no increase in capacity, but the parking occurs now, so the proposals are formalising this in a way that is acceptable to HCC as the highway authority. Including this scheme with the others sites means that the only real costs are for works and these are minimal being limited to signing and markings.
  o The application for a VXO cannot delay the process. If one is made and is successful, there are numerous locations within HCC where VXOs are contained within a length of marked parking bays, so this can be accommodated as required.

Therefore, the decision is that the proposals should progress to sealing as advertised.

3. **Alternative options considered and rejected**

Aside from determining the extents of the proposals at the initial stage, there have been no other options considered.

4. **Consultation**

(a) Comments of Executive Member

Consulted on 25th January 2017 and confirmed agreement for proposed decision and for scheme to proceed via e-mail on 25th January 2017.

(b) Comments of other consultees

The local members were consulted at informal and formal stages and support the scheme.

Hertfordshire Constabulary raised no objection to the scheme. Dacorum Borough Council made no comments on the locations. However, the assumption is they would enforce the restrictions. No other statutory consultees made any comment on the proposals.

The decision to proceed was supported by the local member (Nick Hollinghurst) on 11th January 2017 where they confirmed approvals for the proposals in their advertised states.

5. **Following consultation with, and the concurrence of the Executive Member, I am proceeding with the proposed decision.**

Signed: ........................................... Name: Ian Thompson
6. Copies of agreed document to:

- All consultees
- Chairman, and Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- hard & electronic copy (for public inspection both at County Hall and on Hertsdirect) Assistant Head of Member Services - Room 211 County Hall.

1. for guidance see Chief Legal Officer’s note “Taking Decisions”
2. details of any alternative options considered and rejected by the officer at the time the decision was made
3. record any conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member consulted. If an Executive Member declares a conflict of interest DO NOT PROCEED without seeking advice from the Chief Legal Officer
4. If the matter has general significance for the Council and/or is, or is likely to be, controversial, then the officer shall consult the appropriate Executive Member before proceeding. In some cases it will be necessary to consult more than one Executive Member, and in some cases the Leader of the Council will need to be consulted
5. If the matter has local significance, but no general significance for the Council and no controversial aspects, the officer shall consult or inform the local member in writing (or by email) and proceed. It is essential that all officers responsible for delivering services ensure that local members are kept well briefed on issues affecting their areas.