

DECISION RECORD ¹

Subject: Traffic Regulation Orders

THE HERTFORDSHIRE (VARIOUS ROADS, BUSHEY) (RESTRICTION OF WAITING) ORDER 2017

Delegated Officer: Steve Dibben

Executive Member: Terry Douris

Tel: 01992 658158

Portfolio: Highways

1. Decision

To proceed with the implementation of 'No waiting at any time' double yellow line restrictions as advertised in parts of Herkomer Road, Bournehall Avenue, Park Road, Bournehall Road, Bournemead, Koh-i-noor, Herne Road, Napier Drive, Three Valleys Way, Cockram Close, Wright Close, Wellsfield, Bushey Grove Road and Lambert Court, Bushey.

2. Reasons for the decision

The proposal is to implement *No Waiting at any Time* restrictions in parts of Herkomer Road, Bournehall Avenue, Park Road, Bournehall Road, Bournemead, Koh-i-noor, Herne Road, Napier Drive, Bushey Grove Road and Lambert Court, Bushey to deter inappropriate parking around junctions and footway parking, to maintain sight lines and improve accessibility. Therefore the proposed restrictions were designed to address concerns that had arisen because of on-street parking habits.

Informal consultation with statutory consultees and adjacent residents in Herkomer Road, Bournehall Avenue, Park Road, Bournehall Road, Bournemead, Koh-i-noor, Herne Road, Napier Drive, Bushey Grove Road and Lambert Court took place between 8th and 22nd January 2016. There were 6 responses to the informal consultation, each in support of the proposed restrictions. Each response was considered and discussed with the local county councillor, following which the promoting officer decided the proposals should be formally advertised un-amended.

Proposals for Three Valleys Way, Cockram Close, Wright Close and Westfield were then included in the overall scheme following completion of an adjacent development and consequential parking problems. So informal consultation for Three Valleys, Cockram Close, Wright Close and Westfield Way took place between 23rd May and 13th June 2016, which was further extended to encourage community participation until 5th August 2016. This extended consultation drew 8 responses; 5 in support with 3 objecting. The 3 objections all supported the restrictions but were worried the proposals did not go far enough to overcome potential displaced parking that may arise. Each response was considered by the promoting officer and local county councillor, and the promoting officer's decision, in regards to the objections was that the proposed restrictions were sufficient to maintain traffic free-flow, safety and junction visibility. However, to mitigate those objections officer's proposed to monitor the impact of any displaced parking. Consequently, the promoting officer decided the proposals should be formally advertised un-amended.

The proposed restrictions for each site were then advertised in a Public Notice, this is a statutory requirement; residents were then notified through a letter drop. The formal consultation took place between 6th and 27th January 2017, to which a number of responses were received. These are summarised as follows:

Bushey Grove Road, Lambert Court and Napier Drive

There were 4 responses to the Public Notice; 3 being objections. The main reasons for objection were that:

- a Controlled Parking Scheme (CPZ) should be introduced;
- there would be a loss of on-street parking;
- parking would displace into adjacent streets;
- traffic speeds will increase;
- 'H' bar parking are required to protect driveways;

The promoting officer considered each objection against the reasons for the proposed restrictions and came to the following opinion:

Napier Drive: The restrictions are proposed to deter motorists from parking on the footway and within the double bend section of Napier Drive. Parked vehicles partially obstruct passage for pedestrians and inhibit passage of larger vehicles such as refuse vehicles and emergency service vehicles. The extent of proposed restriction is the minimum to achieve Rule 243 of the Highway Code, which informs that motorists should not stop or park anywhere which would prevent access for Emergency Services vehicles or on a bend. Additionally, Rule 244 informs that motorists must not park partially or wholly on the pavement unless signs permit it, because parking on the footway can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs. The promoting officer recommended the proposed restrictions should be implemented because of the overriding road safety concerns.

Bushey Grove Road/Lambert Court: The restrictions are proposed to deter motorists from parking on the junction and opposite parking bays. Parked vehicles currently obstruct visibility at the junction, detrimentally reducing sight lines. The extent of proposed restriction around the junction is the minimum described within Rule 243 of the Highway Code, which informs motorists should not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction. Whilst some vehicles will be displaced, it is anticipated they will move to areas which will not restrict sight lines. The length of restriction in Lambert Court is extended to deter motorists from parking opposite parking bays, this is necessary for accessibility purposes. The request for a CPZ has been passed to Hertsmere Borough Council, as the Parking Authority, for consideration. Subsequent negotiations with 1 objector has resulted in that objection being withdrawn, on the understanding that 'H' bar markings will be provided for 24 & 26 Bushey Grove Road.. Sufficient on-street parking in Bushey Grove Road has been retained so there is no evidence to suggest that traffic speeds will increase, however, this matter will be monitored. The promoting officer recommended the proposed restrictions should be implemented because of the overriding road safety concerns.

Herkomer Road, Bournehall Road, Kol-I-Noor Avenue, Bournemead & Clapgate Road

There were 3 responses received to the Public Notice, each supporting the proposed restrictions. There were no objections. The promoting officer considered each response, the reasons for the proposed restrictions, and recommended the proposed restrictions should be implemented.

Three Valleys Way, Wright Close, Wellsfield and Cockram Close

There were 2 responses received to the Public Notice, each supporting the proposed restrictions. There were no objections. There was however 3 objections received during the informal consultation, each worried the proposals did not go far enough to overcome potential displaced parking that may arise. Each response was again considered by the promoting officer who recommended the proposed restrictions should be implemented because the proposed restrictions were deemed sufficient to maintain traffic free-flow, safety and junction visibility. However, officers propose to monitor the impact of any displaced parking.

Having reviewed the evidence, proposed restrictions, consultation and responses, I am of the view that the restrictions are proportionate and necessary, and that they should be implemented un-amended.

4. Consultation

(a) Comments of Executive Member ^{2 3}

Consulted on 17th March 2017 and confirmed agreement for the proposed decision and scheme to proceed on 20th March 2017, by confirming:

'Noting the response from Cllr West, I am content to approve these schemes as finally presented'.

(b) Comments of other consultees ⁴

The process was supported by the local member at the informal and formal consultation stages. County Councillor Jane West was further updated about objections on 20th March 2017 and confirmed support, for the reason there had been insufficient opposition to persuade Councillor West that the scheme should not be implemented un-amended.

Hertfordshire Constabulary raised no objections.

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

Signed:

Title: Hig

Date: 24th March 2017

6. Copies of agreed document to:

- All consultees
- Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- hard copy (for public inspection) Assistant Head of Member Services - Room 211 County Hall.

¹ for guidance see Chief Legal Officer's note "Taking Decisions"

² record any conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member consulted. Also record any dispensations granted by the Council's Standards Committee

³ 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

⁴ 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 e mail) 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.